



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Third Session

Standing Committee
on
Alberta's Economic Future

Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act

Tuesday, August 8, 2017
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-3-14

**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)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (NDP)
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (UCP)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (NDP)*
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)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (NDP)**
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (UCP)
Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)***

* substitution for Kim Schreiner

** substitution for Craig Coolahan

*** substitution for Colin Piquette

Also in Attendance

Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake (UCP)

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>

9 a.m.

Tuesday, August 8, 2017

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to welcome all members, staff, and guests to this meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. I'd like to recognize that this committee 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 would ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, and then we will hear from those on the phone. I'll start with my deputy chair to my right.

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

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

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

Mr. Shepherd: Morning. MLA David Shepherd, Edmonton-Centre.

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

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

Ms McKittrick: Annie McKittrick, MLA, Sherwood Park.

Dr. Turner: Bob Turner, MLA, Edmonton-Whitemud.

Connolly: Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwood.

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

Ms LeBlanc: Stephanie LeBlanc, Parliamentary Counsel.

Ms Dean: Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and director of House services.

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

The Chair: All right. Those on the phone?

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

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

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, Little Bow.

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

The Chair: All right. I'd like to note for the record that Mr. Shepherd is substituting for Mr. Coolahan, Ms McKittrick is substituting for Mrs. Schreiner, and Dr. Turner is substituting for Mr. Piquette.

Before we turn to the business at hand, a few operational items. The microphone consoles are operated by *Hansard* staff. Please ensure your cellphones are on silent mode. Audio and video of the committee proceedings is streamed live on the Internet and recorded by *Alberta Hansard*. Audio and video access and meeting transcripts can be obtained via the Legislature website.

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

Mr. Taylor, if you'd like to introduce yourself for the record as well.

Mr. Taylor: Yeah. It's Wes Taylor, MLA, Battle River-Wainwright.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you.

All right. Approval of minutes. We have the minutes of our last meeting on June 8, 2017. Are there any errors or omissions to note? Seeing and hearing none, would a member move the adoption of the minutes, please? Moved by MLA Fitzpatrick that the minutes of the June 8, 2017, meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be adopted as circulated. All those in favour, please say aye.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, we've got some background noise there. If somebody could mute their phone, please.

The Chair: If all members can ensure that their audio is muted. It does cause feedback for those on the phone.

Excellent. All right. On the motion all those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? That motion is carried.

We'll move on to item 4, our review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, and reviewing of submission summary documents. Our next item of business is to discuss the written submissions made to the committee from both stakeholders and the public. To assist us with our task, legislative office research services has provided two submissions summary documents to members. I would like to invite Dr. Amato to provide a brief overview of the documents for the committee.

Go ahead.

Dr. Amato: Good morning. I'm hoping that you have access to two documents, the summary of stakeholder submissions and the summary of public submissions. What I think I'll do is that I'll just briefly go over both documents and maybe provide some background as to how those documents were put together and organized, and then I'll be pleased to answer any questions that anyone might have.

In terms of the stakeholder submissions you'll note that the committee received submissions from 15 stakeholders. That's a fairly detailed document that summarizes at length – and comprehensively, I might add – what the stakeholders said. Of those 15 submissions seven stakeholders expressed opposition to Bill 203, four expressed support, and four expressed neither support for nor opposition to the bill. Of the latter category, the four that expressed neither opposition to nor support for the bill, some of those stakeholders brought issues forward that they wanted to draw the committee's attention to. In essence, that's that document. Does anyone have any questions? Maybe I can answer some questions about that document if anyone has them, and then I'll turn to the larger one.

The Chair: Any questions about the stakeholder document? I'll open that up to the phones.

Dr. Amato, if you'd like to go on to the second one.

Dr. Amato: Sure. The second document is the summary of public submissions. Maybe I'll draw your attention to the introduction, the

submission process, the statistical overview, and also the table of contents. That starts on page 4.

You'll note there that the committee received approximately 13,500 written submissions. Of those, approximately 10,000, or 74 per cent, of submissions expressed favour for Bill 203; approximately 3,000, or 24 per cent, expressed opposition to the bill; and approximately 200, or 1 per cent, stated that they were undecided about the bill.

Let me describe the process of arriving at this document. As you can imagine, it was somewhat of a challenge to deal with 13,500 submissions. The submission process for the most part was that most members of the public indicated their opinions about the bill through a web form, and that's over 13,000 of those submissions. This online form asked a question: should Bill 203, the Alberta Standard Time Act, be passed? Submitters were required by the form to respond to this question, and they had three options in their response. They could say yes, no, or undecided. Then, in addition, they were invited to share their reasons for their opinions or comment on Bill 203. That section of the form was not mandatory. It's important to note that approximately 32 per cent of submitters did not provide a rationale for their response, so that means that approximately 70 per cent did.

