



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Third Session

Standing Committee
on
Alberta's Economic Future

Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act
Stakeholder Presentations

Tuesday, September 5, 2017
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-3-15

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

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

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

Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (NDP)
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (NDP)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (NDP)
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake (UCP)*
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (NDP)
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (UCP)
Gottfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (NDP)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (NDP)
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (NDP)
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (UCP)
Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (NDP)**

* substitution for Wes Taylor

** substitution for Kim Schreiner

Bill 203 Sponsor

Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (NDP)

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>

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Participants

Muslim Community of Edmonton Mosque	EF-819
Sherif Elsayed, Imam	
Calgary Airport Authority	EF-822
Rob Palmer, Vice-president, Finance, and Chief Financial Officer	
WestJet	EF-822
Brian Znotins, Vice-president, Network, Alliances, and Corporate Development	
Edmonton International Airport.....	EF-823
Lynn Wyton, Director, Passenger Market Development	
National Golf Course Owners Association.....	EF-833
Brent Hutcheon, Alberta Regional Director	
Canadian Society of Club Managers	EF-833
Scott Hippe, Representative, Alberta Branch	
Canadian Association of Road Safety Professionals	EF-837
Tony Churchill, Board Member	
Oilers Entertainment Group.....	EF-840
Stew MacDonald, Executive Vice-president, Revenue	
Tim Shipton, Senior Vice-president, Corporate Communications and Government Relations	

9 a.m.

Tuesday, September 5, 2017

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

The Chair: Welcome, everyone – members, staff, guests – to the meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. I'd first like to acknowledge that this meeting is commencing on the traditional land of Treaty 6.

My name is Graham Sucha. I'm the MLA for Calgary-Shaw and the chair of the committee. I'd ask that committee members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and then we'll hear from those on the phone. We'll start with the member to my right.

Mr. van Dijken: Good morning. Deputy Chair Glenn van Dijken, MLA for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, MLA, Little Bow.

Mr. Cyr: Scott Cyr, MLA, Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

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

Mr. Piquette: Good morning. Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Red Water.

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

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

Ms Woollard: Good morning. Denise Woollard, MLA, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair: And those on the phone?

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

Connolly: Good morning. Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwood.

The Chair: Excellent.

For the record I'd like to note that Ms Woollard is substituting for Mrs. Schreiner, and Mr. Cyr is substituting for Mr. Taylor.

Before we get to the business at hand, a few operational items. The microphone consoles are operated by *Hansard* staff. Please ensure that all cellphones are on silent mode. Audio and video recording of committee proceedings is streamed live on the Internet and recorded by *Hansard*. Audio and video access and the meeting transcripts are obtained via the Legislative Assembly website.

I'll move to the agenda. Would a member like to move approval of the agenda for today's meeting? Moved by Member McPherson

that the September 5, 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. On the phones? That motion is carried.

Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting. We have the minutes from our last meeting on August 8, 2017. Are there any errors or omissions to note? Seeing and hearing none, if a member would like to move adoption of the minutes, please. Moved by MLA Fitzpatrick that the minutes for the August 8, 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. On the phones? That motion is carried.

We'll move on to the next item on the agenda, oral presentations from stakeholders in regard to Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act. Hon. members, on August 8 the committee decided to hear oral presentations in regard to its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act. All of the persons and organizations that the committee decided to invite were contacted by the committee clerk. The oral presentations that we are hearing today are being made prior to a series of public meetings that will be held by a subcommittee of this committee, which was established in the August 8, 2017, meeting. Public meetings will be held here in Edmonton, Grande Prairie, Calgary, and Lethbridge.

For today's oral presentations all participants have been invited to make a five-minute presentation as part of the review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act. After the presentations are completed, I will open the floor to questions from committee members.

At this point I would like to introduce our first panel guest, who is at the table with us today. Before you begin, please introduce yourself for the record. You're from the Islamic Centre University, if I'm correct.

Muslim Community of Edmonton Mosque

Imam Elsayed: Yes. My name is Sherif Elsayed. I'm the imam of the Muslim Community of Edmonton mosque, the university mosque. I'm here to represent the mosque and speak on behalf of the committee of the mosque. First of all, thank you so much for allowing us to be a part of this conversation and committee.

Two, just to quickly highlight, you know, the population of Muslims in Alberta, according to the recent estimates, is about 120,000, which is almost 2.8 per cent of Albertans. To represent and to speak on behalf of every Muslim will be very hard, but as much as I can, I will be giving the impact, how this will affect the Muslim religious practice when it comes to the change of the time.

Muslims, when we practise – I believe some of you are aware of that – we pray five times a day, and the good thing is that our prayer goes by the signs, not by the time, so it is by the sun and by the sunset, which means that whether we change the time or we keep it as it is, we'll be still following the sun and the signs during the day.

There will be personal preference. For example, I'll give you a very quick note. In December and January of every year our first prayer goes according to the current time. The first prayer goes around 7 a.m. If we keep it as it is and we don't change the time, this prayer will be around 8. I will say that some Muslims will be affected by that. He prays and goes to work; now he's not going to be able to. Again, my understanding as a Muslim leader is that he still can pray at work. It's not a big deal.

The bottom line is that as Muslims I don't see – maybe from a personal preference you will find some people against and some people pro, but from a religious perspective there is nothing in the Islamic religion that is against what will happen, that will say that what the government is thinking of will affect the religious practice of the Muslim community in Alberta. I see, and I discussed this with

my committee and community, that if you guys decide to go with it or to keep it as it is, we'll not be affected, so either way we're okay with it as the Muslim community. We are neither for nor against the change and would support the outcome of this discussion either way.

Thank you so much.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you. You said it was Mr. Elsayed, if I'm correct?

Imam Elsayed: Yes. Sherif Elsayed.

The Chair: Excellent.

I'll now open it up for questions from any committee members. MLA Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair, and thank you very much, Imam, for your presentation. I appreciate you taking the time to come here. In my riding of Edmonton-McClung, of course, the Muslim Association of Canada Rahma mosque is located, so I'm quite interested in hearing what you have to say on this proposal. It's very important to this committee that we hear from all Albertans as well and consider the effects the proposed changes in Bill 203 could have. I just have a couple of clarifying questions. First, in regard to Ramadan my understanding is that daylight saving time has some impact on your fasting and prayer schedule given that it occurs when we have some of our longest days. Can you speak to this issue?

Imam Elsayed: Yes. Again, in Ramadan when it comes to fasting, we fast from the dawn, before the sun rises, until the sun sets, so, again, it's the matter of the signs for the start of the fasting and end of the fasting. In the summer it goes up to, like, 10 p.m. In the winter – as far as I understand, we will keep the summer time. Correct me if I'm wrong.

The Chair: You're correct. We would remain the same. We'd basically be what you'd see in Saskatchewan.

Imam Elsayed: Exactly.

The Chair: You'd remain the same time in the summer.

Imam Elsayed: In the winter the sun sets around 4. It will set around 5. But I will be starting fasting an hour late, so it will be the same number of hours at the end of the day. It's not going to be affecting the number of hours. Instead of 4, it will be 5.

9:10

We discussed this. When I discussed it with my committee, it will be even better for people who finish work and go back to pray at the end of the day or go finish or break their fast at home with their families. However, the only thing is that the early prayer will be at 8 for around 45 days throughout the whole year. So basically it's not going to affect the fasting at all.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Thanks for that.

Now, if we went to Mountain Standard Time all year round, dawn would occur one hour earlier. What effect would that have on members of your community?

Imam Elsayed: In winter it's not going to affect, again, any. As I said at the beginning, you will have personal preferences, some businesses, some people, but from a religious perspective, which is my area, I don't think it has any effect on the practice of the Muslims with regard to their religious services.

Mr. Dach: All right. I was curious about this, so I looked up to see when the dawn prayer, the fajr, occurred today, and I noted that it was happening around 5 a.m.

Imam Elsayed: Yes.

Mr. Dach: If we were on Mountain Standard Time all year, that would have been around 4 a.m. today. I also looked at around the longest day of year. It was 3:30 a.m. Does this mean that the dawn prayer would occur at 2:30 a.m. on Mountain Standard Time?

Imam Elsayed: Yeah. That's exactly when we pray. During the summertime we pray at 2:30.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Wow.

Imam Elsayed: We're fine with that.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Sounds good. I just wanted to clarify, and I appreciate your input.

Imam Elsayed: Basically, at the last Ramadan our fasting time was from 2:30 until 10:10. That's what we usually have then.

Mr. Dach: Excellent. Thank you.

Imam Elsayed: You're welcome.

The Chair: Excellent.

Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Imam, thank you for taking your time today to speak with us and inform us of some of the implications of this possible legislation. You mentioned about the 8 o'clock prayer time in the wintertime, and I wondered if you'd had any conversations with any of your followers and congregation with respect to any challenges they feel they may have in the workplace. I know that most workplaces try and be as accommodating as they can, but if you're in a production facility or manufacturing or something which is involved with logistics or something like that, that 8 a.m. time may cause some issues between the Islamic followers and their employers. Did you hear any concerns with respect to that from a workplace perspective, productivity perspective, either from employers or employees that you spoke with within your congregation?

Imam Elsayed: Thank you for the question. Concerning the current issue that we're dealing with, we didn't do that kind of questionnaire or survey. But in general we usually get these questions because even 7 o'clock is still – if you're talking about construction or the oil field, you know, at the end of the day, even 7 o'clock is a matter of discussion between the employer and the employee. We all try our best. Most of the employers understand, and they accommodate their employees. We have solutions for that but on individual levels. I don't put it as a rule because prayer time is not for me to decide or to delay or to put it earlier. I follow the sign, and I have to pray at that time. I'm not sure. It will for sure create some kind of unease for some people. They're not going to feel comfortable about it. But whether it affects, again, the practice itself or not – because they can pray at work. If the employer allows them or not, that's another issue.

Let's think about it in a different way. In winter we pray five prayers within office hours. We pray the first prayer, second, third, and fourth within office hours. People work from 8 or 7 to 4; we pray at 7, one; we pray, two, at 12 and at 2 and 4. No employer will allow an employee to take half an hour, half an hour, 15 minutes,

15 minutes, 15 minutes unless they are willing to accommodate them at the end of the day. We're dealing with it on an individual level, but I think it's a good point for us to start. I think the discussion is continuing anyway, so we need to do some kind of, like, survey or questionnaire within the Muslim community. I'm not representing every single voice in Alberta. At the end of the day, I'm going to try my best to handle this job.

Mr. Gotfried: Wonderful. Thank you.

Imam Elsayed: Thank you so much.

The Chair: MLA Woollard.

Ms Woollard: Thank you. Thank you, Imam.

Imam Elsayed: Yes, ma'am.

Ms Woollard: In regard to prayer time, at the present time, when we have to do the changing of the time – we spring forward; we fall back – how is this affecting or does it affect the members of your community? I mean, it obviously does, but is that an issue or a problem in any way, the present, you know, use of time change to go from standard to daylight saving and back again?

Imam Elsayed: I don't think it will be a big effect as a kind of, like, confusion at the beginning. It will happen with everybody. That's your norm. You plan your schedule this way. I believe I did some research, and I know some people are against it, and I understand where they're coming from because it will create that kind of confusion or a different schedule. But, again, if we're talking about a Muslim community and their practice and their religious service, it shouldn't be a big effect on their religious services.

Ms Woollard: Okay.

Imam Elsayed: Yeah. For me personally, when I go pray at 7, I have enough time to go prepare my kids for their school and to take them to school. I'm being honest, and I'm talking of myself now. Now, I came late because of this. I had to drop my kids at their school first, and then I came. You know, 8 will be a challenge with work, taking care of the kids, and stuff like that. But this is a personal thing, and it's not a professional and it's not a religious effect, at the end of the day.

Ms Woollard: I really appreciate your thoughts because those are the things that affect everyone, right?

Imam Elsayed: Exactly.

Ms Woollard: In your opinion, do you think it's preferable right now, at this time of year, to be on Mountain Daylight or Mountain Standard Time? Which do you think would be better?

Imam Elsayed: I think this one is better for me. For one of the prayers, at least, we'll be getting an hour extra. But that's my personal opinion about it.

Ms Woollard: Exactly.

Imam Elsayed: If we keep it as it is today and not change in November as we do, it will be better from this perspective.

Ms Woollard: Okay. What about during the winter months? Do you think it would be better to have the daylight saving or the standard time?

Imam Elsayed: To keep the daylight saving.

Ms Woollard: Okay. Thank you very much.

Imam Elsayed: Thank you so much.

The Chair: Any other questions from any members?

Seeing and hearing none, Mr. Elsayed, thank you so much for coming in and making your presentation to us today.

Imam Elsayed: Thank you so much. Thank you.

The Chair: Right now we'll set up for the next members. Just as a note for Mr. Elsayed as well as or for any members presenting today, if you have any additional information to provide us, you can e-mail the committee clerk by September 12.

9:20

Hon. members, we're in a rare occurrence. We're actually ahead of schedule. I think this is the first time for our committee. With that being said . . .

An Hon. Member: There's a time joke in there somewhere.

The Chair: Right.

Hon. members, before we begin, let's go around the table and introduce ourselves for the record for the next guests. Again, I will remind everyone participating today that we've invited each participant to make a five-minute presentation, after which we'll open the floor for questions from committee members.

I'll start with my deputy chair, on my right side, to introduce himself for the record.

Mr. van Dijken: Good morning. Glenn van Dijken, MLA for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, Little Bow.

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

Mr. Cyr: Scott Cyr, MLA for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

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

Ms McPherson: Karen McPherson, MLA for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, which is where the Calgary International Airport is.

Mr. Piquette: Hello. Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater.

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

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

Ms Woollard: Good morning. Denise Woollard, MLA, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

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

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

The Chair: And those on the phone?

Connolly: Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwod.

Mr. Panda: Prasad Panda, Calgary-Foothills.

The Chair: Excellent. And I'm Graham Sucha. I'm the committee chair and the MLA for Calgary-Shaw.

I'll allow you to introduce yourselves, starting with Mr. Palmer.

Mr. Palmer: Yes. Rob Palmer, chief financial officer and VP of finance at the Calgary International Airport.

Mr. Znotins: Good morning. Brian Znotins, vice-president, network, alliances, and corporate development with WestJet.

Mr. Wyton: Good morning. Lynn Wyton, director of market development with Edmonton International Airport.

The Chair: Excellent.

Mr. Palmer, if you'd like to begin with your presentation.

Calgary Airport Authority

Mr. Palmer: Yes. Thank you. As I mentioned, my name is Rob Palmer. I'm the vice-president of finance and the chief financial officer at the Calgary airport. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to stand alongside our customers and partners to share our concerns with Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act.

To provide a sense of span and scope of operations, 50 million people can be reached within a day's drive of YYC, and cargo can be transported anywhere around the globe from this point within 48 hours. YYC benefits from a strategic location both within Canada and within Alberta, providing a single-hub location specialized in receiving, transferring, storing, and distributing air, rail, highway cargo to both domestic and international markets.

Seventy-five per cent of Alberta's air cargo shipments move through YYC to serve 80 nonstop destinations globally along with Alberta's only nonstop passenger service to Japan, China, Switzerland, Germany, Belize, and Mexico City. YYC is also Alberta's only nonstop, year-round passenger service to the United Kingdom, boasting the highest passenger per capita out of major Canadian cities. All of this positions us as one of Canada's best connected airports for air service, with nearly 16 million passengers in 2016 and seven consecutive years of passenger growth.

We contribute billions of dollars to Alberta's economic development, just over \$8 billion in GDP, and we are a key driver for the province in its efforts to diversify the economy. With the opening of the new international and U.S. terminal, YYC is even better positioned to build airline and destination networks that provide travellers more connections to more places. From a jobs perspective, we directly employ 24,000 Calgarians, with more than 48,000 jobs created and/or maintained by businesses and projects taking place at YYC.

This long list of achievements is driven by careful planning, strategic airline growth, and well-established departure and arrival times that have been integrated into a global airline network. YYC is deeply concerned about the potential impacts on our business, network connections, and growth opportunities should the proposed bill change the time zone moving forward. Any changes that decouple Alberta from the time zone changes followed by most other Canadian provinces and our global partners would essentially distance our province and our airport from other strategically aligned networks. These well-established networks with critical time schedules ensure Calgary, Alberta, and the rest of the country are aligned with the global economy. The proposed time change amendments as laid out in the bill would significantly impact the 16 million passengers per year originating in and out of Calgary and would also impact YYC's position as an airport of choice as global airline connections are renegotiated and recalibrated.

Consultation with our key stakeholders, customers, and partners has amplified the need to clearly identify the impacts and corresponding costs associated with changing the daylight savings time schedule. Initial analysis informs us that the impacts of such a change would be widespread, complex, and costly. YYC's airline partners have well-established schedules, critical connection times at global airports that are synchronized for optimal passenger experience. A permanent time change would not only isolate us from the many markets and customers that we do business with but would also impact Albertans who choose to travel.

As Calgary-based airline WestJet noted, the proposed time change would also require a significant change to the schedule. These changes, although seemingly small, could lead many who are connecting through our airport to simply choose alternate routes that bypass Alberta altogether. In an increasingly competitive landscape, where both local and global businesses are evaluating our city, our region, and our airport against other geographical locations and time zones, segregating Alberta from its current time zone shouldn't be a factor that works against us.