There was a team of people that got together to read all of the submissions, approximately 70 per cent of those responses, and the vast majority of responses could be categorized in order to identify pattern. There were fairly similar responses across all those who were in favour, all those who were opposed, and all those who were undecided. All of the submission comments were read, and they were grouped into the categories that you see in the submission summary.

The submissions summary, once you turn to page 6 onwards, categorizes all of the responses and provides sample responses in each category. You can see the number of responses that were received that were categorized by that category, the approximate percentage, and, again, some sample responses to give you an indication of what was said by members of the public.

There was also a request made to research services to do some analysis of responses by region, and to do that, we used maps of Alberta provided by Treasury Board and Finance that divide Alberta into eight economic regions. We did some analysis of where submissions were coming from, and we also attempted to categorize each response by region, which we did; however, no discernible patterns emerged. You can see, starting I think on page 22, some charts that provide a more detailed analysis showing the number of responses received from each region, but again no real discernible patterns emerged except that the vast majority of responses – that is, submissions received – were from Calgary, followed by Edmonton, followed by Lethbridge, Medicine Hat. Beyond that, I think it's difficult to discern exact patterns that we might pull out.

The rest, I think, is provided in great detail in the document and, again, in that statistical overview, which is on page 4 and 5.

I would be pleased to answer any questions that the committee might have about the summary.

9:10

The Chair: All right. Thank you, Dr. Amato. I think it's important to recognize the work that's been put into this document, too, considering the number of submissions.

MLA Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. I do also want to first off start by commending the research staff for handling this immense workload

because it was, I believe, an unprecedented response to questions that were put forward for the public to respond to. Was it a record response to such questions?

Dr. Amato: Yes.

Mr. Dach: So it actually was the most number of – could you comment on that a bit?

Dr. Amato: Well, I can. I haven't been at the job for a long time, but I believe that the largest number before this was 400 responses, so we hit, you know, almost 13,600. Again, the vast majority were received through the web form, but there were also some that are included in the summary that were received in what we might call more traditional ways via e-mail, via fax, and via mail, by post.

Mr. Dach: I know you noted in your analysis that the largest number of responses were from Edmonton and Calgary and then Lethbridge and Medicine Hat and that no other real inferences could be garnered from that information, but I'm wondering if, just by the number of responses in and of themselves, conclusions could be drawn as to the interest that Albertans have in this. Is that something that you considered?

Dr. Amato: I'm not sure that's something I can comment on, but, I mean, it's certainly something that the committee might consider.

Mr. Dach: So basically, it would mean that given the number of responses you've gotten, Albertans are obviously interested in the issue I would think is a reasonable conclusion to draw. All right.

Well, once again I just wanted to commend the research staff because it was an overwhelming amount of data to deal with in a short period of time. I'm wondering: given the hard work you put into it and some of the conclusions you looked at, we didn't really hear from anybody north of Fort McMurray. Is that anything that you can comment on, just as to why you think it might have happened?

Dr. Amato: I can't comment on that, no.

Mr. Dach: All right. In the information that you've provided in the report, like I said, basically the strongest information or strongest piece of the data is that the response was overwhelming. Now, based on a survey question developed by the LAO and the information gathered through these submissions, does it offer an accurate representation of public opinion on the matter?

Dr. Amato: It offers an accurate representation of the submissions that were received, so I couldn't comment on public opinion writ wide, right? Again, the question is an interesting one: how many people are in the province? How many submissions were received? I mean, I think those would be the two numbers that I would consider in answering that question if it were to be considered.

Mr. Dach: Okay. What I'm trying to get at is basically looking at the large number of responses, wondering if indeed you noticed in your analysis that we heard equally from northern and southern parts of the province and that the responses were a good representation.

Dr. Amato: Well, again, I think that we didn't divide the province strictly speaking according to a north-south line, but given that the overwhelming number of responses were from Edmonton and Calgary, which, broadly speaking, represent – I mean, not exactly, but there's a division there. You know, you can say that there is some representation of more northern areas and more southern

areas of the province and then a diversity of responses across all of these economic regions.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Just a final follow-up. I'm just wondering about the implications that are inherent in the potential legislation for our eastern and western border areas. Did we hear from a large number of Albertans from these areas such as Grande Prairie, Lloydminster, and Medicine Hat?

Dr. Amato: We certainly heard from Albertans in those regions, yes, and they identified themselves. They were asked on the form to identify the city or the location they were from, and there were a fair number certainly from Grande Prairie and certainly some from Lloydminster, Medicine Hat. That was the third-largest response in terms of the regions that we divided it into, so yes.

Mr. Dach: Okay. Sounds good.

I think what I'll do is yield to my colleague, Mr. Connolly, for further questions.

The Chair: Before we begin, I'll give the opportunity for those on the phone if they have any questions as well.