In closing, we want to emphasize YYC's role in positioning Calgary and Alberta on the global stage as strategic, logistic, and transportation hubs. We believe the overall impact of the proposed time change to the aviation industry and industries that use and/or benefit from it cannot be understated and should be a major consideration for the committee.

We thank the committee for hearing our shared concerns and welcome any questions. Thank you.

The Chair: All right. I'll now move on to Mr. Znotins.

WestJet

Mr. Znotins: Good morning. My name is Brian Znotins, and I'm the vice-president of network, alliances, and corporate development at WestJet. I've worked in the airline industry for 19 years building and growing world-class hubs at three different airlines, including one of the world's largest. On behalf of WestJet and our more than 12,000 WestJetters thank you for the opportunity to share our perspective on Bill 203. I'm also very pleased to be joined by two of our provincial airport partners, Edmonton and Calgary international airports.

If I may, I'd like to begin with some background information to set context for my remarks. WestJet launched in 1996 with 220 employees and three aircraft serving five destinations, all of them in western Canada. As you may recall, Edmonton and Calgary were among the original five. Today we have more than 12,000 WestJetters and 150 aircraft serving over 100 destinations in North America, the Caribbean, and Europe. We are proud of our Alberta roots and grateful for the loyalty and support of the more than 200 million guests we have flown in the last 21 years.

Air service is an absolutely vital component of any economy, and WestJet is a significant driver of growth and prosperity in this province. According to an economic impact study, in 2016 our direct, indirect, and induced aggregate impact in Alberta was responsible for more than 34,000 full-time equivalent jobs and a total labour income over \$2.3 billion. When WestJet's other operating expenditures in Alberta are added, we generate a total economic output of nearly \$5.3 billion.

WestJet serves four cities in Alberta: Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, Edmonton, and Calgary. We have over 175 daily flights to and from this province. In fact, 25 per cent of our flights originate in Alberta, and 40 per cent touch the province during the course of a day. Indeed, it is fair to say that not only was Alberta our incubator

in the early years; it remains a major contributor to our financial performance today.

When WestJet first launched, we were a small regional point-to-point carrier, which is to say that for the most part we took guests from their original destinations to their final destination. We did not have a network with multiple destinations for guests to connect to. Today we have grown our airline network and are becoming a full-service network carrier using the hub-and-spoke model, which is absolutely critical to our ability to continue to grow, evolve, and be successful in an industry known more for red ink than for black. Most large airlines have more than one hub, and at WestJet we have three: Vancouver, Calgary, and Toronto. It is our ability to grow our hub in Calgary and continue expansion in Edmonton which creates jobs and associated positive economic spinoffs, including a significant contribution to tourism in this province.

That is our concern today as we contemplate the potential impact of Bill 203. We have a vision of growing Calgary so that it joins other top North American hubs as a gateway to Canada and the world. On that note, WestJet is already flying nonstop to Europe from seven Canadian cities, including to London from Edmonton and Calgary. But that's not all. In May of this year we announced firm orders for ten 787 Dreamliners, with options on another 10, to continue our international expansion. The economic advantages of a global airline headquartered here in Alberta are numerous and far reaching, but the potential inconsistencies caused by not following widely accepted daylight savings time programs will negatively impact our hub strategy in this province and ultimately our ability to continue to grow here.

9:30

Let's look at a real-life, practical example of the damage that this proposal could cause to WestJet and to the Alberta communities we serve. Implementing the Alberta Standard Time Act would place Alberta two time zones away from British Columbia during the winter months. When British Columbia changes back to standard time in November, our scheduled departure times from British Columbia will move back by one hour. Guests leaving Vancouver today at 6 a.m. to make an onward 9:30 a.m. connection in Calgary would now have to leave B.C. at 5 a.m.

Most of WestJet's morning departures out of Calgary are in this 9:30 time frame, especially flights that operate only once per day. It goes without saying that 5 a.m. flights aren't particularly appealing to most travellers, and most will choose alternative routes that bypass Alberta, using airports like Seattle, Denver, and Chicago to reach their final destinations. This connecting traffic is a key building block to the growth of WestJet's hub in Calgary and our continued expansion here in Edmonton.

It also has a positive downstream impact on the strength of our services in Fort McMurray and Grande Prairie. Without that traffic our growth plans would not be possible and could actually lead to reductions in flights if we lost connecting guests who currently use Calgary and Edmonton today. If Bill 203 passes and Alberta remains on the same time all year round, we will see our traffic from British Columbia erode.

In addition to hindering the growth of our Calgary hub, which in turn has negative economic impacts within this province, we believe we would also see increased demand for service through our Vancouver hub as guests opt for more convenient flight times and options there. While this is good for Vancouver and for British Columbia, it would mean the jobs and economic stimulus that results from the growth of our Calgary hub would move west. It goes without saying that in a fragile economy, which is just now showing signs of recovery, we want to ensure that policy decisions made will assist rather than hinder that recovery.

Thank you again for the opportunity to share our concerns about Bill 203 with you. I am pleased to answer any questions once the rest of our panel has concluded their presentations.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Znotins.

Mr. Wyton, if you'd like to do your presentation as well.

Edmonton International Airport

Mr. Wyton: Thank you. As I mentioned, my name is Lynn Wyton, and I'm director of market development with Edmonton International Airport. On behalf of the Edmonton International Airport I want to thank the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future for taking the time to consider the merit and challenges associated with Bill 203. Essentially, thank you for creating this forum. It's also my privilege to be here with colleagues from WestJet and Calgary International Airport for this discussion.

Turning to the proposed legislation under discussion, based on consultation with some of our key stakeholders and our internal discussions, we would encourage this committee and the provincial government to give this matter a fulsome and careful review.

While we are aware of the challenges of daylight saving time, we worry about the unintended consequences of taking our province out of alignment with many of the markets and customers with whom we do business every day. Currently Alberta moves in lockstep with much of the world with respect to yearly time changes. Although little noticed, our business associates have come to know Alberta as a daylight saving time location. In practical terms, that means that we move in tandem with almost everyone with whom we have significant dealings, a critical foundation piece as we move to strengthen Alberta's position as a key logistics and transportation hub that moves people and goods around the world.

However, should Alberta move alone to end its use of daylight saving time, it would result in a type of disconnect with several regions with whom we are trying to develop close cultural and business connections. This challenge will exist, for example, for such key business centres as Los Angeles, San Francisco and the Silicon Valley, Seattle, and Vancouver. Important to note is that these cities are some of Alberta's key connection points into new markets and the Asia Pacific region, and the degree to which we can make our personal and business connections into the west coast flow easily impacts our business competitiveness and the strength of our cultural ties.

From our customers' perspective we see two key impacts. First, the proposed time change would take Alberta two time zones away from North America's west coast during the winter months. Under the proposed legislation, then, travellers attempting to fly from the west coast to Edmonton for a day of meetings or to begin their vacation in Alberta would need to take early departing flights between 5 and 6 a.m. instead of after 6 a.m., as is current practice. This will prove to be a hurdle for some travellers who are deciding whether or not to travel to Alberta to conduct business face to face or to have a vacation. These potential impacts are significant, and in competitive business and tourism marketplaces we encourage this committee to be cautious about offering an inconvenient change to our cultural and business partners.

A quick review of the numbers shows that more than 15,000 flights from B.C. and the western United States would be impacted yearly through Edmonton International Airport.

Secondly, we also know that a time zone change would impact customers by creating confusion as people made improper time changes to their own schedule, resulting in missed flights at Edmonton International Airport.

Simply put, the timing of flights is essential in our industry, and deviating from the current daylight saving time could well have unintended consequences for air service into and through Alberta. Those negative impacts could in turn dampen the positive economic growth momentum that we as an airport offer the Edmonton region and Alberta more broadly.

In closing, I'd like to note how critical WestJet's perspective on this issue is to us. With respect to WestJet's key role in our province, Alberta's air service has benefited significantly from their head office presence here. For Edmonton WestJet is 54 per cent of our market and of critical importance. WestJet connects travellers from the west coast through Alberta cities and on to other markets in Canada. Alberta benefits from this significantly in terms of more air service and economic value to our province. By introducing such an early start time, it will make it far less attractive for travellers on the west coast to choose WestJet to connect through Alberta and on to other markets.

In closing, from our perspective it would appear prudent for the committee to give more in-depth consideration such as a fulsome economic impact assessment before making any changes to daylight saving time. Again I thank the committee for its consideration and would be pleased to discuss our ideas and interests at this time.

Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you very much.

Mr. Znotins, I know you noted that you have some colleagues in the gallery there. If they have any supplemental comments for any of the questions that are presented today, there is a microphone available for them as well. The only thing I would ask is that if they do present at the microphone, they introduce themselves for the record.

I'll open up the floor for questions. Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My first question, Mr. Palmer. In hearing your presentation, I actually have had a fairly good relationship with YYC, and I do understand that in terms of GDP for the city of Calgary you represent about 7 per cent. Is that right?

Mr. Palmer: Right. Yeah, I think that's the approximate number. Yeah.

Ms McPherson: Yeah. Okay. So this is a big consideration for you. I understand that.

I was wondering if you've given any thought at all – I know it's not in the bill itself, but if the time change were to be constantly one hour different from Vancouver, would that make a material difference to your consideration?

Mr. Palmer: Well, the thought for us is really – and we've mentioned it a few times – being that two hours away from the west coast. That's the significant piece for us. We feel that having the connections out from the west coast, as we mentioned earlier, through Alberta, either through Edmonton or Calgary, and then on to the rest of the airline networks really focuses on the airline schedule. Brian had mentioned through the WestJet ones, but for us it's other airlines, it's cargo, and it's the interconnectivity with YYC across the globe. Any change to that that disadvantages us we wouldn't be in favour of.

Ms McPherson: So if it wasn't two hours, if it was just one hour – sorry; I really struggle with the map on this – would that be more favourable? Would that be easier to manage?

Mr. Palmer: Well, I think that the issue here is really that there is a set structure today which the world operates around, and we struggle with why we'd want to move off of that from an economic and financial and global competitiveness perspective. Moving us two hours is the example used today. Say that someone has to leave Vancouver at 5 a.m. to get to their flight that carries on to Toronto or to the U.S. or to overseas, it would make it a lot more difficult for someone to catch that flight. They might choose other routes to come through there. The two hours from the west coast is a big part of it, but also just making us uncompetitive for the global interconnections from an airline perspective is really what we're concerned about.

Ms McPherson: Okay. Just a little bit further on the example that you're using, going from Vancouver to Ontario, routing through Alberta, the end point, the arrival in Ontario, that's a fixed time? That won't change?

Mr. Palmer: I may ask our expert here at WestJet to answer some of those questions.

9:40

Ms McPherson: Sure. Thanks.

Mr. Znotins: Thank you for the question, Member McPherson. We set our flight schedules out of Calgary so that we can build connections from different provinces in and near Calgary and then we can fly on to onward destinations at a specific time of day. I'll use a Nashville flight as an example. It's a better example than Toronto because there's no nonstop service from the west to Nashville.

We launched a recent Calgary-Nashville service twice a week, and that flight needs to leave at 9:30 out of Calgary so it can get to Nashville and back in time to get back that night and build connections to onward flights. Out of Vancouver right now, if you're leaving Vancouver and you want to go to Nashville, you can choose Calgary, you can drive to Seattle, you can connect in Denver or Chicago: a bunch of different connecting options that you have.

For us to compete with that traffic and have a 6 a.m. departure is actually a little bit of a struggle as it is, but to move it to a 5 a.m. departure out of Vancouver to connect to that 9:30 flight in Calgary would be catastrophic for those guests who are trying to connect through. We can't simply just re-time our Calgary flights to 10:30 so that we can keep that Vancouver time because the Nashville flight will get back to Calgary too late and guests in Calgary won't want to get back to Calgary from Nashville at 10:30 and getting in their car and driving home and it's midnight.

We want to be very close to B.C. not only in distance – we can't change that – but time, and that two hours is a big difference for us.

Ms McPherson: So it's not just the flight there and the destination; it's the return flight as well.

Mr. Znotins: Yes.

Ms McPherson: So it's not like you're parking your plane there overnight and waiting for them.

Mr. Znotins: That's exactly right. All of our flights on these types of destinations generally leave Calgary at 9:30 in the morning, and they generally get back at about 9:30 at night. They're going to the destination, exchanging guests there, and coming back to the hub and then connecting in Calgary again.

Ms McPherson: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Znotins: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, gentlemen, for your insights for us today. For the record I spent about 20 years in the airline industry with Cathay Pacific, so I know just enough to get myself into trouble on this. Of course, one of the favourite sayings in the airline industry is: "What's the best way to become a millionaire? It's to start as a billionaire and buy an airline." We understand how fragile your industry can be during difficult times and how tight the margins can be.

We've seen over the world the development of hubs and how those benefit economies, in some cases not just the cities but the whole countries that are involved. Places like Hong Kong, Singapore, Amsterdam, and Dubai have built real economies around not only the passenger traffic but the cargo side of the business as well, which, obviously, helps the economics. I have some concerns about the traffic leakage, which I think is the issue here. You know, what we won't know is how much we've lost until it actually occurs, and that will impact you in terms of your load factors and could deeply affect your margins because we also know that you don't earn much money until you break over that break-even load factor to actually earn some dollars.

Some of my concern is around, you know, if we can quantify these numbers to some degree. I've just done some simple math here, and let's just say it's 10 passengers a day, which I suspect would be very conservative in terms of a possible loss of traffic. But if that's 10 passengers a day times an average fare of let's just say \$400 – say \$300; we'll be even more modest with that. That's \$3,000 a day times 365 days a year. We're at \$1,095,000 lost in revenue for the airline. What if that number were to double or triple? We'd be looking at an annual revenue leakage in the millions of dollars per year, which could be your profit margins because those could be the load factors that take you over the top.

Could you comment on your concerns about that leakage and the revenue and the margins, the losses that could unfold from that, without being necessarily specific, just some of your concerns on how that could unfold and damage the economy and damage your company?

Mr. Znotins: Thank you, Member Gotfried. I believe you hit the nail on the head. I may not need to answer that question at all, given how well you posed it.

I'll use my Nashville example again. We have about 12 per cent of our connecting guests in Alberta coming from British Columbia. As a company we run a margin depending on the year – some years are better than others – of about 10 or 15 per cent. If we were to lose 10 per cent of our guests, or 15, 12 per cent of our guests, any in that range, that more or less, in a very simple sense, wipes out our entire profitability for the year.

Profitability is what drives growth for the airline, so today if we were to make this change, what it would do is stall growth. We were very proud of this Nashville flight that we added from Calgary. Who'd have thought that we could have nonstop service between those two points? But over half of that flight is connecting guests, and 12 per cent of those connecting guests are coming from B.C. If the margin on that flight is 12 per cent, then we won't make money on that flight and we won't be growing to more Nashvilles in the future. We would like to add other destinations in the U.S. and across Canada which provide convenience for Albertans flying either on a one-stop or a nonstop basis, and it provides jobs for the Alberta economy, both at YYC and YEG, and it also provides jobs

in Fort McMurray and Grande Prairie because there are guests going from Grande Prairie to Calgary to Nashville or from Fort McMurray to Calgary to Nashville as well.

What we're hopeful for at WestJet is growing our Alberta presence, and that growth will be predicated on connections. It helps diversify us away from the energy economy so that we're not entirely dependent on oil and gas traffic moving to and from Calgary and Edmonton. We can bring guests from B.C., we can bring them from Saskatchewan, bring them through the hub to some destination, and that insulates us more so than we are today from this type of energy variability and demand.

For us it's just as much about the flights today and the profitability today as it is for the opportunity for growth. I've built hubs in North America through my career. I'm hoping we can build an even bigger and better hub in Calgary and then more flights out of Edmonton as well, and to do that, we need these connecting guests. To take us two hours away from B.C. cuts off that opportunity for us, and that's where the challenge will lie going forward.

Mr. Palmer: If I may add, Mr. Gotfried?

Mr. Gotfried: Of course.

Mr. Palmer: The compounding effect of that is – that's the impact on the airline, right? Then you think about the impact on the airports. You have fewer passengers coming through. They're not spending money on food and beverage, parking, taking a taxi, so all that is just compounded through fewer passengers coming from the airline through the airports. Again, the economic impact just keeps compounding as you have the impact on the airline. Then it trickles down through the airport and then through the city and the economy as well.

Mr. Gotfried: So airports, vendors, hotels, taxi companies. The list would go on.

Mr. Palmer: Yeah. Absolutely.

Mr. Gotfried: Just another quick question that relates, I think, very much to the network. We're very lucky to have somebody with your talent for developing hubs like Denver and Chicago, which, I think, are things we'd like to emulate in the future. You mentioned that WestJet has invested in some 787 aircraft. I missed the number. Was it 20 aircraft?

Mr. Znotins: We have an order for 10 firm and 10 more options.

Mr. Gotfried: So 20, at about \$200 million apiece Canadian.

Mr. Znotins: We don't disclose the purchase price of the airplanes.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. I hope you got a better deal than that.

That actually speaks to the future ambitions of WestJet in terms of global reach. Do you believe – again, I'm assuming that your hope will be to draw traffic, not just from British Columbia but transborder, using Calgary as a hub to fly to places like England, Europe, Beijing, places like that that you could offer convenient connections. Would this also be impacted by that as you grow your global network?

Mr. Znotins: Absolutely. As we continue to launch these large airplanes, these wide-bodies, to long-haul destinations, they too are dependent on connections, so if we're building our hub in Calgary, that hub will help to support the 787 in the future. If we're not building the hub in Calgary, we're not building the flights out of

Edmonton, and instead we're building flights out of Vancouver or Toronto because they're in a better position than Calgary because of the proposed time zone change. That will make 787s disproportionately grow out of those two hubs instead of growing out of Calgary or Edmonton as well. A hub feeds on itself. The more you grow it, the more it wants to grow, and that will attract not only small airplanes but large airplanes like the 787 as well.

Mr. Gotfried: From my knowledge, again, the economic multiplier of air service is going to be things like business, commercial relationships, tourism obviously, but also some of the cargo movements that could be used in the belly of the passenger aircraft as well.

Mr. Znotins: That's absolutely right. Again going to my Nashville example, we're bringing Tennesseans to Alberta for the first time because there is nonstop service now. Many guests don't want to connect to whatever vacation destination they're going to, and by having this nonstop service, we're introducing Americans to Alberta for the first time as well as Americans that can connect through Calgary onward into B.C. on our flights.

Mr. Gotfried: Yeah, which is a conversation I've had before with some other carriers. If you have to connect through Salt Lake City to come to Banff, why wouldn't you just go to Park City in Utah as well instead of coming all the way to Calgary?

Mr. Znotins: That's exactly right. Yeah.

Mr. Gotfried: Those are great ambitions.

In terms of the outbound connections you did talk about, you know, the Nashville example, but what about some of your other airline partners, particularly in the United States, where you're connecting to their hubs or connecting back from their hubs? Would you see that impacting you in some of the partnerships? I'm not sure of all your partners, but I know you've got partnerships with various U.S. carriers. Could you tell us how that could be affected and how that could also impact your traffic?

Mr. Znotins: Absolutely. Our two largest partners in North America right now are Delta and American, and we do fly to their hubs such as Dallas, and from Dallas there are onward connections to South America and the Caribbean. For Calgary to change time zones and us leaving the flights constant in Calgary for reasons that I noted earlier, a 9:30 flight out of Calgary going down to Dallas now would get in a bit early and create a long connect to a South American flight, and instead you may be able to take a competitor via another gateway on a shorter connect basis down to Latin America. It is a concern of ours as well.

9:50

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. In many of those partner airlines you have code-share as well, do you not?

Mr. Znotins: Absolutely, yes.

Mr. Gotfried: So you have the appearance of service on a WestJet code.

Mr. Znotins: Yes. We'd like to be able to offer service via code-share until we can offer service ourselves on our own flights, but it allows us to open up the world for guests who like earning their WestJet dollars or are loyal to WestJet and can do that on the code-share of another airline.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. Chair, I have some further questions, but I'd like to ensure that other people have an opportunity to also participate.

The Chair: Okay. I'll put you in the queue.

MLA Coolahan.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for your presentation, gentlemen. It hasn't made the job of the committee any easier. I think it is a difficult decision here because on one hand we have many, many submissions on this topic from Albertans who would like to see it done away with, but then we have some very significant economic players who see it differently. So it is a very difficult task.

Now, looking at the 75 per cent of people who submitted saying that they would like to do away with DST, I don't recall there being a heading around travel, so this wasn't their concern. Did you hear from Albertans directly, saying "We are concerned about travel times"? That's for anybody – sorry – who can answer it.

Mr. Wyton: I can start that answer. In my discussion I talked about internal stakeholder discussions and external. We connect extensively with our airlines, as do airports around the world, as you can imagine. They in some way serve as a valuable proxy for direct discussions with travellers. And you can imagine there's also some risk for us to step in directly and invite fulsome, you know, discussion into our system when, in fact, this is the proper forum for that. So we're pleased and will continue to support this forum as the proper place for those discussions.

We also did have discussions with players not at this table. I can inform you that they offered detailed discussions with their travellers' perspectives at the top of their mind in describing the impacts, much of what you're hearing today, in very similar ways.

Maybe I can go into the travellers. Edmonton International Airport spends a great deal of time in partnership with Travel Alberta and also with Edmonton Tourism in discussions exactly in this area. We touched on the tourism expansion, whether from Tennessee, from Asia. We've seen some real successes in that area. Those tourists are counting on Alberta being the typical partner that they rely on. And you can imagine, as you build new markets into these areas – China specifically; Japan has had some interesting expansion recently – they're counting on consistency from us.

I'll just close with one more point. That consistency also reaches into our connections with California, for example, where we, again, have growing tourism interests. I can talk about the entryway into the Alberta Rockies from Edmonton. That's a growing opportunity. The Ice District arrives in Edmonton, and Californians sit up and take notice and go: "Oh, wow. That's a really interesting thing. I'd like to visit. I'd like to start there, and I'd like then to go into the Rockies, into a different part of the Rockies. Oh, I need to leave at 5 a.m. to get there by 9 a.m." That's a different equation than they and their travel agents expect, so I can speak with confidence that, yes, the travellers and their travelling partners will notice this, are noticing it, are concerned about it.

Mr. Znotins: From my perspective, I'm sure most Albertans don't lay awake at night like I do, building airline hubs and understanding the nuances of what a time change would do to an airline schedule. In many cases someone in British Columbia just won't consider the WestJet flight at 5 a.m. They may consider a United flight over Denver at 6 or 7 a.m. to make their connection, and for them they will notice very little difference as a consequence of Alberta changing.

I think where the concern from WestJet's perspective lies is the unilateral change. If we were to move with the rest of the world or North America and move away from daylight saving time or adopt it permanently, whichever we choose, that would largely go unnoticed. From my perspective, travellers are thinking about changing their clocks, and if B.C. stopped changing their clocks and Ontario did and California did all at the same time, I think generally you'd have that perspective. I don't think what you're hearing from Albertans right now is a perspective on changing our clocks unilaterally; you're hearing a perspective on not wanting to change our clocks or the world to not change their clocks anymore, because they haven't thought through the consequences of that as it relates to air travel.

Mr. Coolahan: Okay. Actually, that was my next question. As an airline industry – because a lot of jurisdictions are looking at this right now for various reasons, all over the world, all over Canada – if this bill did not pass and we remained on daylight saving time and B.C. decided to get rid of it, how would that impact your business? Would you be sitting here calling for us to make a change?

Mr. Znotins: Well, it depends which direction they chose to go. As the bill in Alberta is proposed right now, we're actually adopting daylight saving time permanently rather than abolishing it. They would make that same choice, too. If they were either in the same time zone as us for part of the year or one hour away, it would be largely no impact to WestJet because we believe that's a manageable schedule. But if they were to move two hours away as well, we would probably be in the British Columbia Legislature talking about the damage it would do to WestJet there, too, as a result of this. Again, if we were in a world where Alberta and B.C. and Ontario and California all decided to move at the same time, that would be perfectly fine. It's the unilateral move that we have concerns with.

Mr. Coolahan: Okay. So it's an all-or-nothing proposition for the west, I guess, for at least the west.

Mr. Znotins: Well, with B.C. being such a large economic partner for us and the west being such a large economic partner, there are not only the distances of economies but there are the times of economies, and you're in effect distancing yourself more from your most important economic partners by being two hours away from them for a portion of the year.

Mr. Wyton: If I can just add one note. Significant departures from daylight saving time occur in Hawaii, Arizona, and Saskatchewan, so I'm sure that you could have conversations within your own networks very quickly about what it's like to travel to Arizona and experience this change.

Mr. Coolahan: When you discuss Calgary as a hub and Vancouver as a hub, you're referring to goods as well – is that correct? – not just people.

Mr. Znotins: Cargo is an important piece of the airport business and is an important piece of WestJet's business as well. To the extent that we're connecting guests on new flights, we will be connecting cargo through and to the hub as well, and 787s in particular are exceptional cargo airplanes. They can drive a lot of volume. Where we place those airplanes will be influenced by this decision, and thus where the cargo opportunities are will on a knock-on effect basis be influenced as well.

Mr. Palmer: Yeah. On a broader scale, from the Calgary airport perspective, cargo plays a significant part, not only the cargo that WestJet brings but the dedicated cargo carriers. We mentioned earlier in my prepared remarks that 75 per cent of the air cargo for Alberta does come through Calgary. That is linked up through the complex airline networks from the cargo carriers as well. It would be an impact on them, too.

Mr. Wyton: Just to conclude with Edmonton's experience in cargo, we've grown our cargo shipments for the last seven years out of Edmonton International Airport, so absolutely vital to that discussion as well.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you.
Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Going to the phones, Mr. Panda.

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank our guests today from the airport authorities and the airlines to take time to come and present to us.

I'm just hearing the comments of both Mr. Gotfried and Mr. Coolahan. You know, my questions are as a follow-up to their comments. Out of 4.2 million Albertans probably we have submissions from less than half a per cent, but then there are more than a million people that travel from Alberta, particularly from Calgary and Edmonton. Myself and my family and friends take flights from Calgary and Edmonton for connections overseas. Today the world has become a global village, and we just can't make changes disregarding the impacts. This committee is called the Economic Future Committee, so we should be sensitive about the economic impacts of all the policy decisions. If we make changes, particularly in my case, when I take a flight to India and the connection in London is very short – most of the time many of my friends actually miss the flight because of weather delays from here. Then they end up paying extra money to stay in hotels, and the next day there is no guarantee they will get connections. So we have to be mindful about that.

10:00

Also the cost. Like Mr. Gotfried said, if the airlines' profits take a hit, I'm sure they're going to pass that on to the customers. Already people are, you know, paying extra costs for increased corporate taxes and personal income taxes and the carbon tax and whatnot. I just want the guests to comment on how that would impact the passengers and your customers and on how much of those additional costs you will have to pass on to Albertans.

Thank you.

Mr. Palmer: I can take a stab at that from an airport perspective. The airport's viability is the number of passengers going through it. We generate revenues from the airlines directly, but that is our smallest piece of revenue. A good portion of our revenue is generated from passengers, from what we call nonaeronautical revenue. The more passengers that go through, they generate more, as Mr. Gotfried mentioned, either through taxis or food and beverages and in a variety of hotels, in revenue there. The simple connection there is that if you have fewer passengers, you have less revenue being generated.

We're on a cost-recovery basis, so we do everything we can to minimize our costs and be as efficient as possible. One of two things happens: you reduce services provided, which would probably mean fewer jobs, or you would have to pass some of those additional costs that aren't being recovered through revenue on to

the passengers. Usually the way it works is that one of those two things would happen.

The Chair: Do you have any supplementals, Mr. Panda?

Mr. Panda: No. I'll share the time with my colleagues, and I'll come back.

The Chair: Okay. Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay. I have a couple of questions that I think are probably pertinent to everyone. The first one – and I did it very inelegantly before, so I'll just ask directly. If we were to stop observing daylight saving time and just stay on Mountain Standard Time, do you have a sense of what sort of an impact that might have on your business?

Mr. Znotins: As the bill is proposed right now, we would be adopting daylight saving time permanently. If instead we chose to abolish it and stay on Mountain Standard Time, that would be a better option for us because then half the year, in the summer, we would be in the same time zone as British Columbia. In the winter we'd be one away and in no case would we be two hours away from British Columbia. We believe that moving unilaterally is still disadvantageous to WestJet in total, but if we were very keen to stop changing the clocks, that would be a better move for WestJet than the one that's currently proposed.

Ms McPherson: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Wyton: One of the statistics I'll return to from our presentation is that this is 15,000 flights a year. To MLA Gotfried: in looking at 10 passengers impacted per flight and, you know, using those numbers, it's not precise, and in our concluding paragraph we called for a fulsome economic impact review. We would of course be glad to co-operate in something like that and work with whomever was designated.

To speak candidly, we can't see any upside here. We can only see that this would have detrimental effects on economic growth, on business development in the province.

Ms McPherson: Is that regardless of whether it was a two-hour time zone difference or one hour or no? It's the change that's got the most impact: am I hearing that correctly?

Mr. Wyton: Correct. Twice in our presentation we used the phrase "tandem." If we move in concert with the other jurisdictions in North America, we fully understand that, as you've described. There's some risk here of describing things in uncollaborative, unco-operative terms, which doesn't work in Alberta. If we can build momentum and lead in North America as Albertans, that's a different discussion, and we'd be glad to work in that area as well.

Ms McPherson: So you don't see it as a place to be an outlier?

Mr. Wyton: Correct. Very well said.

Mr. Palmer: Yeah. I'd reiterate the comments already made. We're using B.C. as the one example, but again it is the global aspect of us not moving in tandem or moving by ourselves when no one else is following. It really throws things out of balance from a global, international, competitive perspective.

Ms McPherson: I do have one question, and it kind of ties in with your request for an economic impact assessment. Just as a general number for all of the stakeholders here, do you have a sense, that

you could share with us, of the percentage of business or flights that would be impacted by the change in time zone?

Mr. Palmer: I don't have a precise number that we could provide.

Ms McPherson: Oh, I don't expect anything precise.

Mr. Palmer: I think it would require a lot further analysis on that end. It would have to be in conjunction with our partners to come up with a fulsome number on that. A lot of it, from an airport perspective, is that the airlines, whether they be cargo or passenger, make the decisions to fly into your airport. They're the ones ultimately making the route decisions on where they're going to go. From an airport perspective, then, we would layer on the trickle-down effect of: what does that mean for our concessionaires and the rest of the economic impact?

Ms McPherson: Just as it stands right now, how many of the flights that are coming in and out of YYC are from another time zone or going to another time zone? Do you have a sense of that?

Mr. Palmer: I don't, personally, no.

Ms McPherson: Okay. All right. Thanks.

Mr. Znotins: From WestJet's perspective, we agree with Mr. Palmer that, you know, more fulsome study would be required. From a very simple approach, the growth that you see today in Calgary and Edmonton as a result of the connecting guests that we have would not be possible going forward. Whether you measure it 10 years from now or 15 years from now, as long as we're different than the rest of the world and, more importantly, two hours away from B.C., that will stall the growth in Alberta for WestJet. Depending on which year you pick, that will be a number of flights every year. As an airline we tend to grow between 5 and 10 per cent every year, and Calgary tends to grow in concert with that. If Calgary were to stall and instead we redirect that growth to Toronto and Vancouver, that then would be an indication of the type of opportunity we'd be forgoing as a result of this change.

Ms McPherson: Okay. That's very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Wyton: Just returning to the quick analysis we did, we looked at the flights coming from the west coast nonstop into Edmonton, and those are 15,000 flights per year. A hundred per cent of those passengers would be impacted on those flights as they make different plans or they adjust to our change. It's a really rudimentary number. Exactly as you both described, we could go into more detail if asked, but we think that's also a very useful number when we consider that those flights are coming from some global centres that I've already described.

Ms McPherson: It does sound like the west coast is particularly important to Edmonton. Am I getting the gist of that?

Mr. Wyton: Yes, and I think it's shared across the table.

Mr. Palmer: Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. Znotins: Absolutely.

Ms McPherson: Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Excellent.

Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a few questions. I've heard no upside, and it concerns me, as the Economic Future Committee, that we would embark on a path which has no upside for your businesses and, by extension, the businesses that serve the passengers, the suppliers, and the vendors that operate at the airport. That deeply concerns me.

I just wanted to sort of maybe get your sense of how this could play out over the future. We all know that when you have a small competitive advantage, sometimes you outperform your projections, and that's a good thing. What we don't know is that if we build something that is uncompetitive in terms of passenger friendliness, it could actually underperform, and we could actually have much more impact as other carriers take the opportunity and see that opportunity, which they will do, and start jiggling their schedules to be even that much better than what you've got from the west coast, not just across North America using other hubs.

I'm concerned about some of the international expansion opportunities you're looking at with the 787. I'm just trying to think here. To feed a 787 to a place like Beijing or Hong Kong or somewhere, a flight like that can't survive with Calgary traffic or Edmonton traffic. You have to bring all the traffic from western Canada and maybe even from eastern Canada through that flight. Can you see a scenario whereby it would make more sense for you to operate that flight from Vancouver, from the west coast, if this two-hour time difference were an issue, that we would actually drive the economics of that to operate out of a west coast hub that you would feed from across Canada versus Calgary, where you have some challenges with the backhaul traffic coming from B.C., which would be a significant market to support that flight with very convenient times?

10:10

Mr. Znotins: That's absolutely correct. As we're choosing to deploy these 787s, it's part of my team's job to choose the most profitable deployment for those 787s. They're a very high-risk airplane. You noted hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of asset value. It's not that Calgary may be unable to support the flight; it's that Vancouver may be better suited to support the flight in this new environment.

We're always choosing the best opportunity for our airplanes. We may have many good opportunities, but the best one is the one where we deploy the airplane. In the case where Calgary becomes a high-risk option and Vancouver is a lower risk option because of the ability to connect Calgarians and Edmontonians as well through Vancouver, that may be where we end up putting the airplane. That's been true throughout my career, that the best opportunity attracts the airplane, not necessarily just a good opportunity.

Mr. Gotfried: So not only is there potentially a financial impact on WestJet's overall operations from this challenge of the time change, but it could also affect Alberta's ability to attract those long-haul flights, to become more of an international hub, and to be able to attract – I mean, obviously, that will then affect commercial traffic, high-yield traffic, cargo, and also tourism, most specifically, I think, as well because of nonstop flights to a destination. So there's more to this global concern for all Albertans as opposed to just WestJet and your suppliers and airports. Would that be safe to say as well?