Seeing and hearing none, Member Connolly.

Connolly: Sure. Just one question to satisfy my own curiosity. How many people faxed in their response?

Dr. Amato: Unfortunately, I don't have the statistic. One or two, we think.

Connolly: Okay. So not an overly large number.

Dr. Amato: But, I mean, a fair number by mail.

Connolly: Well, it's easier, I think, and not so '80s. Was feedback steady throughout, or did it kind of drop off at the end, or did it amp up at the end? How did it really . . .

Dr. Amato: That's a question – certainly, over the first couple of weeks responses came in at a very, very high volume. And then the last several weeks they – and I hesitate to say dropped in this context, given the number of responses that we typically receive – dropped down to something like 1,000 or 1,500 a week. But I think the last week was something like 2,000 or 2,500. So a concentration in the beginning two weeks and then a concentration in the last week and a half. But, I mean, in terms of volume, quite steady throughout.

Connolly: All right. Thanks.

Dr. Amato: That's probably in response – again, I can't necessarily say – to steady advertising campaigns.

Connolly: Great. Perfect.

I think that's all the questions I have.

The Chair: All right. I'll open up the floor for any other questions. Ms McKitrick.

Ms McKitrick: Thank you. Also, I really appreciate the work that went on. I was just wondering, just for clarity, when you're talking about responses received from Edmonton, do you mean the city of Edmonton or do you mean the capital region? I'm just trying to figure out where in your analysis are the ridings outside of Edmonton.

Dr. Amato: Sure. I provided the maps in the submission summary so that you can actually see that we're talking about the Edmonton region. And it's the Edmonton region as defined by – sorry. These economic regions are maps provided by Treasury Board and Finance.

Ms McKitrick: Okay.

Dr. Amato: So you can see that there's Athabasca or Grande Prairie, Peace River, and you can see that it's actually a fairly sort of large region of the province. The Edmonton region is similarly large. The Calgary region similarly includes, for example, Airdrie and other surrounding areas that are on the map.

Ms McKitrick: Thank you. I find that really important to kind of clarify because I wanted to make sure that I knew where the responses from the constituents in my riding went to. Thank you.

Dr. Amato: No, absolutely. I'm glad you asked. Sorry if I was unclear.

The Chair: Any other questions? On the phones?

Well, thank you, Dr. Amato.

Seeing that there are no other questions, hon. members, moving on to late submissions. The committee received a number of submissions past the deadline established at our June 8, 2017, meeting. Members will recall that stakeholders had until July 21 to respond to the committee's invitation to provide input for Bill 203. The public was asked to provide feedback by July 28, 2017.

Four stakeholder submissions – the Association of Alberta Agricultural Fieldmen as well as submissions from the Edmonton, Calgary, and Fort McMurray airport authorities – were received a few days past the July 21 deadline. Additionally, there were approximately a dozen public submissions that were received in the weeks following the committee's deadline. Therefore, the committee should decide whether to include these submissions as part of its review of Bill 203.

I'll open up the floor for any thoughts on the matter. Member Connolly.

9:20

Connolly: Yeah. I think the late submissions should be included. I can move a motion if that's what's needed. I'll move that all written submissions received by the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future by August 4, 2017, in regard to its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, be accepted and included in the review process.

The Chair: With that motion on the floor, I'll open that motion up for discussion.

Connolly: Do you want me to reread it so you can actually write it down, or have you pretty much got it? It's pretty basic.

The Chair: Any discussion on the motion? On the phones? All right.

Seeing and hearing none, Mr. Roth, I will get you to read the motion out for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Connolly that all written submissions received by the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future by August 4, 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.

Moving on to item (c), decision on making submissions public. The committee should now decide on whether or not to make public the submissions it has received in relation to the review. Hon. members, as per the motion of the committee on June 8, 2017, all advertisements asking for public submissions indicate that the identity and content of the submissions may be made public. In previous reviews, as members know, committees have elected to make public the submissions received after redacting personal contact information and sensitive personal information. In the instance of this review the committee has certainly broken a record in the number of submissions it has received. As it's been alluded to before, approximately 13,500 submissions have been received via e-mail, letter, a web form on the committee's external website, and, as Member Connolly outlined, fax.

With the number of submissions there come some challenges making them public that will ensure personal information will not be revealed. The committee has a couple of options to consider in regard to this. Should the committee decide to make the submissions public, the first option might be to follow the ordinary practice of redacting sensitive personal information for all 13,500 submissions. This will be a process that will require some time from the committee staff as they would need to review each submission individually for sensitive and personal information. Alternatively, the committee may wish to consider the idea of making the submission summary public. With this option the committee could choose to include the names of all persons and organizations who made submissions in an appendix to the summary.

I would now open this up to the floor for discussion on this topic and whether or not the committee would wish to make submissions received public.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Has this type of public disclosure been made in the past?