Mr. Znotins: That's right. Yes.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. I just want to get back to a question on the cargo issue. Having been in the business, courier traffic and sort of high-speed cargo, as it were, that needs to get to destinations

quickly, is very high yield. In fact, it's as high yield as business class passengers in many cases. Are you concerned also with the connectivity to other cargo networks and to your own network in terms of courier services, which are high yield, and other high-value cargo?

Mr. Znotins: We're absolutely concerned about that. Just like guests, connecting cargo is a great opportunity as well, especially temperature-controlled cargo. That's the high-yield cargo that you're referring to. Time is of the essence when you're doing that. If the 787 is building a longer connection in Calgary and that opportunity isn't there and it goes via another hub or if the 787 isn't in Calgary in the first place because of the guest opportunity that we don't have versus other hubs, then that would be a loss for Alberta and a gain for either some U.S. states or another Canadian province.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. Just one last question. You know, we're talking about traffic leakage. I think most of us around this table are familiar with the term "carbon leakage." I'm just worried that we're going to drive business out of Alberta just because of an inconvenience for Albertans.

You've talked about a study, and I think that that would be worth while so that we around this table and Albertans can understand that what they perceive as an inconvenience may turn into a very deep economic impact on Alberta. Would you feel more comfortable if a study were done that would give us that kind of information? The impact on WestJet, the impact on the airports and all the suppliers and all the tourism, and other economic multipliers that might come from that: would you feel more comfortable if that information was on the table when we or Albertans are making that decision?

Mr. Palmer: Yes. Being from the Calgary airport, absolutely. I think that the question was posed earlier. No one brought up travel as a concern. I don't think they're thinking about it, so they don't know the knock-on effect of not moving their clock forward or back once a year. They're like: okay; it's a lot easier. I know there are other ramifications of it, but I don't think it's been fully vetted about: what are the other impacts of it? So any financial, any data to be provided for that we'd be in favour of.

Mr. Wyton: Yes, very much so.

Mr. Gotfried: I have one question. Today we heard about the GDP impact at the Calgary airport. I would like to hear what the impact on the Edmonton International Airport is from a GDP perspective for the Edmonton region.

Mr. Wyton: Again, our focus when we sat down was: what's the core piece of data that we can share, knowing that there would be a number of presentations and a number of important perspectives? As I began to speak, I described that we understand why this discussion is taking place. Our perspective, we thought, was best described with those 15,000 flights. Our GDP impact at Edmonton International Airport is just over \$2 billion a year, based on 2012 numbers, so we know that's moving north. We're actually in the process of creating a new GDP study as we speak.

I don't want to risk overstating the GDP impact, but I'll give an example of our discussions within the provincial government. We collaborate very closely with the Economic Development and Trade ministry here. We value their insight, and we work closely as we build relationships. If we think back to the discussions that we've had with them, precisely with their business partners, I can't think of a single business relationship that we've built with the Economic Development and Trade ministry that wouldn't be

impacted by this decision. Again, none of those would be positive impacts from a GDP perspective.

Mr. Znotins: From WestJet's perspective we are in conversations with airports around the world and around North America, and when they come to WestJet looking for a new nonstop service, one of the reasons they cite for that is that they're looking to attract new head offices in their home city, and air service is one of the most important factors in the location of that head office. For us more nonstop service to Calgary and Edmonton will naturally mean knock-on effects of more head offices in Calgary and Edmonton for global operations around the world, and that, we believe, is a big GDP influencer of both airports and airlines in the provincial economy.

Mr. Gotfried: Just one last question, then, on that. Having been in the business, I know how hard it is to attract new flights, and I can say for Calgary and Edmonton how hard it is to attract them. Brian, maybe you could comment on how hard it is to get them back if you lose them because of bad economics.

Mr. Znotins: In network planning we're in the business of forecasting. We're forecasting financial performance of a given flight. No one's crystal ball is any clearer than anyone else's, but once you have actual results to drive your decision, if you launch a flight and it doesn't work, those actual results will override any forecast going forward for a number of years. You would rather take a risk on a new opportunity than pursue one that you knew failed before, and that airplane will just simply get reallocated elsewhere in the network.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you very much. Very informative. Thank you.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you for coming in again. This is a lot of very good information. Now, I know that WestJet explored coming up to Cold Lake. That's where I'm from, Bonnyville-Cold Lake. Now, do you see that over the last two years it has been getting easier to do business in Alberta or harder doing business in Alberta and less likely or more likely to add routes in Alberta?

Mr. Znotins: I wouldn't characterize that it's easier or harder to do business in Alberta right now. Obviously, it's harder to do business in Alberta because of the state of the economy. The economy is recovering. We're seeing that in travel data for the first quarter of this year. The total travel demand in and out of Alberta has started increasing for the first time in two years. We've wiped almost a billion dollars in travel demand out of Alberta on a \$6 billion base. That's been pretty tough for an airline to absorb, and it's been tough on WestJet, so I think that supersedes most other factors when we're looking at our performance in the province.

Going forward, as that economic recovery continues, we not only want to grow with it; we want to outgrow it by drawing in guests from other provinces who are not impacted by the Alberta economy. Generally speaking, airlines can grow with GDP, so if GDP is growing 2 or 3 per cent, an airline can grow 2 to 3 per cent because travel demand is growing 2 to 3 per cent. But if you can somehow gather up guests from other economies and bring them into your hub, that allows you to overgrow that GDP, and that's what WestJet is hoping to do with Calgary and Edmonton, overgrow GDP so that we can further diversify ourselves and not make us as exposed to the energy ups and downs that we've seen over the last three years.

Mr. Cyr: Have we seen more growth in other provinces for WestJet versus Alberta?

Mr. Znotins: Over the last five to 10 years on a percentage basis WestJet has grown in Toronto and Ontario more than Alberta. That's largely due to a smaller base, but right now Calgary is not actually WestJet's largest hub. It's Toronto, another big economic powerhouse in the region.

Toronto is built more on local guests going to and from Toronto, much like a New York, where the airport is constrained and you can serve local guests. Calgary and Vancouver we hope to grow more on connecting guests. Over the last 18 months we've actually diverted some flights away from Calgary to the east because of the economic conditions here. Just this year we started growing again, and we hope to grow in the future as the economy recovers and we build the hub. Calgary and Toronto will be neck and neck, but we meet with airports on an ongoing basis.

From an economic point of view, an airport costs point of view, a logistics point of view, all of those factor into our decisions where we grow, and if a hub or an airport becomes more competitive than another for those reasons I mentioned already, we'll overgrow that hub. This potential bill is actually a red X on the list of potential advantages that Calgary and Edmonton could have versus our other big markets that we fly to, and we'll be at risk of diverting airplanes from Alberta to Ontario and B.C. as a result of this change.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you very much.

10:20

Mr. Palmer: MLA Cyr, if I may add as well, just on a general basis in the last couple of years the Alberta airports haven't grown nearly as much or some have contracted compared to the other large airports in Canada, and that is really economic based, right? The downturn in the oil and gas industry has impacted the airports as well. You look at Vancouver or Toronto or Montreal probably growing at close to double digits where here in Alberta it's probably low single digits and sometimes even negative. As Brian had mentioned, we're starting to finally see the turn where the economy is picking up. Airlines are looking differently at Alberta again now, and to add, as he phrased, the big red X would just push us back one step. Where we think we're finally getting out of the doldrums, if you will, and moving forward with some positive news, this would push us back one.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you.

The Chair: Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What I do understand from your annual general meeting, the last one, is that YYC actually grew. Is that right?

Mr. Palmer: One point six per cent. Yeah. We did. Agreed. So 1.6. But if we compare ourselves to Toronto and Vancouver, they are probably 8, 9, or 10 per cent.

Ms McPherson: Oh, for sure. Yeah. But that there was the possibility – I mean, you guys did a great job. That's why you grew.

Mr. Palmer: Well, thank you. I can't take all the credit for that, but yes. The point was that it's been – if you go back four or five years, Alberta was probably leading the way for growth, and now it's gone through its economic downturn. We're trying to pull out of that now, and anything we can do to continue that momentum is something we're in favour of.

Ms McPherson: Great. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, all, for coming to present. I highlight the incredible growth of the airports and WestJet in the last 20 years, and it's been great to see in this province. It is a major driver in this province, in our ability to be a global competitor, and thank you for all the work that you do in helping to grow that end of our province.

In the WestJet presentation we see that a statement is made that if we go away from widely accepted daylight savings time practices, it will negatively impact the hub strategy that you're currently engaged in in this province. That's a significant concern of this committee, I believe, and it should be a significant concern of all Albertans, but not all Albertans are fully aware of these types of impacts. I guess my question is: for the industry to make Albertans aware, are there any steps that the industry is taking to inform Albertans of those negative consequences? We will be going as a subcommittee on the road in the next couple of weeks to try and get some information from Albertans in different jurisdictions, but I'm worried that a lot of Albertans aren't fully aware of these types of consequences. I farm for a living also, and in the ag industry it's been very clear that it's up to the industry to get the people informed of our practices and how we bring food to the tables of the people. Are you engaging in any type of educational endeavour to help Albertans understand these ramifications?

Mr. Palmer: Speaking for Calgary, again I think it's starting with this meeting here and providing our comments and concerns through this venue. It will continue to grow from there, but this is our first step in working with our partners and our customers to gather some information. I would say that we're going to continue to spread the word, if you will, but this was our first step in providing that information to this committee.

Mr. Znotins: You know, as I've explained here today, the impact on WestJet and the airports is nuanced, and nuanced arguments are often difficult to convey simply. I would certainly look to partnering with this committee. Even the *Calgary Herald* covered this late last week, and I had the opportunity to speak with them and explain as simply as I could what the impact to WestJet would be. But in a nuanced world like this, we would certainly need to have the support of the members of this committee as well as that of our airport partners to explain this as we move forward.

It really just boils down to economic benefit and the jobs that come with it for Albertans. Most Albertans from a travel time point of view won't know the growth that they forwent as a result of making this change. That's a difficult argument to make, but it's very clear in the experience I've had in this business. Hubs have shrunk or gone away because of their lack of competitiveness with other hubs in the market, and it's when it's too late that most individuals realize the economic pain that comes with losing a hub. If you were to ask a Pittsburgh or a Cleveland or a St. Louis what the impact of losing their hub was, I think that all could state it now, but it would be a lot harder to state before that hub went away. We're not talking about losing hubs here, but just that the opportunities for growth that come are very nuanced.

Mr. Wyton: We've had initial discussions with a group of closely held stakeholders, our partners in many ways. We've started that process. It's really great to hear you comment on the development of the tour through Alberta as people begin to describe this. We, too, see that as an impact point, where some of these kinds of issues,

as you've described them, nuanced issues, can be raised and the awareness brought that this is a travel and a cargo discussion.

Mr. van Dijken: If I may follow up, when I hear the comment that hubs have shrunk or gone away, that by then it's definitely too late to regrow or to get that thing moving ahead again, it's a significant concern for myself that a lot of Albertans are not fully aware of that risk. You know, we did have a submission that called for a democratic vote by the people of Alberta to decide the issue. If it moves in that direction, would the industry be willing and ready to get all the information out there so that Albertans can make an informed decision?

Mr. Wyton: Yes. We'd be delighted to co-operate and collaborate on this and build the understanding in the province together. Yes. Thanks for the opportunity.

Mr. van Dijken: If I may, you said, "Thanks for the opportunity." I need to understand what you're thinking the opportunity is. Is the opportunity the opportunity to inform, or is it the opportunity for Albertans to have a vote?

Mr. Wyton: At the conclusion of my comments, right at the end, we called for a fulsome economic impact review. We see that the process then takes care of itself. With respect to the legislative process we respectfully deferred it to your needs. As I stated earlier as well, we understand why we're at this table, how this discussion came to fruition. We understand some of the drivers in the communities that brought this forward. Developing an economic impact study, we think, would be a significant contribution to that discussion.

The Chair: To be cognizant of time, I have Gotfried and then Coolahan on the list, and then I'm going to cut it off, just to keep us on time.

Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you. The information you brought to us today is, I think, very balanced and very informative and speaks to the impact. I mean, we are the Economic Future Committee, and I think Albertans need to know about the economic impact of this, not just for WestJet and the airports but for all the other businesses that could benefit from the opportunity of having better connectivity, not only to Canada but North America and the world. I think that it cannot be overstated in terms of the opportunities to be the global player that Alberta can be.

One of the comments earlier was about the possibility that we may lose some of those opportunities, let's say, to Vancouver. We're blessed to have WestJet as an Alberta-based, Calgary-based company, which we're very proud of, I think. All Albertans are very proud of what WestJet has been able to do in terms of building a now global airline here, which has created 12,000 jobs. You've invested over \$18 billion in aircraft, \$4 billion, give or take, to come with more globally aspirational aircraft.

10:30

My concern is that, for example, if you were to launch a service to Asia and choose Vancouver – yes, you are Alberta's darling, yes, we would love for you to build your hub here, but you are one of Canada's premier airlines now. If you were to move some of those operations, those long-haul operations, to Vancouver, would it be safe to say that as you felt success from that operation, that might also shift some of your focus from a Calgary hub to a west coast Vancouver hub if that suited the feeder traffic, the timing, the

logistics, access to bigger markets? Is that possible? I hope that that's not going to happen. But is that possible, that you could shift your focus to another hub because of a growth opportunity versus what could be a dying hub opportunity?

Mr. Znotins: Well, thank you, Member Gotfried. That's exactly what we're concerned about being in Alberta. Alberta is our home. We have a fiduciary responsibility to our shareholders to grow where we're most profitable, but I think if you spoke to most WestJetters, certainly in Alberta, we're rooting for Alberta and we want Alberta to grow the fastest if we had our choice. But it's got to come with the profitability, so if we don't see the profitability in Alberta for whatever reason, be it economic or the change we're contemplating here today, then that growth will come elsewhere.

There's a phrase that we use in network planning: nothing begets growth like success, like profitability. If we were to put the first 787 into Vancouver and it was successful and we built the support for that 787 with flights coming in from Terrace or from Calgary or Edmonton to support that flight that's going on to Asia, those support flights are already in place for the second 787 to go from Vancouver to Asia as well. And hubs build themselves. As you're profitable and as you add more flights, that creates more connecting opportunities to add more flights.

Perhaps the perfect example of this is Charlotte. Just recently American's senior vice-president of revenue management was at a conference and said that Charlotte was American's most profitable hub; not Dallas, not New York, not Chicago, but Charlotte. Charlotte is one of the smallest cities they have a hub in, but it's successful because of the connections that it brings. Over 78 per cent of the guests in Charlotte are connecting through to other flights.

People who live in Charlotte have just a wealth of nonstop service, and they have head offices in Charlotte that they wouldn't otherwise have because of the hubbing and connectivity that goes on there. That's what we're looking to do here as well, get into that virtuous cycle of growth begetting more growth, and that could in essence start in Vancouver and continue there rather than starting in Calgary and continuing here with the change that we're proposing today.

Mr. Gotfried: So in theory you could service, let's say, some underserved or secondary cities in the United States and give them a better connection through Calgary than they could get through some of their own local hubs.

Mr. Znotins: Absolutely. We're in the business at WestJet of network planning. We're in the business of saving people time, and if we can build a solid connection over Calgary versus some other U.S. hub, then guests will naturally gravitate to us, especially the guests who are flying for business, which tend to be higher yield and value the time the most compared to the leisure guests. We love all of our guests, but the business guests are the ones that will tend to buy more on time savings than a leisure guest, and those are the ones that generate the higher yields. They're more likely to sit in Plus, more likely to be a frequent flyer member, and they're the guests that will drive more profitability for us. They're the most time sensitive, and today we're here talking about time. We want to make sure that we make the right decision.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. We've talked about the passenger side, the revenue side of this, but obviously part of the mix here is just profitability and cost. We're looking at this possibly layering some costs on WestJet, not just from an operational standpoint but even a technical standpoint in terms of computers having to be reprogrammed for the Calgary marketplace. I'm assuming that's

there. Obviously, there are other taxes and things like that that we need to be cognizant of.

I think we all want to help WestJet to continue to grow the hubs here in Alberta, that we can be the global player that other airlines have attempted to do in the past and have not brought to fruition. I'm hopeful that we'll have an opportunity to share your message with Albertans so that if it gets to a point where we have a vote that Albertans need to make a decision on or that we have to make a decision on here, we can do it with the information that you've been able to provide us today and maybe with a more fulsome report as well.

Thank you.

Mr. Znotins: Absolutely. Thank you.

The Chair: MLA Coolahan.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Chair. Just a couple of quick questions. In your early economic assessments of what's happening with the change in time zones, did you not see – you probably have to do a deep dive on this, I guess – any economic benefits to being that much closer to the east, larger populations in time?

Mr. Znotins: Well, there were some minor benefits of having Toronto and Ottawa and Montreal closer to Calgary from a time zone point of view, but generally speaking, our connecting opportunity in Calgary is from the west to the east and south. It's not from the east to the west. There's plenty of service to connect nonstop from Toronto to these western points. What we'd rather do is gather up the Vancouverites or guests from Victoria and Terrace and Comox and Nanaimo and bring them through Calgary to go to Nashville, whereas Toronto over Calgary to Nashville is not a very good flight. You're going way out of your way to use Calgary as a hub there. For us the very slight benefit you may see in some markets as a result of being closer to the east is far overshadowed by the great detriment we would see from losing the west.

Mr. Coolahan: And this is primarily being western based because – I don't believe we've heard from your competitors.

Mr. Znotins: Our competitors reference their hubs as being Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver.

Mr. Coolahan: Right. Okay.

Just the last question here quickly and really out of curiosity. A lot of the submissions that we heard from Albertans around why we should keep daylight saving time is the long evenings and the daylight that we get, which is quite wonderful, actually. Does extra daylight or less daylight impact the airline industry, or is it just strictly time?

Mr. Wyton: There's not a significant impact.

Just to refer to your previous question again, because the connections from eastern Canada and eastern United States, for example, into Edmonton International Airport are well established over decades, those patterns for the passengers there, they understand the two-hour difference. Again, we didn't see any upside emerging from a change in that way. When we look at the length of evening, that's a smaller consideration by far as compared to the other impacts that we were describing this morning.

Mr. Coolahan: Good. Thank you.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Excellent. I want to thank our presenters for joining us this morning as well and for your responding to our questions, too.

If you have any additional information to provide us, please forward it through the committee clerk by September 12.

We'll now take a short break and resume at 10:45 with our next presenters.

[The committee adjourned from 10:37 a.m. to 10:50 a.m.]

The Chair: I apologize for the delay. I'd like to call the meeting back to order and welcome everyone.

As a courtesy to our guests who are at the table here, I would have us all introduce ourselves for the record. I'm Graham Sucha. I'm the MLA for Calgary-Shaw and chair of this committee. I'll start with my deputy chair, to my right.

Mr. van Dijken: Good morning. Glenn van Dijken from the Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock constituency.

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, Little Bow.

Mr. Cyr: Scott Cyr, the MLA for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

Ms McPherson: Good morning. I'm Karen McPherson. I'm the MLA for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Mr. Piquette: Hello. I'm Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach, Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Carson: Hello. Jon Carson, MLA, Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Ms Woollard: Good morning. Denise Woollard, MLA, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

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

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

The Chair: Excellent.

And those on the phone?

Connolly: Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwood.

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

The Chair: All right. At this point I'd like to welcome our guests. I'd ask that you begin your presentation by introducing yourself for the record. I'll start with the Alberta chapter of the National Golf Course Owners Association.

National Golf Course Owners Association

Mr. Hutcheon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Brent Hutcheon is my name. I'm the Alberta regional director for the National Golf Course Owners Association. We'll certainly be making up some time, I think, on your agenda. During my brief presentation, obviously, please feel free to interrupt me as we go. I will be pretty much going from a script here, so please bear with me. I'd like to thank the committee for this opportunity and would also like to wish a speedy recovery to committee member Wes Taylor. I understand he went under the knife here last week.

The National Golf Course Owners Association Canada is a not-for-profit trade association for the business of golf in Canada. We're owned, operated, and directed by our 1,400 Canada-wide members, including 193 here in Alberta. Our mandate is to provide one voice for the golf industry and provide business support to the

Canadian golf industry. As stated in our earlier submission, one of our pillars of support is advocacy, so that's why we're here today.

A little bit of background. I'd like to give the committee some background about the golf industry before we weigh in on the economic impact study of golf in Canada. I'm referencing a 31-page 2014 economic impact study, and I can forward a copy of this study to those who wish to see it. It must be noted that we are commissioning another study for economic impact across Canada this fall.

Some of the highlights in the study in 2014. Canada's 2014 golf cluster economic impact amounts to about \$14.3 billion of Canada's GDP, up from \$12.2 billion in 2009. The business of golf contributes \$2.4 billion towards Alberta's GDP, up from \$1.78 billion in 2009. Alberta golf businesses paid \$829 million in property and other indirect taxes here in Alberta plus \$309 million in federal and provincial income taxes in 2014. Alberta created 43,000 jobs in 2014, which was down about 7,000 from 2009, and we do expect this number to be lower again in the 2017 report.

Right into the meat and potatoes of why we're here today is Bill 203. When Bill 203 was being considered, coincidentally we were holding our annual series of spring warm-up meetings in March across Alberta, and this item was high on the agenda. At that time we had yet to see the proposal, but we were all worried that the potential loss of evening sunlight during the golf season would be devastating for our business, and we still stand behind that. After reading the legislation, I have to admit that universal time was very confusing to some in my profession as they thought that UTC and Greenwich time were exactly the same. I understand that that is different. We came to a better understanding of what was proposed.

As I stand before this committee, I really want to get, again, a one hundred per cent understanding that, in fact, the time that we're standing at right now is what we're proposing to go forward. Is that correct? Okay. Thank you. Really and truly, as an industry we would also like assurance that it wouldn't go in the other direction. If it was to go backwards and we go to the wintertime hours, it would be an absolute devastation not only for our industry but if you think of some of the other minor sports. Ball, soccer, any other outdoor activity in the summertime would be drastically impacted. Again, I'm really hoping that that is the case and that it doesn't go in the other direction.

If that is the case, that we're talking about leaving it at this particular time, we as the representatives of the Alberta golf industry stand by our previous statement that if there is to be a change toward a standard time in Alberta, we would support the proposal that's been put forward.

Like I said, we're going to make up some time here. Unless there are any follow-up questions, I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to make this presentation, and I would give the floor to my colleague Scott.

Canadian Society of Club Managers

Mr. Hippe: Perfect. Thanks, Brent. My name is Scott Hippe. I'm the general manager at the Belvedere Golf and Country Club, and I act as a representative of the Alberta branch of the Canadian Society of Club Managers. The Canadian Society of Club Managers has roughly 560 members across Canada. Within Alberta we represent 60 clubs, and of those 60 clubs, 43 are golf clubs. Primarily what we're talking about here today is golf and the ability to stay on daylight time. Similar to Brent, the CSCM works hand in hand with the NGCOA. You know, as we read the bill, we are in support of the bill to stay on Mountain Daylight Time throughout the summer

as the hours at the end of the evening are critical to the success of our golf business.

Like Brent said, this will be relatively short, and if you have any questions for either of us, please feel free to ask.

The Chair: Excellent. All right. Well, thank you.

I'll now open up the floor for questions from members. Hmm. Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: He's forgotten who I am over the summer. No problem.

The last people that presented were the airport authorities and WestJet, and they talked about the value that would be put in if an economic impact study were to be done by this committee. Would you see any value in that, and what would you expect to see if such a study were done?

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

Mr. Hutcheon: I mean, it is a different business model, obviously. The impact on their business would be far greater than on ours. I don't see a harm in an economic impact study. We do it as an industry, you know, once every four years, and we find that information critical. Research is very key in our business, particularly moving forward.

It's getting tougher and tougher to make a go of it in our industry. It used to be – many years ago I remember that a Premier we had, Mr. Getty, said that we could build a golf course a day and that we still wouldn't keep up with demand. That was during the Tiger years, of course, and, you know, a lot of people took that to heart and dug a hole in the ground and charged 10 bucks to go play golf, and everything was good.

Times have certainly changed. The last three years the economy has certainly taken its toll on our industry as well as most others, but I think more education, more research, more data are key to any decision that we make, so I would personally support that. You know, I don't speak a hundred per cent for all of our members, but I'm certain that they'd fall in on that as well.

Mr. Hippe: Just to add to Brent's point, you know, we would be in full support of that as well. With the 60 different clubs, we represent roughly 50,000 members across Alberta. Our job is to communicate with our members on a daily basis to understand any economic impact. Part of the reason that I'm here today representing CSCM is to fully understand the impact not just across our industry but across other industries, so we would be in full support of that.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

MLA Piquette.

11:00

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, a very interesting presentation. I mean, brevity is the soul of wit, so it was well done. Now, I appreciate you guys letting us know what the economic impact of the golfing industry in general is. It's actually pretty substantial, so definitely it's good that you guys came out. Now, I think you've made it very clear what your preference is, you know, as to which way this legislation should go. You'd like to see an end to switching in the fall, so keeping us at the present time. Just a question: how badly would the alternative impact your business? If you didn't have that extra hour of sunlight in the evening, how would that work for you?

Mr. Hippe: It's tough to understand the full impact – right? – but it would be catastrophic. You know, I speak to our golf members. I would hazard to assume or guess that close to 80 per cent of our business is done after 5 o'clock, so just in simple math terms and simple time terms you're looking at a four-hour round of golf. If you're starting to infringe on 9 o'clock as a time to play golf, or when the sun is going down, that would be catastrophic because then we're going from 18 holes to nine holes, which would change the whole dynamic of golf in Alberta. For those individuals, for the majority of the people that pay our bills that are after 5 o'clock – it's probably a myth that everybody golfs during the day. That's not really what happens. The business is driven by the nighttime, after 5 o'clock for sure.

Mr. Piquette: Okay.

Do you have any . . .

Mr. Hutcheon: Well, I'll refer to Scott because he's more in operations. I'm more in the background looking at things, but in my previous life I was sitting in his chair as a manager of a golf course as well.

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

There are ladies' leagues. There are men's leagues. There are junior leagues. You know, I'm thinking not just of golf, but I'm thinking that the entire minor sports community in Alberta would be very impacted by this as well. I mean, this time of the year right now would be almost similar to what it would be in the prime time of the season, and it's very difficult now even to just play nine holes after 6 o'clock. If we had that year-round, people getting off work at 5 or whatever wouldn't take the time, then, to go out. They'd make other decisions on what they're going to do with their recreational dollar. We certainly don't want to see that happen in our industry.

I do have to thank you again for your comments on the GDP. That was one of the reasons that we came here today. About four years ago we came to Edmonton and did a round-table with a lot of the MLAs. At that time their eyes were kind of wide open, too. They didn't understand how significant the industry of golf is here in Alberta. Thank you for stating that.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you for coming.

Just from what you're telling me, just so I understand the golf season and how different the impacts would be, you're saying that the prime time is this time of year? If we didn't change the time, if we stayed on, how would that impact the beginning of the season and the end of the season? Is there a difference? Like, how do you see your volume – do you know what I'm getting at? Where would the impact be?

Mr. Hippe: Yeah. I guess when I say "prime time," I'm not talking necessarily the month but the time of day.

Mr. Piquette: I see. Okay.

Mr. Hippe: Yeah. So the time of day being early evening, late evening, and into dusk. Any impact on that hour moving closer and giving us less daylight would make a drastic impact on our business. You know, you can imagine that if you can golf until 10 o'clock in the middle of the summer and that changes to 9 o'clock, right? What I'm saying is that after 5 o'clock or after 6 o'clock 85 per cent of our business is coming from those golfers.

Mr. Piquette: So that's a pretty important hour, then, is what you're telling us.

Mr. Hippe: It is one of the most important hours, yeah, and not just because of that single hour impact but because a game of golf does take four hours, right? If you start to infringe on a four-hour time frame, that makes a massive impact.

Mr. Piquette: I see. Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent.

Mr. Cyr.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you. I've sat and talked with my local golf courses. There are three main ones in my constituency, and they're saying that they're having a tough time engaging millennials, trying to get them out and golfing, if you will. Now, does that mean that we're more reliant or less reliant on air travel to get to filling these slots within the golf courses?

Mr. Hutcheon: We actually are just beginning to engage with other travel associations across Alberta just on that case. We're in the initial stages of trying to get some more inbound traffic into Alberta for golf. I think in the last year or so there's been a direct flight from Beijing going into Calgary on a weekly basis. We need to understand and try to figure out how to tap into that market. Marketing is going to be key to our success and our future moving forward. I'd say at this point in time that no is the answer to your question. It's not going to impact it a lot, but I suspect it will in the future when we get a little more organized and as an industry get involved with some other partners in the tourism industry as well to create that need.

Mr. Cyr: May I follow up, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you.

So let's say, for instance, a WestJet hub was to shift from Alberta. This could potentially very much affect you guys, then?

Mr. Hutcheon: Well, I would assume it would already. If you look at some of the tourism-ready facilities – the Jaspers, the Banffs, the Wolf Creeks of the world – they're already engaged in that on their own without help for the entire industry. Yes, it would impact them considerably.

Mr. Cyr: One final one?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Cyr: You were here during the presentation by WestJet and the – sorry; I can't remember.

Mr. Schneider: The airport authorities.

Mr. Cyr: The airport authorities. Thank you, Mr. Schneider.

Doesn't that alarm you that they're putting out all kinds of warning alarms, if you will, that this is really bad for them and this could translate to the future being really bad for you?

Mr. Hippe: Yeah. You know, the Alberta economy has definitely in the last three years seen its challenges, which in turn is a direct challenge for golf. Golf, you know, for lack of a better word, is not the cheapest thing to do as an extracurricular activity. Any further impact to the economy is going to hurt our business.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Hutcheon: I hadn't thought of that, Mr. Cyr, but after listening to their presentation, you know, and thinking that they're more concerned about the winter hours than the summer hours, like we're more concerned about – but if we do, for example, lose a hub, then absolutely it's going to impact us.

The Chair: Excellent.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. I'm going to start from the perspective that I'm a contributor to that \$2.3 billion. Unfortunately, I've only gotten to play seven games this year, but I certainly have a membership, and I see the value in golf. I also have grandchildren and great-grandchildren who are involved in minor sports, and that extra hour of daylight is pretty important.

Scott, you had mentioned the prime time for golf certainly being probably after 5 o'clock, and my experience during my working life was certainly after work, so having the extra daylight has an impact. I live in Lethbridge. We actually have one golf course that's open 365 days a year. You may be hitting into the snow, but it's open. Can you tell me or give me an example about the difference in attendance at golf courses during the day as opposed to the evening?

Mr. Hippe: Now, are you specifically talking about the golfer or just the impact that it makes on . . .

Ms Fitzpatrick: The impact on the business in terms of – well, you know, even if you gave me kind of a percentage of people who play during the daytime and a percentage who play after 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Hippe: Yeah. I guess I'll speak to my expertise within a private club. Within a private club, you know, you definitely focus on the daytime golfer, but the daytime golfer is a retired golfer that time is not an issue for – right? – whereas our evening golfer, which is the growth of our business, which is the golfer that is aspiring to be retired and golf during the day, is the heart of our business. That is the key focus. When I say 85 per cent, I might be underestimating the impact down the road five, 10 years. That's the impact it would make on us immediately. We still, even though, you know – like you said yourself, only seven rounds. We thank you for playing only seven rounds, but we wish you'd play more.

11:10

Ms Fitzpatrick: I'd love to play more.

Mr. Hippe: Right. But the future of the club is individuals like yourself – right? – that time is of the essence. It's time sensitive, and people do work.

Ms Fitzpatrick: In terms of the millennials I don't know about other places, but I can certainly tell you that around Lethbridge lots of millennials play golf, and they don't have to fly anywhere because we've got some great courses right there.

The second part of the question I just asked was: does it vary depending on the location of the course?

Mr. Hippe: As far as the prime time goes?

Ms Fitzpatrick: Yes.

Mr. Hippe: It would vary a little bit as there is different daylight at different golf clubs across Alberta, and there are different seasons. You know, Lethbridge is – yeah, if they can do 12 months a year, then great for them.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Pretty close.

Mr. Hippe: Us in Edmonton, you know, we're six months. So it would vary, yeah.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Hypothetically, if the province went to Mountain Time, you'd have much more daylight in the morning. Do you think golfers would get up earlier to go golf in the morning, and could your industry accommodate that? I have my own thoughts on it.

Mr. Hutcheon: There are almost two parts to that question. One is that the maintenance of the golf course is always done in the morning, the mowing and the trimming and the raking of the bunkers. In several municipalities – I believe Edmonton is even one – there's a noise restriction bylaw. You wouldn't even be able to get started on the maintenance side, so that hour in the morning would be absolutely no good because you can only start at 6 o'clock in the morning or whatever time it is. As far as the shift, too, the whole province would have to go to bed an hour earlier, I suppose, but I would suspect that, you know, with almost a blue-collar, go-getter attitude spirit of Albertans, I don't think they'd take the time to go golfing in the morning. For that extra hour they'd probably go to work sooner in my opinion.

Ms Fitzpatrick: I certainly thank you for that response because I know that, you know, if I had to be at work at 8 o'clock, there's no way I'm going out and playing 18 holes between 6 o'clock and 8 in the morning. Everybody that I worked with that played golf had the same experience. They were going golfing in the evening rather than in the morning.

Do you have any idea of the amount of money that would be lost? I know you said it was "catastrophic," but what's the amount of money, do you think, that it would cost if we went to Mountain Standard Time instead of daylight savings?

Mr. Hutcheon: Well, I'll speak on behalf of Small Town, Alberta. For example, I'm helping my daughter who's on maternity leave right now manage her little nine-hole golf course in the middle of nowhere. It's not like it used to be. It's not as busy as it used to be, but the driving force behind their entire revenue stream is the ladies' and the men's nights. If that were to get reduced, the golf course would probably have to close. I'm speaking on behalf of Small Town, Alberta. I'm sure the more urban centres could certainly withstand it a little better than Small Town, Alberta.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Well, certainly, speaking to my club – again, it's just outside of Lethbridge. They have said to me over and over again that if they were to lose that hour – and they're a pretty busy club with lots of retirees, but that extra hour in the evening is what is the difference between working and losing the business.

Mr. Hippe: Yeah. Just to further add to Brent, if we made that shift, we would have to dive into – I say "catastrophic" because there would be a fundamental shift within our entire industry. The impact would be great. It would require a lot of effort to understand that.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. Those are all my questions. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Excellent. To be cognizant of the time, we'll close with Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for presenting to us today. I'm a little confused around some of the conversation we're having here today. We have Bill 203 in front of us, which is Alberta Standard Time Act, which is going to be daylight savings time all year around, or the status quo, which will give you daylight

savings time, by my estimation, from November 5 of this year until March 11, 2018, for example. Given that we're talking around Mountain Standard Time, which is not really even up for discussion at this point in time, I guess I'd like to understand what the impact would be if we were to stay status quo and there would be an hour less time from November 5 until March 11 for the majority of your courses.