Ms Dean: In almost all instances the submissions are made public, but it is a decision for the committee.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Yeah.

The Chair: All right. Any other questions?

Mr. Panda: Mr. Chair, I have no objection making that public, but we haven't received any copies of that information. When do we get that?

The Chair: Of the submissions?

Mr. Panda: Yeah.

The Chair: The submissions have been sent off on a weekly basis, if I'm correct, via e-mail, but because of the vast quantity of them, they've come through as an Excel spreadsheet.

Mr. Panda: No. These late submissions.

The Chair: Oh, the late submissions.

Mr. Roth.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Late submissions actually have been posted as well. The ones that are late have a bracket behind them in the submission window on the committee's internal website that says "late."

Mr. Panda: Thank you.

Ms Fitzpatrick: If I may suggest a motion. Moved by myself that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future make the stakeholder and public submission summary documents provided by research services available on the public website, including the names of individual submission authors.

The Chair: Okay. What that motion – sorry, Dr. Amato.

Dr. Amato: May I ask for a clarification? One other thing that we can do is that we can include, with the names of all the submitters and the stakeholder submissions, whether they indicated yes, no, or were undecided about the bill. If that's something that the committee would like, that is something that we can do.

Ms Fitzpatrick: I think that's okay. Yeah.

The Chair: Would we need that to be in the motion as well?

Ms Dean: It's the intent.

The Chair: Okay. For sure. All right. I will open up this motion for discussion. Anyone on the phones?

Seeing and hearing none, Mr. Roth, if you would like to read it in for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Ms Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future make the stakeholder and public submission summary documents provided by research services available on the public website, including the names of individual submission authors.

The Chair: Having heard the motion, all those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. Members on the phone? That motion is carried.

We'll move on to item (d), public consultation and oral presentations. Hon. members, moving on to the next step is part of the public consultation process. Some committees in the past have opted to get more detailed information on particular topics for specific identified organizations and individuals in the form of oral presentations. I would like to open the floor up to committee members as to whether they would like to invite particular organizations and individuals to make oral presentations to the committee.

Seeing that, I'll open up the floor.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried, go ahead.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to – you know, I guess my previous position on this from an oral presentation perspective would be to find some of those groups that have some research and some very key issues with respect to the impact on their industries or people or safety and those sorts of things so that we can actually go to find out the pros and cons from some of those identified. So maybe it's an opportunity for us to go through some of the current submissions – obviously, we've got pros and cons that have been clearly identified from the stakeholders from our research team, which is very helpful – and bring in some of those specific groups that have identified some of the key issues.

I'm not talking just inconvenience; I'm talking about cost, I'm talking about safety, and I'm talking about mental health. If we could bring some of those issues to the forefront for our

consideration, it might inform our conversation and our discussion much better, not only on our behalf but on behalf of Albertans.

The Chair: Okay. Any other members? MLA Fitzpatrick.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. Based on what the member just said, I'll make another motion that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite individuals, organizations based on submissions by committee members received by this Friday, the 11th of August, in addition to the following, to make an oral presentation to the committee as part of its Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act.

Mr. Roth: Sorry. I missed that.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. That

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite individuals and organizations based on submissions by committee members received by Friday, August 11, in addition to the following, to make an oral presentation to the committee as part of its Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act review:

Then there's a list of people who made submissions.

Sisters of Providence, Blake Shaffer, WestJet, the Oilers, the Flames, UNA, AUPE, Islamic Centre University, the Muslim Community of Edmonton, the northern indigenous and Métis communities, Alberta chapter of National Golf Course Owners, chambers of commerce from Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, et cetera.

Do you want me to list them all?

9:30

Mr. Roth: Do you have them on a list?

Ms Fitzpatrick: Yes, I do.

Ms Dean: Can I just seek clarification from the member about the intent? Is it simply to invite those individuals or organizations who have made a submission to the committee? Is that the intent?

Ms Fitzpatrick: Yes. Because this was a long weekend, I think that, you know, there might be some that our members of the committee might feel should be invited, and because it was the weekend, we didn't get a chance to do it, so if we could give until Friday to get the rest of those names in.

The Chair: So for clarification the committee members have until Friday to submit who they want to make oral presentations?

Ms Fitzpatrick: Yeah. That's right.

The Chair: Okay. With that motion on the floor I'll open it up for discussion. Ms Fitzpatrick, do you have the list handy for . . .

Ms Fitzpatrick: I do. I'm just going to e-mail it to him.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Dean: Mr. Chair, I just want to inquire further. Basically, are you looking for another level of approval from the committee in terms of those people on the list, or will the committee members simply be submitting names for individuals or groups to be invited?

Ms Fitzpatrick: The committee would be submitting names. I can give you an example. The Lethbridge city council has spoken to me many times about this, and I'd certainly like to reach out to them, so they would give an oral presentation.

Mr. van Dijken: I believe we've done some fairly robust reaching out to stakeholders by inviting them to provide written submissions. I believe that the written submissions are reflective of those that found it necessary to respond and that to open up now for oral presentations to a wide range of stakeholders might create a difficulty in trying to accommodate oral presentations from many, many, many, many different individuals and stakeholders, as the motion is prepared to do. I'm not sure how we're going to fit that in to properly accommodate the large number of oral presentations that could come as a result of committee members inviting them to come forward. We would almost need another committee meeting to approve a new list of oral presentations, and I'm not sure that we're prepared or able to do that at this time.

The Chair: To further sort of offset procedurally what Mr. van Dijken has outlined here, too, it should be the decision of the committee as to who these members are. However, they can delegate this task to other committee members for determination as well, so approval of the chair or deputy chair as well.

Connolly: I was just about to reiterate what you were saying. I believe that if we say that anyone on the committee can make submissions for oral presentations, like Mr. Gotfried was suggesting, approval can then be done through the chair or the deputy chair. Is that correct, Parliamentary Counsel?

Ms Dean: It's a decision for the committee if they wish to delegate that to the chair and deputy chair.

Connolly: So we can say that an e-mail will be sent out to the chair and deputy chair once all the submissions have been gathered on August 11, and then the approval will be up to them, correct?

The Chair: If it's the will of the committee, yes. Thanks.

I would suggest that an amendment be moved to ensure that that's encompassed in the motion as well.

Connolly: Then I will move that amendment.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, put me on the list, please.

The Chair: Yeah.

We're now on discussion of the amendment. I will just have the clerk read it off before we proceed.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Connolly that the motion be amended by adding the words "with the approval of the chair and deputy chair" after the words "individuals and organizations."

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried, you were next on the list.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, I just want to reiterate, you know, that if we're just going to – I mean, we don't want a thousand people saying that they can come forward. I understand that we need to have some approval process, but I would really like us to focus on some of the submissions that are not necessarily, I mean, just inconvenience, not just personal opinion, but where they have actually cited either some issues of commercial importance, of safety, of mental health, those sorts of things. So I'm wondering if we can distill this down and have the research team do a little bit of getting a quick classification of those where there's some evidence-based responses. We as a committee and, I think, we on behalf of Albertans need to find out if there's more information that we need to determine that might impact this and, really, to inform us but, more importantly or as importantly, to inform Albertans

about some of the issues surrounding this decision and this piece of legislation.

I'm not sure exactly whether this moving to approval by the chair and deputy chair achieves that. I would certainly like to see us narrow down the funnel here. We've got responses from people. We have the ability to categorize and sort those accordingly, but I think that in that sorting mechanism if we can bring out those where some citations or concerns about people's mental health and depression and safety are brought forward and issues of cost or our globalization that we're trying to do in terms of the airlines and airports. From the comments that they have made, we know that WestJet is ordering 787 Dreamliners, which will allow them to become a global player. If we impact that negatively, it could cost Alberta millions of dollars, not to mention the connectivity it could give us globally, which we and the Alberta government, civic authorities, airports, and airlines have been working diligently and very expensively to try and achieve over the years.

I'd like to make sure that we don't spend more time just getting the same information verbally, that we focus on some evidence-based and some cost-based and some safety-based issues here and make sure we bring those forward.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Connolly: I believe research services has already done this work through the summaries and the web forms. Well, this list was compiled by members of our caucus because we went through the written submissions and looked at who we wanted to hear from a bit more and ask questions to on a person-by-person basis, so I believe that this list is comprehensive. I wouldn't say comprehensive, and that's why we have until Friday, but, like, the list includes chambers of commerce. It includes religious organizations such as the Islamic community, who may have issues with the time change in regard to Ramadan. We also invite WestJet, Stampeders, Oilers, who have all said that they may have issues. That's why we're inviting these people, so that we can have their input brought to us and we can have that dialogue. That's why we created this list and went through the issues. Well, we went through the issues and the written submissions before this meeting so that we could have a list of who we wanted to invite.

9:40

The Chair: MLA Fitzpatrick.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. There is a correction in what I had originally said. In the third line, where it says "based on recommendation," it was "based on submissions received."

The Chair: All right. Any further discussion on the amendment? On the phones?

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

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Connolly that the motion be amended by adding the words "with the approval of the chair and deputy chair" after the words "individuals and organizations."

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

We're back on the main motion. I will open that up for discussion. We'll give members an opportunity just to see the whole motion, and we'll also send it off via e-mail to the committee.

Ms Dean: Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms Dean: I just wanted to get some clarity because some of these organizations have not made submissions to the committee, so the language that Member Fitzpatrick just brought forward would be inconsistent with that enumerated list.