Mr. Hippe: Yeah. As we've stated, you know, both NGCOA and the CSCM, in our letters, we are in favour of, or we would support, Bill 203. It would have no impact to our business as stated. Part of the reason that we're here is just to understand fully if there was – as we talk about time, we want to understand that it's just daylight savings time.

Mr. Gotfried: Supplemental to that, then, is if we stayed at the status quo, which would give you daylight savings time from next year, well, to, say, this year from March 11 to November 5 or November 5 of this fall until March 11, 2018, what impact would that have on your business?

Mr. Hutcheon: None.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent.

I want to thank our presenters for coming in today as well and providing us with their responses to any of their questions and their feedback. If you have any additional information to provide us, please forward it to the committee clerk by September 12. Thank you all very much for coming in.

Mr. Hutcheon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Hippe: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: All right. We're now going to move on to panel D, the Canadian Association of Road Safety Professionals. As our individual representative from the organization gets seated, I'd ask that we introduce ourselves for the record. My name is Graham Sucha. I'm the committee chair and the MLA for Calgary-Shaw. I'll move to my deputy chair on my right side here.

Mr. van Dijken: Glenn van Dijken, MLA for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, Little Bow.

Mr. Gill: Prab Gill, Calgary-Greenway.

Mr. Cyr: Scott Cyr, the MLA for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

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

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

Mr. Piquette: Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater.

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

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

Ms Woollard: Good morning. Denise Woollard, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

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

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

The Chair: Excellent.
For those on the phones.

Connolly: Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwood.

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

The Chair: Excellent. Please remember that today the participant has been invited to provide a five-minute presentation, and after that we'll open the floor for questions.

Mr. Churchill, if you'd like to proceed.

Canadian Association of Road Safety Professionals

Mr. Churchill: Thank you. I'm from Calgary-Lougheed.

Thank you very much for inviting me to come and speak on behalf of the Canadian Association of Road Safety Professionals. We're always happy to come and speak about traffic safety. We don't have a strong advocacy position. Part of that is that we are a multidisciplinary organization, so we do have members from industry as well as from government. In many cases governments have different practices. That's part of the reason that we don't have a strong advocacy position, but we are happy to disseminate knowledge and share knowledge about traffic safety and create connections between the various stakeholders in traffic safety. It's not just engineering; it's also education, legislation, enforcement. All of those things work together in concert to improve the safety of our roads, so thank you for inviting me to speak.

In terms of the available research about daylight savings time and collisions, it's quite mixed. There are a lot of different studies that have been over time looking at different aspects of it, and some of them have been finding slightly different things. I'm just going to do a quick rundown through these and provide a quick summary of where we're at in terms of what we see as some of the benefits of converting to year-round time or the potential drawbacks.

11:20

In terms of the Alberta setting we're talking about some societal benefits or disbenefits of different industries. Traffic safety in Alberta actually has a societal disbenefit, so if we look at the economic loss related to collisions and responding to collisions, the estimate for 2015, based on a study which was done in Edmonton on the societal disbenefit, or costs, of collisions, the collision number from Alberta provincially is about \$5.7 billion. You get similar numbers at a national level in terms of percentage, and it's about 4 per cent of GDP. So that's kind of the overall traffic safety picture in terms of the disbenefit in terms of traffic safety.

One of the first studies that I thought was relatively recent and relevant was done in 1995, looking at collision statistics from the United States, and they actually looked at the entire year. I'd say that there are two general classes of studies, ones that are a very short period looking at the effect during that immediate time change, so, like, in the week following the time change either in the spring and fall, or studies that look at the effect of the entire year. These are basically looking at the effect of the light or at the effect of the loss of one hour of sleep, so the disturbance to circadian rhythm. It's kind of like you're jet-lagged for those first few days, or the effect may last slightly longer.

This first one did look at the entire year, and they found that the study provided strong support for the proposition that daylight

savings saves lives on the order of about 8 per cent for the entire year. They did say that extending daylight savings further into the winter could save additional lives. That was the study from 1995, Ferguson et al.

There was a Canadian study which looked at just the week proceeding, the week following the change, and the week thereafter, and that study, using Canadian data exclusively, found that there is an increase in accidents of approximately 8 per cent in the week following the change in the spring whereas there was a small but slightly smaller effect in the fall in terms of the reduction. There was actually a reduction in collisions, so basically in that net-neutral effect. That is basically just isolating the effect of the sleep disturbance, so a small, small effect.

In 2000 there was a study done in Sweden regarding daylight savings time. They found a quite similar effect, where they found that there was an 11 per cent increase in collisions in the one week following the time change in the spring. They found that the effect in the fall was negligible. It was a decrease of 2 per cent, which they said they couldn't statistically prove was related specifically to the time change. But their general overall conclusion was that even with that small increase in the spring that one week, it doesn't have a significant, measurable, important, effect overall in terms of the year. It is something that they could measure, but their results were saying, you know, that in terms of some of the other benefits or disbenefits to society overall there doesn't seem to be a strong effect.

Another study was done in 2001 in the United States. This one found that there was a significant increase in collisions in the spring of almost doubling, and there was a significant increase as well in the fall. So here's a study that's showing an increase in the spring and the fall related to the time change and the sleep disturbance. Again, this is just kind of looking at the shift, not the overall year. We've seen a no-change in the fall, an increase, and a decrease, so the results are a bit mixed.

There was a study done in 2004 which looked at all fatal collisions across the United States for a two-year period, and they found that there was a reduction of pedestrian collisions. This one was looking specifically at pedestrian collisions. They found that there was a reduction in pedestrian collisions of 13 per cent during the daylight savings time, so they're saying that they would project that there would be a further reduction if that time was extended into the fall because of the change in daylight.

The Chair: All right. Just to cut you off for a quick second, Mr. Churchill, the five minute's time for your presentation has lapsed, but I just wanted see if a committee member has any opposition to us continuing your presentation. Okay. I just wanted to make sure. Proceed.

Mr. Churchill: I'll just wrap it up really quickly, then. Sorry.

One of the most recent studies was a finding, consistent with the first one, which was looking at the entire year, that there is a net benefit to converting to year-round daylight savings time.

Now, the only caveat that I would share, because we are shifting the daylight, which is the effect. We know that there are a lot of collisions that happen during the winter in the evening time, which would now be daylight, so there is a benefit there, but one of the disbenefits is that we are losing an hour of light during the morning time. That is a time when we know that youth pedestrians are out going to and from school, so they may be at a greater risk. At the same time, in the evening, after 5 o'clock, they would have the added protection of the sunlight, but it may just be worth considering some additional education and awareness for motorists

as well as pedestrians that they don't have the daylight, which does contribute to pedestrian collisions.

I'd be happy to answer any questions you have.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you very much for coming and making the time to present to our committee today. We appreciate you guys coming down specifically because, of course, you know, with your dedication to enhancing road safety you can speak with information to what's been one of the refrains we've been hearing pretty commonly among the private submissions to the committee. From what I can understand, it seems like the proponents of them are worried about the rise of accidents when drivers lose that one hour of sleep. It's that sleep disturbance kind of part. Now, I can see that the research is kind of back and forth on this, isn't it? I wonder if maybe you could help us make a bit of sense on this because I know the difference between showing a difference and then having it be deemed significant: controlling fender bending, van rolls, and so on.

I mean, in your opinion, would you say that there is an absolute change in the number of traffic accidents on or around clock-switching days? You've had a chance to look at the data, the different reports, you know, what side's up and so on. In your opinion, do you see that change?

Mr. Churchill: Thank you. Great question. This is quite common in traffic safety literature or in any scientific literature, really, because to a great extent it depends on the data set that you're using and the methodology that you're using to analyze that data, so that type of variability is quite typical, specifically in terms of the specific numbers that are reached. But in general with what you're saying, I would definitely echo that the literature, to me, is showing that there is a high likelihood that there is an effect in the short term related to that sleep loss. In terms of human factors and how we operate our vehicles there have been a lot of other studies in other workplaces specifically about incidents or, you know, accidents that are happening in the workplace following the time change, which also adds to that.

In terms of traffic safety principles, one of the principles that we talk about in traffic safety is consistency. Anything you can do to make things more clear to motorists is going to generally result in more uniform behaviour, which is going to reduce the likelihood of collisions, so if we can avoid things like time changes – in the city of Calgary, where I work, we recently harmonized our times for our playground zones and school zones. We used to have it that the playground zones were from 8:30 in the morning until one hour after sunset, and there were a lot of questions about: what was sunset today? I don't know if any of you know. I didn't look it up this morning, but sunset is a moving target, right? We've found through our study of that change that when we just said that the playground zones and school zones go until 9 o'clock in the evening, we found that we have better compliance. We have reported that people have a better understanding of what that time is, and we have seen a reduction in collisions during those time periods and after.

Consistency is a big thing in traffic safety, too, so that's, I think, another benefit of just having one time and not having the time change. That is quite consistently found in the studies that are looking at the entire year, that it is a net benefit for traffic safety.

Mr. Piquette: Just so I'm a hundred per cent clear on this, what you're saying is that the hour of daylight, you know, in and of itself is far less significant than the simple matter of changing, so you'd be agnostic as to whether we would be on DST or on MST year-round, then? I'm just trying to make sure I understand.

11:30

Mr. Churchill: There's a disbenefit because then you'd be losing an hour. If we kept the system as we have it, then the disbenefit would be that we could have an additional hour of protection in the evenings during the winter. That is almost a net negative. It's very neutral.

I would say that the stronger benefit is not having the time-shift, whether that's before or after. There is generally during the summer more traffic during the evening hours than what would be added as a morning hour. I would see that as a negative. As has been pointed out, I don't believe that that's the question. I believe that in either case the summer time will remain the same, and the question just is: do we maintain the current practice of changing the time, or do we maintain that summer time throughout the entire year?

Mr. Piquette: Just to maybe follow up on that now, talking specifically about fall and winter, you're saying that one of the impacts of staying on DST would be, potentially, that school-children would be more exposed in the morning. But you also said that there's more volume in the afternoon. So I suppose there's volume of travel in the afternoon. How about, you know, frequency of accidents? How much extra risk would it be in the morning versus, say, in the afternoon, from just the volume of accidents we have currently?

Mr. Churchill: In general, looking at traffic patterns, there is definitely a peak in traffic in the a.m. peak time and a peak in traffic in the p.m. peak time. The p.m. peak is larger because we also have a lot of trip chaining. We have people going out for dinner, all of those things. So in general there are more people moving around in the evening peak than there are in the a.m. peak.

Quite often a lot of emphasis is put on young pedestrians, and in that case they're generally more likely to be out during the a.m. peak than the p.m. peak. Schools let out before the p.m. peak, when people are driving home from work. It really lifts up. In terms of protecting that one specific group, making sure that they have good education so that they're aware of some of those risks, that was the reason for that note.

Mr. Piquette: Okay. How about right at the very margins, let's say, a comparison of dawn and dusk? Maybe you'd want to see the most dramatic variance.

Mr. Churchill: I would say that they're quite similar. It's very closely tied to overall traffic volumes, and in general traffic volumes in the afternoon are higher. That's why in these studies they're saying that there is a net benefit to maintaining that time throughout the year because you are providing that light, which does definitely increase the likelihood of safe interactions in the evening.

Mr. Piquette: Okay. Just one last one, just to humour me. Is there any correlation, then, between dawn and dusk depending on what season of the year it is? Like, would there be, you know, more accidents in the afternoon in winter as opposed to summer? Just to try to get a more nuanced – you understand where I'm . . .

Mr. Churchill: Right. I would say that in general in terms of pedestrian collisions, for sure. We see them peak in November. November is generally the highest month for pedestrian collisions. The winter is relatively high, especially in urban areas, and that's just a function of a lot of pedestrian trips, so there are more conflicts. But it does seem like there may be more of an effect of having the light and then losing the light as opposed to not having the light and then gaining the light in terms of the change. If you're

coming from dark to light, there's less of an effect than going from light to dark in terms of how people adjust and behave. There are more pedestrian collisions in the fall than in the comparable period in the spring.

Mr. Piquette: And that would be due in some degree, setting aside increasing volume because of the season, to the change in the light rather than the transitory impact of changing the time.

Mr. Churchill: Yes. That would be one of the effects. As with everything in traffic safety, it isn't a very clear: this happens because of that. The cause and effect is very difficult because it is such a complex system. At the same time, we have a lot of new school-aged children that are going to a school that are at increased risk because they're not familiar with how to interact with traffic. So there are a lot of different things that are all working together in concert, but in general, when we look at the number of collisions we are seeing, we see more in the fall than in the spring.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for presenting to us today and for the information you've provided us with. You were mentioning some of the impact on safety. I think some of the things that we're hearing from our constituents and various people are about the daylight savings time during the winter months. The morning hours, I think, are sort of the biggest concern. You know, as I think you noted, in the springtime, if we stick with the status quo, you're going from, say, a sunrise of 6:57 in the morning to 7:57 in the morning. That hour time change is kind of during a fairly heavy commute time. It'd be interesting to find out whether the impact is because it's dark or because people are tired. I don't know if there's ever an easy answer to that. All you have is statistics that will bear it out. I guess you could ask the people who have the accidents what caused it. You might find that some would say, "Dark," and some would say, "Because I was tired," but it could be a combination of the two.

I'm a little concerned that in the wintertime, for example, in Calgary, if we stay with Alberta standard time, we'll go from an 8:37 in the morning sunrise to 9:37, which will in many cases put us from dark to darker, I think, just when the kids are going to school. Have you had any conversations with school patrols, with the AMA, or with anyone who is very focused on getting kids to school safely with respect to some of their concerns on this?

Mr. Churchill: With respect to the concerns that AMA patrols have, I haven't had a chance to speak with them directly on this. Unfortunately, this came across my desk fairly late. We do collaborate with them on a lot of different things in the city of Calgary.

Mr. Gotfried: I'm just using Calgary as an example here. It's going to get worse, actually, the further north you go. That darkness will creep a little more.

Mr. Churchill: Yeah. So I guess what I would say is that the patrols do operate through the winter throughout the school year. You know, the level of darkness kind of at the very start of January, for example, and during the month of January would be quite similar to what it would be if we didn't have the shift in the fall. It would be dark to darker, but in general the patrols do operate very safely. We haven't ever had an incident – knock on wood – while patrols have been in operation even during the dark of January. In terms of how they would operate, I wouldn't foresee that they would have

major concerns about that. They may have, but I didn't have that discussion.

Mr. Gotfried: Yeah. I think it would be a worthwhile discussion for us all to understand a little bit more about that.

Mr. Churchill: Fair comment.

Mr. Gotfried: My kids are not school aged anymore – they're just out of that – but I think that as a parent I would be concerned about the darkness in the morning, and I think that we would hope that we would have either some statistics or some mitigation of any risks of that in terms of visibility. I mean, that extra darkness for that extra hour in the morning: again, Calgary is going from 8:37 to 9:37, and Edmonton will be that much later, and Fort McMurray will be that much later again in terms of when the sun rises. I think we're pushing, like, as late as almost 10:30 for the sun to rise. That's one issue.

I guess the other one would be about safe road crews, work crews, working in the dark for an extra hour in the morning. Do you have any statistics on that with respect to road safety for road workers because of an extra hour of darkness in the morning?

Mr. Churchill: In general the type of roadwork activities are maintenance during that time period. If we do ever have road closures in Calgary – I'm not sure what the practice would be in other areas, but in general we don't entertain road closures until after 9 o'clock. We generally wait until after the morning rush is done, and we curtail those activities before the p.m. peak starts. So that would be entirely within the daylight hours, and that is part of the reason that we have that practice, just with the added benefit of operating in sunlight.

Mr. Gotfried: But in theory we're going to have either heavy traffic or commute times for people with sunrise being an hour later, which could affect visibility in the mornings, I would imagine, particularly if we have other challenges, weather challenges and things like that. A little sunlight goes a long way sometimes even if it's in light snow and things like that. I would, you know, hope that maybe as we go forward with this, there may be some opportunity to get some broader statistics or some opportunities for us to understand what that looks like. Students primarily, I think, are my biggest concern but also road workers and any safety issues there.

I appreciate your information here. I think that we probably need a bit more to understand this issue better, and hopefully, whichever way we go, the statistics don't prove us wrong.

Thank you.

11:40

Mr. Churchill: Can I provide one follow-up comment on that?

The Chair: Absolutely, Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill: That's a great point, and I would actually recommend that you do that. We did do this when we were looking at the harmonization of our playground and school zone times in Calgary. We did it after the decision was made so that 9 o'clock was set, but then the question that came out was: what is the actual net benefit in terms of safety? We actually went through exactly that exercise that you're talking about. We drew the line across on this map. You guys have probably seen these sun chart maps. We basically drew the line across at the 9 o'clock. We said: how many collisions are happening after 9 o'clock during the winter but before one hour after sunset, and how many are happening during the winter after one hour after sunset but before 9 o'clock? The benefit

in terms of providing that protection is quite clear. That is an excellent idea.

Mr. Gotfried: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent.

Any other members have any questions?

Connolly: Yeah. I just have a quick question.

The Chair: Yeah. Go ahead, Member Connolly.