The Chair: You're alluding to the change where it says "based on submissions received," right?

Ms Dean: That's correct.

Mr. Panda: Can I still make an amendment to that, Mr. Chair? Just to fix that problem, we can say "including but not limited to," and then continue the list.

The Chair: Yeah. Absolutely.

Mr. Panda, is that the correct amendment that you were looking for?

Mr. Panda: I just offered that because when she mentioned that issue, I thought that's how we can fix it.

The Chair: Okay.

All right. I'll open up discussion on that amendment.

Seeing and hearing none, I'll call the question on the amendment.

Mr. van Dijken: Mr. Chair, if I may.

The Chair: Oh. Sorry, Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: You know, I am going to reiterate that all of these stakeholders were contacted and given ample opportunity to make written submissions. To move forward now and reaching out again, I would suggest that those that have not made submissions had ample opportunity to get engaged and be part of the process previously and showed no initiative to participate to this point, so I have difficulty moving forward with this. You know, I believe that all of these stakeholders have had the opportunity to become engaged and decided not to. I'm not sure why we're moving in a direction that is trying to make them engaged.

The Chair: Just for the procedural process I'm going to pull us back to the amendment and then reopen discussions for the main motion as well. Any further discussion on the amendment?

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

We're back on the main motion. Member Coolahan.

Connolly: Connolly.

The Chair: Sorry, Member Connolly. Sorry. It was a long weekend.

Connolly: It's okay. It was a long weekend.

The issue is that a lot of issues were identified in the written submissions, and many of these – well, all of these people will be affected in different ways, so I believe that inviting them to make submissions will clarify a lot of things we heard in the written submissions. That's why I believe that we need to have oral presentations.

The Chair: MLA Shepherd.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, just in agreement with Mr. Connolly in regard to the comments from Mr. van Dijken.

Having participated in a number of reviews both as a member and a chair on a number of committees, I think the oral presentations phase is pretty common. In all the processes I've participated in, it's not unusual to invite in people for oral presentations who have already made written presentations as well, simply to give us the opportunity to delve a bit more in depth into the presentations that are made, ask additional questions. In terms of inviting people who have not participated in the submission process so far, again, once we hear from written submissions and that sort of thing, often it can highlight additional people who we find we should speak to who they themselves may not have realized that there may in fact be an impact.

I certainly appreciated what Mr. van Dijken is saying in terms of wanting to streamline as much as possible, and I would certainly support that being the overarching intent for the committee so as not to overburden members, but I think it's important that we have the flexibility to be able to accommodate the information that we want to gather in the oral presentation process.

The Chair: I'll open it up for those on the phone. Any questions or comments on the motion?

Back on the floor.

Connolly: Just a quick clarification. Would this motion as it's written now still allow for committee members to make suggestions to add members to the list if they so choose?

The Chair: Ms Dean, correct me if I'm wrong, but you have until August 11 as the motion outlines.

Ms Dean: Subject to the approval of the chair and deputy chair.

Connolly: Thanks.

The Chair: Any further questions or comments?

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

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Ms Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future invite individuals and organizations with the approval of the chair and deputy chair, including but not limited to those who made submissions to the committee members, by August 11, 2017, to make an oral presentation to the committee as part of its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, including the Sisters of Providence; Blake Shaffer; WestJet; the Edmonton Oilers; the Calgary Flames; United Nurses of Alberta; Alberta Union of Provincial Employees; Islamic Centre University; the northern indigenous and Métis communities; Alberta chapter of National Golf Course Owners; chambers of commerce from Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Lloydminster; Boyle Street Education Centre; the Edmonton, Calgary, and Fort McMurray airports; the Edmonton Eskimos; the Calgary Stampede; and FC Edmonton.

9:50

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

We'll now be moving on to . . .

Mr. van Dijken: Just for clarification, I need to . . .

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yeah. Sorry, Chair. The way the motion is worded – I'm trying to get an understanding as to the listing that we have.

This is "including but not limited to those who made submissions to committee members." Still, the chair and deputy chair approve all beyond this list or even with regard to this list?

The Chair: So you're asking for clarification if we have to approve what is included in the list here?

Mr. van Dijken: Right.

The Chair: The interpretation that I make, because the discussion was opened up and the committee voted on the list as proposed, is that we have already voted in favour of the inclusion of the members that are on this list. Any further members would be up to the decision of the chair and deputy chair.

Mr. Dach: That's my conclusion as well, that it would just simply be that any further invitations would be requiring the consent of the chair and deputy chair and that the ones that are listed here are already approved.

The Chair: Any other questions in relation to the motion that has passed or oral presentations?

Seeing and hearing none, we'll move on to public meetings, item (d)(ii). Hon. members, the committee may want to discuss whether or not to hold public meetings as part of the review of Bill 203. Committee staff have put together some initial estimates as to what public meetings might cost should the committee wish to travel to different locations within the province. On the high end certain public meetings of the committee could average about \$42,500 each. Total cost of holding public meetings would depend on the number of meetings, locations, methods of travel, and other factors. Regardless of location audio equipment will need to be rented and operated, and advertising of local meetings would need to be done. Additionally, for public meetings Legislative Assembly security services would need to be present as would *Hansard*, legislative office communications, research, and committee officials' staff. So speaking in relation to that, regardless of where we land on this, there will be a cost affiliated with it even if it's held locally here in Edmonton.

At this time I would like to open up the floor for discussion on the question of whether the committee will hold public meetings as part of the committee's review of Bill 203.

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: I just didn't hear a number of locations that were proposed. I don't think I sat in on the last meeting, but I haven't seen anything that recommended X amount of locations. Is that number available?

The Chair: The number of locations and where you choose to meet would be up to the will of the committee. So it's up to the decision of where the committee wants to land.

Mr. Schneider: I guess, if I could continue, just to follow up . . .

The Chair: Yeah. Absolutely.

Mr. Schneider: If there is no evidence, you know – all research to be presented at these locations: does it make sense? I guess if it were 42 grand or so per, if we have 10 locations, that's 420 grand plus probably some numbers we aren't sure of yet. Have we not offered all we could to stakeholders by now, having oral presentations, offering written proposals, written submissions? We have a record

number of presentations or submissions being made. I question the fact that we need to go on a road show. I mean, if there's some concern about border towns not submitting, it's kind of like turning your air conditioning off. That's a decision made by those folks. We could target those places and ask for submissions, but written or oral I'm talking about. I guess I just can't speak favourably about going on the road.

That's all I've got to say, Mr. Chair. Thanks.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Certainly, I recall many times in the past the opposition saying that we don't have enough consultation. I would like certainly to talk to some of these people who've given written submissions to get some further feedback on what they've said. I'm certainly in favour of going on the road and getting that kind of clarification. That's how I'm going to vote.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, put me on the list, please.

The Chair: Okay. I'll have you on after Member Connolly.

Connolly: I think we can all agree that what Mr. Schneider proposes is ridiculous, going around the province for 10 cities. However, I would have to say that we received 14,000 submissions, which is a record by 13,000. I think it would be best if we did perhaps have maybe four locations: Edmonton, Calgary, then either Fort McMurray or Grande Prairie, and then probably Lethbridge because that's where we received the next largest number of submissions. But it is, I think, imperative that we do talk to Albertans face to face in regard to this issue because it's going to affect people's daily lives, especially people who are living up near Grande Prairie. When you're so close to the B.C. border, at some times it could be two hours' difference. Then with time change down in the southeast quadrant of the province, it can be a very different idea.

I think that we should go out and talk to Albertans. I think, again, that 10 cities is completely ridiculous, but having four cities that represent a good swath of the province could be beneficial to the committee.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I understand we've had record submissions, which means, you know, that we've shaken the tree as we've gotten some good responses. If we feel that there are some areas that are underrepresented – and I've heard border towns and the far north, High Level and such places – I think we could reach out to those communities and seek some further written submissions without incurring the cost, number one. Number two, we do have technology in place where if we do some oral presentations, we could invite certain organizations. Again, I'm just going to say here that everybody's opinion counts; however, if we have people where if it's not just, "I have a preference," but "I actually have some evidence that would say that these things need to be considered in terms of more of a technical or safety-related or mental health issues," I think those would be helpful for us.

The other thing I think we need to remember is that we are doing outreach. There are 87 of us across the province, and every individual has the opportunity to come into their MLA's office. Obviously, that's a bit more challenged in remote areas, but the remote areas also would cost us much more to go to, so we have to find other ways to reach them, as the MLAs that serve those areas already do.

10:00

My suggestion is that we have that reach in the community. I'm listening to my constituents. I'm sure everybody on the committee is listening to theirs. You know, we could encourage people to go and visit their MLAs if they wanted to have a more face-to-face opportunity to voice their opinion. Then we could actually ask the MLAs to compile those in a way which may just be reinforcement of what we've already received from individuals and to bring that back to the committee.

We're in a very tight cost environment here. We have record submissions, which is already very encouraging, but I think we need to be fiscally responsible on this, and if we already have offices in place in 87 different constituencies across the province, we do have an opportunity and an obligation to listen to our constituents. I think we already have that ability to achieve that. That's my comment on this.

The Chair: MLA Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. I know that doing things frugally and with respect to keeping costs down is important to us as well as the opposition, but we haven't had this kind of a response to a question ever before in this province. I appreciate the member who just spoke, talking about having the MLAs receive the information and then report back, but that's not formally on the record, and it doesn't follow through with what we want to do as a committee, I believe, and that is to actually record very faithfully the wishes of Albertans on this matter.