Connolly: Hi. Just quickly, I was wondering if you have any data from the area of northern B.C. that does not observe daylight saving time. I know it's a very small area, but I was wondering about the differences between that area and most of the rest of Canada.

Mr. Churchill: I don't have any data specific to that, but of note is the Canadian study which was done by Stanley Coren from UBC. This was the 1996 study that I referred to. He did look at jurisdictions from across Canada which practise daylight saving time. This was the study where he found an increase in traffic accidents in the week following the change of approximately 8 per cent and a slightly smaller magnitude after the shift in the fall.

He did also look at Saskatchewan, which was not practising daylight saving time, and he did not find a change in their collisions. Where he was able to compare locations which did not change from daylight saving to standard time, so where there isn't a change or they just have a consistent time, he didn't find the increase in collisions that he found in locations which do practise the daylight saving time.

Connolly: Okay. Thanks.

Just quickly, do you have an opinion or recommendation, if Alberta were to stop following daylight saving time, whether we should go with Mountain Daylight Time or Mountain Standard Time?

Mr. Churchill: I think it would be prudent to confirm with the collisions. In general I would say that based on the studies that I have seen, it does appear that in most locations, because of the higher traffic volumes in the evening, there is a benefit to actually maintaining the daylight saving time, so having an additional hour during the winter in the evening. But that is offset by a potentially increased risk in the morning. I think that would be worth confirming with Alberta data.

Connolly: Great. Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you.

Any other members wishing to ask any questions?

Seeing and hearing none, Mr. Churchill, thank you so much for coming in and presenting to us today. If you have any additional information you wish to provide for us or any documents – I know you had your sun chart there as well – if you can forward it to the committee clerk before September 12, that would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Churchill: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll have the next presenter come up.

All right. Welcome to the table. For the benefit of our guests I'll have us all introduce ourselves for the record. I'm Graham Sucha. I'm the committee chair and the MLA for Calgary-Shaw, and I'll move to my deputy chair on my right side.

Mr. van Dijken: Good morning. Glenn van Dijken, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

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

Mr. Cyr: Scott Cyr, the MLA for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

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

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

Mr. Piquette: Colin Piquette, MLA for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach, Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Carson: Hello. Jon Carson, MLA for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Ms Woollard: Hello. Denise Woollard, MLA, Edmonton-Mill Creek.

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

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

The Chair: Excellent.

I'm going to allow you to provide us with a five-minute presentation. Then we'll open up the floor for questions. If you can introduce yourself for the record, that will be greatly appreciated. Please proceed.

Mr. Shipton: Thank you. Good morning and . . .

Mr. Panda: Chair, do you want us to introduce ourselves?

The Chair: Oh, my apologies. Sorry. I was on a roll. Those on the phone, please introduce yourselves for the record.

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

Connolly: Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwod.

The Chair: Sorry. Now you may proceed.

Mr. Shipton: We forget the people on conference calls as well.

Oilers Entertainment Group

Mr. Shipton: Well, good morning, everybody. My name is Tim Shipton. I'm the senior vice-president of corporate communications and government relations with Oilers Entertainment Group. This is my colleague Stew MacDonald, executive vice-president of revenue with Oilers Entertainment Group.

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

We're here today to, you know, share some insight and perspective, certainly, from our company, Oilers Entertainment Group. We, of course, are probably most well known for being in the business of hockey. Of course, the Edmonton Oilers is one of our franchises, but that also includes the Edmonton Oil Kings, the Bakersfield Condors. We operate Rogers Place, of course – we're about to enter year 2 of hockey at Rogers Place – and are also right now under construction of the Ice District, which is the largest mixed-use sports and entertainment development in North America, a \$2.5 billion private-sector development, that we're leading. So lots of activity in our company right now.

We're here today, of course, to talk about Bill 203. We're also here representing not just the hockey club but our 1,800 employees. Our company has undergone a very rapid growth curve in the last two years and currently has 1,800 full- and part-time staff.

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

We're also here representing our colleagues in the National Hockey League the Calgary Flames. Certainly, we've had a lot of conversation and consultation with the Calgary Flames, and certainly they share some of the opinions and views that we have about the proposed legislation.

We're excited to participate in this process, and we recognize that there are a lot of stakeholders that have a lot of different points of view, all valid, on something as significant as this time-change legislation. We're certainly here representing the two NHL hockey teams but, most importantly, certainly, NHL fans in Alberta. We want to share some insight into some of the analysis that we've done as it would impact NHL hockey, really, I think from the area of fan engagement as it relates to access to hockey for young fans, fans on the broadcast, and people coming to the games.

So that's the perspective that we're going to bring. We're certainly excited about where our organization is at, the Flames as well, two NHL teams that are on the rise. Obviously, Alberta is a passionate market for NHL hockey. It may be rare to see the Oilers and Flames collaborate – certainly, on the ice it is much more rare, if ever – but certainly on this perspective, you know, we share a common perspective.

I'm going to have my colleague Mr. MacDonald drill into some of our perspectives as to what we see as some of the challenges with the legislation.

Mr. MacDonald: Thanks, Tim. Good morning. We've had a chance to review over the last few months the impact of the proposed legislation with the Flames organization and, really, on behalf of NHL hockey fans in the province, and we had categorized the impact in two areas: either neutral, which is certainly a good percentage of it, or negative. There isn't really a change that impacts this from a game start time standpoint to a positive in any area.

I'll focus on the impact of: where does the negative come from out of this? There are really two areas, and both relate to broadcast. One is on where the games are originating, and the other is on the obligations of national broadcasts for the National Hockey League.

11:50

For how it impacts all hockey fans in the province, the broadest brush would be when games move past – what we look at is saying that an 8 o'clock start is, we'd call it, the latest optimal start to retain your entire fan base, young and old, across the province. Games move, with the proposed legislation, past that point to an 8:30, 9, or 9:30 start, running in the range of 10 to 15 games. We've taken a look back a couple of seasons as to how this would have impacted. It would vary year to year based on the schedule, when games are scheduled within that time window. It also varies in the schedule the National Hockey League puts out as to who you're visiting and when, but for the most part those numbers stayed fairly consistent.

For the upcoming season it would be 13 games that are affected in each market and affected in two areas. One would be that those 13 games would impact all NHL fans. Thirteen in each market would impact all NHL fans as to the viewing times of those games being broadcast. So a game you were expecting to see historically at 8 o'clock would move to 9 and from 8:30, which occasionally happened on the west coast, to 9:30. We know historically from television audience numbers that there is certainly an impact the

later the games go as to the audience that are able to stick with it and either watch it from the beginning or watch it through its conclusion.

The other area of impact is one that impacts both the arenas and both hockey clubs directly, and that's the start times of national broadcasts. Both clubs have 22 games that are controlled by the National Hockey League's national rights holders as opposed to the clubs' individual regional broadcasts. Of those 22 games, a number, as you know, are on Saturday nights on *Hockey Night in Canada*, and they're scheduled from an eastern time zone perspective that there are two broadcasts, one that starts at 8 o'clock eastern and one that starts at 10 o'clock eastern. The league and the television rights holder really has three options for those late start times, for all intents, and that's Edmonton, Calgary, and Vancouver. Although we haven't asked for a position from the National Hockey League or a rights holder as to whether they'd move ours, we'd view it as highly, highly unlikely that they would be left with Vancouver as their only option for a late broadcast. So the assumption is that Saturday night games in both Calgary and Edmonton would then move to 9 o'clock, a challenge for fans, a challenge for television viewers, and certainly a challenge for our staff working in the facilities on those evenings.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I'll avoid any comments about the Labour Day Classic game, though.

I'll open up the floor for questions. Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and thank you very much to Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Shipton from Oilers Entertainment Group for coming in to clearly inform the committee as to the important effects that the proposed legislation might have on both the Edmonton Oilers and the Calgary Flames organizations as well as hockey fans that watch both teams. I know, from witnessing, that the side of Mr. MacDonald's head has just a little touch of grey left, as Maurice Richard would say. That would probably come from his era rather than Mr. Shipton's, and that era is one which grew up watching the Oilers and Flames battle it out.

The Oilers began winning Stanley Cups in the '80s. I was obviously a rabid fan then, and we're certainly looking forward to more of that coming down the pipe this season and in the upcoming years. But from your submissions one of the things that I seem to glean from your concerns is that, much like the airline industry, your concerns seem to lie around Alberta being an outlier in perhaps going forward with the change to moving away from changing the clocks on an annual basis twice a year, especially when it gives a difference or results in a difference of two hours between ourselves and the west coast. So those two things seem to be of major concern and perhaps are something that we can talk a little bit about when we delve into it a little bit more.

I wanted to get a couple of things on the table first of all so that you could lay it clear for the record for all of us to consider. In your submission you stated that a fixed time zone would affect games times. First, how many games are played by the Oilers in a season?

Mr. MacDonald: Eighty-two.

Mr. Dach: Eighty-two. How many are home games?

Mr. MacDonald: Forty-one.

Mr. Dach: Forty-one. So half and half.

Now, if we fixed our time zone, it would mean a change to game times from mid-November to March. How many games would be affected? I know you've given us a handout showing that, but just for the record how many games would be affected?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that would vary season to season based on the broadcast schedule and the home game schedules and road schedules of both clubs, but we've looked back three seasons, and in looking at this year's, the number varies between 10 and 15; for the last two years, 13 and 14.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Now, if we stayed on Mountain Standard Time all year, would that lessen the effect, or would it still be a problem?

Mr. MacDonald: We haven't studied that, but I would say that there is still a month and a half of schedule before and after the time change, so those windows would be affected. We'd have to take a look at how many games are in that window, but the results would be the same on national broadcasts and playing games along the west coast, in British Columbia and California.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Now, I know that when I first started watching television broadcasts of hockey, we had a black-and-white Emerson TV. It didn't matter what time it was; we'd have been watching that thing. At 6 o'clock p.m. on Saturday the house shut down, and you watched *Hockey Night in Canada*. Things have changed a little bit. People have options and other viewing opportunities.

I notice that you did have a concern about how we sync up with other jurisdictions for game timing. My understanding is that dropping the daylight saving time is being discussed or has been discussed in about 24 other jurisdictions across North America, including California, which is looking at staying on Pacific Daylight Time. I'm sure that as a large organization, a multibillion-dollar organization, the NHL is probably pretty cognizant of these ongoing discussions and is aware of what's going on, particularly in the United States, where it's the federal jurisdiction that regulates time zones.

Whether or not these states go ahead and actually pass laws that say that they want to eliminate changing their clocks twice a year, it's still up to the federal government in the United States to assess when they decide to make that shift federally. I'm assuming that if that happened in the United States, if federally that took place, you'd probably be on the other side of the coin saying: hey, we've got to keep up with what's going on there and argue for adopting similar legislation so that we're not operating in a time vacuum or time difference there. What effect, though, would it have if California adopted year-round Pacific Daylight Time, assuming that Alberta maintained the status quo?

Mr. MacDonald: That would be dependent on how many games against California teams fell in the window and whether they were evening games. If they were afternoon games, it would be a moot point. If they were evening games, that certainly would have an impact, lessen the impact, certainly neutralize it if the change is made here. But California is probably a smaller portion of this. It's much more significantly a Canadian issue because of Canadian national broadcasts. The NHL doesn't have a national broadcaster in the U.S. to the extent it does in Canada. That's where, you know, clubs like ourselves and Calgary have 22 games that are scheduled and game times determined by the National Hockey League as opposed to our input on that. That is where the majority is driving. Certainly, if that happened, it would be a benefit, no different than if there were some one-offs in other states that could work an hour one way or the other to our benefit or not. The bigger piece we face is that it would be British Columbia from Pacific Time and Ontario from Eastern Time, Quebec from Eastern Time.

Mr. Dach: Just as a matter of curiosity, how much discussion or what level of awareness is there or how much time is it occupying

in the NHL's world as far as really monitoring what's going on with the debate in many states regarding changing to one time zone year-round? Are you pretty much aware of what's happening, or is it not something that has really taken up a lot of space?

Mr. Shipton: Well, certainly, from my perspective, we've had conversations with the league. You know, from a business continuity perspective, I think it's a challenge to sort of understand where the legislative process is at in Canada, in the United States. I think Stew and I would agree that a bigger impact is the debate in Canada as to standard time versus daylight time versus the U.S. market. The fact remains that much of our broadcast is still driven by the Ontario market. As much as we don't like that, that's a reality.

Another point. Not wanting to look too far into the future, certainly from the growth curve and the competitive curve of both the Oilers and Flames, the expectation, certainly from our perspective, is more *Hockey Night in Canada* Saturday night broadcasts versus mid-week, regional, or secondary games, certainly from where our team is at, the dynamism of our young players. I think that just amplifies a little bit of our concern about that opportunity to sell Alberta, sell Oilers hockey, and the national broadcast perspective.

12:00

Mr. Dach: Right.

Final question. I'm just wondering, based on last season: do you know how many games started at 8 p.m. or later? I don't mean to put you on the spot. I mean, if you have it, you have it.

Mr. MacDonald: The impact last year would have been that 13 games would have moved to an 8:30 or later start time.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Would it change if we stayed on Mountain Daylight Time or Mountain Standard Time?

Mr. MacDonald: Again, that would be – we took a look at the current proposal and its impact. We'd have to take a little bit deeper dive on the shoulder windows, the number of games, how many schedules. Again, it would change year to year, and we'd want to look over a three- or four-year average to make sure we're getting the facts back to you correctly.

Mr. Dach: Okay. I'll cede the balance of my time to my colleague or at the behest of the chair to somebody else.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Dach. Thank you for presenting and giving us a perspective on some of your challenges.

When I'm looking at this schedule here, what I'm seeing is that there could be a few things that are results of this timing. It could be some extra wages for employees to cover maybe a longer window to try and get them into the building and spend some money before the game starts. Some other costs that may be associated with that: maybe keeping the lights on later and longer, some lost revenues both in terms of attendance and TV revenues, and something even more important, lost fan engagement. I'm not sure who's going to tell the younger audience that they have to go to bed at the end of the first period or maybe not even see the game at all.

I guess I'm trying to understand if there's a way for us to quantify this in any way, shape, or form in terms of the financial impact. I don't know if you've had a chance to do anything that recognizes what that could look like to either the Oilers or the Flames clubs.

Could you give us maybe a sense of what you've looked at thus far even if it's just a sense of what's going to occur there?

I'll throw another question out there, not for you but just more to put on the table. It's not just what happens inside Rogers Place or within your club, but it could affect many outside businesses, bars, restaurants that thrive from having the overflow of – hopefully, you're in a sellout situation in the arena and some people will have to watch it in other venues and spend money, which is obviously going to create jobs and economic impact as well.

I'm trying to understand the economic impact. We can all understand the emotional impact of maybe not being able to watch a game or maybe somebody who is away missing a game or us having – if you can quantify it a little bit for us as best you can without us necessarily holding you to hard and fast numbers on that.

Mr. Shipton: We don't want to certainly give the impression that we've done a deep financial analysis of the impact, but we certainly have looked at the impacts from a cost perspective of all the things that you laid out. You know, NHL hockey today is a machine of staff. Several hundred staff work every game. There are policing costs, there are utility costs, and on and on it goes. We do know from a business perspective that there's upside and downside risk here.

Certainly, talking to the Flames as well, they felt the same way, that it would be a net negative to the cost per game of these games that we've identified as risk games. Harder, I think, to quantify the economic impact across the economy, but I think you laid out some things that we certainly have thought about. Year 1 at Rogers Place, talking to business owners, small-business owners in the downtown core, bars, restaurants, and the like: they certainly felt overwhelmingly positive impact. Of course, that amplifies even bigger during playoff hockey, which is something we're very proud to say. We were back in the playoffs last season and hope to be for many years to come.

It is something, as this legislation progresses, that we could dig a little bit deeper. I'm sure there would be value in seeing some real numbers on it. It is something we're concerned about.

Stew, I don't know if you have anything to add to that.

Mr. MacDonald: I think one way to look at it is that of the games with start times that are a little bit more within our flexibility, which would be our regional broadcast games, which are 60 games a year, we've got some negotiating power on start times of those games. Our optimal start time is 7, 7:30. If the optimal start time for growing the game and for maximizing return for the National Hockey League in Alberta was 9:30, I'm sure someone at some point would be proposing to the National Hockey League that we start at 9:30. But we knew it's a mix. You want to have it so that your young audience can get in and continue to follow the game, have a chance to watch the game through to its conclusion, for sure, but also have it that it's a model that works for people who are coming into the market from out of town to watch that game, people who are in town, and then being able to get back home after the game, to work within a reasonable window.

That's where you'll see for the most part in live sporting events for evenings, that you're starting at 7 or 7:30, 8 being kind of the max that you push it to, and those tend to trend to Friday or Saturday nights. Anything past that would be pretty easy to look at and say that if there was a benefit to growing the sport, teams across the board in sports would be pushing to later start times.

Mr. Gottfried: So I'm assuming that for the weekday games, let's say Wednesday at 9:30 versus Los Angeles, you'll have a public

service message from Connor McDavid telling the children to go to bed so that their parents don't have to wear that.

Mr. MacDonald: Actually, we're quite happy if the kids watch the game to its conclusion and the parents deal with it the next morning.

Mr. Gottfried: In terms of an economic impact I know that you've sort of looked at some broad impact here. Would it be helpful to have a more in-depth economic impact study? We would talk to your clubs but also probably not just even in the Ice District, but I'm thinking of businesses that are in the suburbs and things like that. Would it be, do you think, helpful to the conversation for us to understand the full economic impact of this change?

Mr. MacDonald: I think for sure we can go deeper, but there's no question when you look at start times of why they're set where they're set. It is: that's what the populace is looking for. If you're a sports fan, if you're a hockey fan, an NHL fan, the game is dictated around growing and capturing the greatest number of fans possible, so the structure that's in place today is done that way to maximize it, no different than the broadcasts on Saturday night.

There was an appetite for more games. We go back to the days when there was one game on Saturday nights, you know, two or three decades ago. The appetite to build the game was from fans across the country. They said: hey, give us two games. There are sometimes three with an afternoon game, but there's going to be an optimum time slot to work with that across the country. From our perspective on it, as you work through this, there is no question that moving games past that 8 o'clock start point is going to have a financial impact, as much long-term as quantifiable short-term impact.

This is about growing the game. This is about growing hockey fans, about growing NHL hockey fans. To do that, there's call it a lifetime value of a fan of the game. You want them from four and five years old watching with their parents to watching with their grandkids when they're 80, 90 years of age. With that, the start times are taken into consideration to have the broadest possible appeal and not alienate any of the audiences.

Mr. Gottfried: So we're seeing, obviously, that there's a financial impact, but really this is kind of about the emotional impact first and then from that is actually some economic impact.

Mr. MacDonald: The game is as strong as the fan base. It's no different than any sport. You're as strong as your fan base, and if you aren't maintaining and growing your fan base – and that can be maybe less quantifiable at times. If you aren't doing that, your sport, your franchise, is going to have challenges in the long term.

Mr. Gottfried: So let's not give them a reason not to watch.

Great. Thank you.

The Chair: Member Carson.

Mr. Carson: Thank you very much, Chair. Thank you both for being here. Most of my questions have been asked. I just have a question in terms of a starting time of 7:30 compared to an 8:30 time, what the viewership difference is like, if there is any, and also ticket sales difference.

Mr. MacDonald: On ticket sales that's going to be dependent on the cycle of where a franchise is. Currently, you know, both franchises are fairly fortunate in the cycle. There's high demand for the product. We're very fortunate with the brand new arena in Edmonton, Rogers Place, that's just opened. It's driven demand further for that.

12:10

I wear a ticket sales hat, a big part of my role with the organization. If someone said to me, "Is there a preference on a 7:30 versus an 8:30 start time?" there is no question. There's more risk with an 8:30 start time, much more security with 7:30 start time. That can run from not just ticket sales but ingress in the building. That can be when fans are leaving games if the game isn't going the way they're looking. So there are all sorts of elements that have an impact from that. It's potentially harder to recruit part-time employees if they know their window is going to run later a number of games during the course of the season. We're very dependent, obviously, on part-time employees at Rogers Place.

There's no one real, clear, easy answer on it to say: "Yes, this is the economic impact of this. This start time is better than this start time." But over a lot of years we've gathered a lot of data, which goes back to our preferred start times. Most clubs in the league have 7 or 7:30 start times, and then 8 o'clock is where we push it for the second game, when *Hockey Night in Canada* starts on Saturday nights.

Mr. Carson: Perfect. Thank you.

Just one final question. In terms of younger audience members do you have any percentage or understanding of how many tickets are being sold to a younger audience?

Mr. MacDonald: We don't from a ticket sales standpoint. We don't track that because it ends up being who's the end user, and usually if youth are attending games, they're attending on data of their parents that we've captured. But, certainly, our television numbers capture under-18 viewers, and it's a very substantial number. We'd be happy to share that as a follow-up with you, but it's a very substantial number and would be for every Canadian NHL team.

Mr. Carson: Thank you.

Mr. Shipton: There's no doubt that for those games that have an earlier start time, you go to the rink both in Edmonton and in Calgary, and you just look across the stands, you see way more kids. An 8 o'clock start: it's tough to get the kids, especially on a weeknight, to the game, get them home, into bed. I know that with my own kids they all want to go to every game, so we definitely see that, certainly, from an anecdotal perspective. But we're happy to share those TV numbers.

Mr. Carson: Actually, just one final follow-up. Do you see the issue growing exponentially during a playoff game? Like, is it a bigger issue between the start times compared to just a regular season game?

Mr. MacDonald: No. I think the one thing you find with any Canadian NHL team: they're pretty forgiving once it gets to playoff time with their team.

Mr. Carson: Fair enough.

Mr. MacDonald: We always use the line that we can probably play Tuesday at 10 a.m. and 18,000 people would find their way to be out there cheering. Again, it's a little bit contradictory, but there's a lot of data to support that playoff time fans are willing to park a lot of decision-making that they utilize during the regular season.

Mr. Dach: The Leg. might even adjourn for that.

Mr. Carson: I think we did. This committee, maybe, even.

The Chair: All right.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you for coming in. I really appreciate it. Are many of your season games sold out?

Mr. MacDonald: Our regular season games have been sold out. That doesn't mean that tickets aren't accessible, just if I got the question correct. We hold back just under a thousand seats for individual game sales that are released. Actually, another release is coming up later this week. But the other piece that's changed with the secondary market is fan-to-fan resale becoming legalized and so prevalent in the world. It allows everybody access to seats, some below face value if you happen to be choosing to go to a game on a Tuesday night against maybe a lesser opponent, and some above.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you.

So with daylight savings time changing, you're probably not going to see a change in attendance or sold-out games.

Mr. MacDonald: I would say that there's a difference for us to current ticket sales and ingress into our building, right? We track ingress. Ticket sales, certainly, are the initial investment from fans to go to a game, but there wouldn't be any team in sports that would have a hundred per cent attendance on the number of tickets out. We've seen through Tim's and my time together a lot of variance depending on team performance and all sorts of other factors, including game start times, the actual number of people who attend, which has an impact on their spend in the building. That impacts staffing of the building. You're always reacting to the number of staff you need versus anticipated ingress, so there would be an impact on ingress in games as start times become later and later.

Mr. Cyr: Okay. So it's safe to say that there would be less income coming into both franchises because of this at an attendance level.

Mr. MacDonald: There would be impact on revenue coming in from potentially a ticket sales standpoint in some point over a cycle. Today both clubs are in a fairly good position, but that isn't necessarily the case five years down the road. There's an impact on the number of people actually attending the game, and their spend at the game that evening. There's also an impact on the number of fans watching the game because the revenue generated off television is all based on the scientifically measured number of viewers of that game broadcast.

Mr. Cyr: Sorry, Mr. Chair.

When your franchise is looking at attendance versus television revenues, do we see more revenues from attendance, or do we see more revenues from the TV?

Mr. MacDonald: Both would be material revenue streams for an NHL franchise in Alberta.

Mr. Cyr: So we'd probably see some attendance drop, but you're going to see a significant TV revenue drop.

Mr. MacDonald: It would impact more customers on television for sure. You know, if we've got 200,000 people watching an Oilers home game, there are 18,300 in the facility that evening, so there's certainly a much larger audience to be impacted from television.

Mr. Cyr: Would you say – I'm sorry, Mr. Chair; may I continue? – that both our franchises, Edmonton and Calgary, may see a significant difference in attendance? What I'm told – and I'll get to my point here – is that Edmonton has a lot of corporate seats that fill up whereas Calgary has individual seats. You can correct me if

I'm wrong. Is it reasonable to say that Calgary is going to be more affected by this daylight savings time than, say, Edmonton for attendance?

Mr. MacDonald: I'll flip it. Edmonton has got a little more of an individual base of ticket purchases, Calgary historically more of a corporate base there, but I believe both markets will face the same challenge, and that is: as the game time moves – the great thing about our province is that even our corporate ticket purchasers are hockey fans. In our province people who purchase the tickets purchase them because they love going to National Hockey League games, and I think that you wouldn't see a dramatic difference between the two. The impact will be on both. If the game is a 9 o'clock start on a Saturday night, even though I've got tickets, am I going to go to the game? Am I staying as late as I can at the game? I don't see a significant difference between the two based on the makeup. We know Calgary's market fairly well, and they know ours, but we don't see a significant difference because of the difference in the fan bases.

Mr. Cyr: Last question. Were you here for the WestJet presentation? No? Their concern is that our hub may shift to some other jurisdiction. Is it possible that a decision like this could shift one of our franchises to a different jurisdiction as well?

Mr. Shipton: Well, that's a big question. I think what we've tried to share with the group today is the impact to access to hockey, and again we talked about, obviously, growing the game, access for young fans, access for any fans. We're trying to increase the number of hockey fans because for us that translates to business. Laying it out, access at the game itself, attendance versus ingress: ingress equals the per caps that we rely on for our bottom line, and on the broadcast side access equals what those TV numbers are. You know, they're exacting, they're quantifiable, which is the revenue that we can then, when we talk to our partners, get from broadcast. I guess the point that we would make is that the net of the 13 games this year, 10 to 15 over the last five years: there is an impact to business. I wouldn't want to speculate. The health of hockey is very strong right now, but from our business perspective we do see this as a risk.

Mr. Cyr: A risk of a franchise possibly, if things go poorly, leaving Alberta?

Mr. Shipton: I wouldn't speculate on that. I think that's a difficult speculation to make, but it is a challenge to business.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you all very much for coming in, and thank you to the presenters for responding to our questions. If you wish to provide any additional feedback or information – you alluded to TV numbers previously – please ensure that they're submitted through the committee clerk before September 12 of this year.

We're going to take a brief five-minute break, and then we'll resume with other business.

[The committee adjourned from 12:20 p.m. to 12:32 p.m.]

The Chair: All right. Thank you, hon. members.

Now we're going to move on to other business. As was just previously discussed with some members offline and for those who are on the phone and tuning in, we've been looking at the numbers for the Grande Prairie meeting that we have scheduled on

September 8, and currently we're sitting at one registered participant, who's looking into presenting in front of the subcommittee. With that being said, I know that that number is relatively low, so we'd like to open that up to committee members for discussion about which direction we would like to go moving forward.

Before then, I'll allow Mr. Roth to provide some feedback in relation to what outreach has been done so far within the matter of this, and then I'll open it up.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Chair, if it's okay, I might refer to LAO communications.

The Chair: Absolutely. Please go ahead.

Ms Dotimas: Hi there. In terms of investment in what we've done so far, we have done print ads in the Grande Prairie *Herald-Tribune*. Thursday of last week we started the print advertising just because from communications' point of view, you know, at the end of summer people usually aren't looking for activities to attend until sort of within the week before it takes place. We did that in the daily paper, and we also advertised in three community newspapers within a 50-kilometre radius of Grande Prairie proper. As well, we have some advertising currently running still to make Grande Prairie and area residents aware of the public meeting coming up this week, and we have some investments in social media as well. So far, as of today, we have an investment of about \$2,500 into the Friday meeting on September 8.

The Chair: Excellent.

Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you. That's great information. So that's what's been expended so far in promoting the event. What is the budget, then, for the travel and the accommodations for us to go to Grande Prairie, if you have that?

Ms Dotimas: I'm going to defer back to the clerk.

The Chair: Mr. Roth.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The venue with the coffee, tea, et cetera, is about \$800. This was the only one that had some air travel, about \$3,300. Hotel rooms are booked, which comes to about \$1,700. Sending audio is probably the biggest anticipated expense for this, and it would be because they do all the audio, they help with the streaming, and all that sort of thing with *Hansard*. That comes to about \$4,200. That's where it's looking now. Not wishing to anticipate anything, there is the option to recover some of those costs, but that's currently what it's looking like.

Mr. Gotfried: It's about \$10,000, not including any staff time or MLAs' time, which is free.

The Chair: Thank you. I'll open it up for discussion from members or any wish for direction here as well, moving forward.

MLA Coolahan.

Mr. Coolahan: Yeah. I mean, I understand what we're looking at in terms of the costs, and everyone wants to be fiscally prudent with this. I am concerned that it's Tuesday and, as we were discussing, Albertans are notoriously last-minute when they join things or buy tickets for concerts and things like this. I do have some concern about making a decision today even though I think we have to. As Mr. Roth was saying, we may want to not expense some of the money out; we can recover some of it. I don't know what to say. I want to hear what other people have to say on this topic, too,

because we said that we were going, and it's hard not to honour that in some respects. Do we know who is signed up for Grande Prairie? Is it a group?

Mr. Roth: It's actually the Grande Prairie Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Coolahan: The chamber of commerce. Thanks.

Mr. Gotfried: I fully respect what Member Coolahan has said with respect to late booking, but if we have one group now which sounds like a group that we could actually engage with probably in other ways, either through a submission or a conversation with a member of the subcommittee or one of the MLAs representing the area there, you know, I think we have a responsibility to be as fiscally responsible with this as we possibly can. We've expended some money now, but we're going to expend \$10,000. That's not including incidentals or anything like that, so over \$10,000 to see one person. I'm having a really hard time swallowing and doing that when we could spend time on a phone conversation. We could have a teleconference. Maybe what we could do is set this up as a teleconference and still allow them to present to us.

The Chair: Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you. Well, the chamber of commerce certainly represents a number of stakeholders in the Grande Prairie area, and I'm wondering, kind of to riff off what you were saying, Mr. Gotfried: what alternatives are available if we do decide to cancel the meeting? What other ways can we engage with the chamber of commerce in order to be able to get the information that's salient to this?

The Chair: Mr. Roth.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Certainly, there are a few different ways. We could invite them to perhaps teleconference at the beginning of the deliberation meetings or somehow get their feedback at one of the other meetings, possibly. Same sort of route. It might be a little bit more challenging logistically, but it's a possibility so that the subcommittee could still hear from them.

Ms McPherson: Thank you very much. I also wonder if the advertisements have already gone out for the other locations where the meetings are being held, and what kind of response there's been to those. I'm just wondering if the short time frame might be part of the reason why we've only gotten one party to respond. Maybe they needed more lead time. I just want to understand so that, first of all, we don't set up the other meetings to have a similar outcome and to see if there might be some adjustment we can make.

Ms Dotimas: Mr. Chair, I can address in terms of what's gone out so far. We did actually simultaneously put everything out to the other areas as well: Edmonton, Calgary, and Lethbridge. Because of the long weekend we actually started around the same time, so Friday and over the weekend we'll have the radio ads up and running. Some of them have already run and will continue to do so now that we're back from the long weekend.

In terms of the attendance or presentations I'll defer to Mr. Roth on that.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Currently for the Edmonton public hearing there are six solid registrations with the seventh that I'm going to get back to. I apparently had a few phone calls on my voice mail during the meeting, so there may be some more. Calgary had about five or six if memory serves; Lethbridge, currently one.

Ms McPherson: Thank you.

12:40

The Chair: MLA Coolahan.

Mr. Coolahan: Actually, I'll defer for now.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Dach: I'm hesitating to really pull the pin on Grande Prairie right now. I know there's 10,000 bucks at stake here, but is there an opportunity – how much further opportunity do they have to actually come forward if the presenters in Grande Prairie sort of realize, "Hey, there's a short time fuse, and we want to make a presentation"? How much further time do they have to actually get the rag out?

The Chair: All right. Committee members, if it's the will of the committee, have the option to extend. I know that we have a motion that's available, if that is the case, to extend the deadline for written submissions. That would be sent in an e-mail to be posted for committee members to review. We could extend that till September 15 probably, logistically.

The other option is, obviously, within a teleconference fashion if the committee members wish to pursue in that fashion, whether it's the Grande Prairie ones moving forward or whatnot. We could even facilitate an opportunity for the subcommittee in the Edmonton meeting if it was the will of the committee to spend a small window in which they could actually meet with or go on teleconference and come into the committee room and speak with the Grande Prairie people in that fashion.

Mr. Dach: I'm just wondering if some of those calls that were perhaps received by voice mail might have actually been from Grande Prairie.

Mr. Roth: I've had a quick look, and they weren't.

Registration. In terms of deadlines, just off the top of my head, I believe we had said something to the effect of September 7 for Grande Prairie and the 11th for the other locations is what we'd requested for people that can present. Of course, the public meeting is open to everybody.

Mr. Dach: Do we have to decide right now about pulling the pin on Grande Prairie?

The Chair: In order – Mr. Roth, correct me if I'm wrong – to recoup the costs for the audio facilitators, we would need to notify them by 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

All right. Any other members wishing to discuss the matter at hand? The other thing, too, is that I do caution members that without any motion, we would be moving forward with the Grande Prairie meeting here.

Go ahead, Member Connolly.

Connolly: Well, I'd at least move the motion to add that additional written submissions be accepted and included.

The Chair: Sorry. You wanted to move . . .

Connolly: Sorry. Yeah. I'll move the motion that additional written submissions received by the standing committee after August 4, 2017, until September 15, 2017, in regard to its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, be accepted and included in the review process.

This would be in addition to whatever we decide for Grande Prairie.

The Chair: All right. So are you moving this motion on written submissions?

Connolly: Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. We now have a motion on the floor to extend written submissions until September 15. I will open that up for discussion.

Seeing and hearing none, having a motion on the floor, Mr. Roth, if you would like to read it in for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Connolly that additional written submissions received by the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future after August 4, 2017, until September 15, 2017, in regard to its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, be accepted and included in the review process.

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.

We are back on other business. Is there any other business that members wish to discuss or in relation to future meetings? Okay.

The next meeting of the committee is scheduled for September 19, 2017.

With that, I will call for a motion to adjourn. Moved by Member McPherson that the meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adjourned. All those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? The meeting now stands adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 12:46 p.m.]