I think that every opportunity should be given to all quadrants of the province to fully express themselves before the committee makes a decision on recommendations to the Legislature with respect to this bill. I'm certainly in favour of looking at maybe cost-saving measures that might keep costs down, but I think it's really important that we do get to other quadrants of the province. Perhaps if we're looking at having committee representation travel, which has been done in the past – I mean, it was done for high-speed rail. It's something that didn't impact the entire province. This bill is more consequential for everyday Albertans.

Perhaps we could have a subcommittee travel instead and reduce costs that way. That's one potential possibility, reducing it. Have a subcommittee of the chair, deputy chair – or if the deputy chair felt that it impeded the time that he was able to spend during September, then perhaps he could designate somebody else – a couple of members of the government side, a couple of members of the opposition. Keep it small but allow us to record properly the views of Albertans throughout the province by going to those four locations in a more cost-effective way. I'll put that out for discussion and see what the committee's thoughts are.

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I think before we go out on the road, we need to be fully equipped to be able to engage fulsomely with Albertans in a way so that we understand many of the consequences that might come forward from a decision such as this and that we are able to discuss with Albertans so that we have an educated and informed ability to properly discuss it with them. I think before we can even think about going on the road, we should talk about the oral presentations.

There's a lot that we can learn from individual stakeholders. I would reflect on what we learned from the airline industry with regard to the written submissions that a lot of individual Albertans possibly have not had the opportunity to even reflect on. I think the

airline industry – maybe it was the WestJet part of it – had requested possibly an aviation analysis with regard to this discussion. Maybe we need that before we can even go on the road and have any kind of effective conversation with Albertans in general. Without all the information being available, how can Albertans truly make an informed presentation?

Connolly: While I agree with Mr. van Dijken, we also have to make sure that – the WestJet and the Oilers: they're only one group of people. There were just under 14,000 people who made submissions. Albertans care about this issue because it affects their everyday lives. We can't just look at Alberta businesses and business owners, although they are very important, and ignore the rest of Albertans. We have to talk to everyone. While we can't literally talk to all 3.5 million people, we need to get a large swath of Albertans to hear from to figure out what we need to do. If we have additional meetings, we can hear from businesspeople, we can hear from the health professionals and average Albertans and ensure that the input we receive is thorough enough to ensure that the recommendations of this committee are reflective of what all Albertans want.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, please put me on the list.

The Chair: Yeah. You'll be after Mr. van Dijken.
Go ahead, Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yeah. With all due respect, I do believe that we've received a large number of submissions. I will agree with that. But at the same time, how many of those submissions would possibly change if they knew all of the repercussions that possibly would be coming forward with the changes that we are proposing? So that's why I believe that we need to uncover as many of those consequences as possible before a decision is actually made.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I mean, we've got lots of submissions, and I think that to characterize the oral presentations as listening just to businesses is wrong. I would actually like us to skew more towards some of the concerns about safety. I've heard concerns about children going to school in the dark. We could talk to safety patrol groups. We could talk to the AMA. We could talk to traffic safety groups. I'm very concerned about that. We've heard submissions from the construction association about workers and the safety of workers going and working in the dark for three and then four hours sometimes if you consider up in northern Alberta in the mornings, which could impact their safety.

We're hearing about mental health issues from organizations. I'm sure that there are varying opinions, which I think we need to hear, on mental health, which can then, of course, lead to depression and, sadly, to other consequences that can affect the lives and the productivity and well-being of Albertans. So I guess my suggestion here, possibly in the form of a motion, would be that we have the oral presentations as selected by the chair and deputy chair brought to us to better inform this committee and Albertans prior to consideration of embarking on a road show.

The Chair: Are you looking to move the motion, Mr. Gotfried?

Mr. Gotfried: Yes, please.

The Chair: Okay. Sorry. Mr. Gotfried, if you could just reread that for us, just to compile it appropriately.

Mr. Gotfried: That the committee hear oral presentations from selected presenters prior to consideration and a decision on whether to embark on a public road show across the province.

The Chair: Mr. Roth, can you just read that in for the record for Mr. Gotfried?

10:10

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. What I have is: moved by Mr. Gotfried that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future hear oral presentations from selected stakeholders prior to making a decision on whether or not to hold public meetings.

The Chair: Does that meet the intent of your motion, Mr. Gotfried?

Mr. Gotfried: It does indeed, Mr. Chair. I think the selection, how that will occur, has already been addressed, so I don't think that needs to be reiterated. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Excellent.
Member Connolly.

Connolly: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Unfortunately, we only have until October 4 to complete this report. Is that correct, Parliamentary Counsel?

The Chair: Yes.

Connolly: If we have public meetings, if we have to send out invitations, that meeting will probably occur the beginning of September approximately? Yes. End of August, beginning of September. Anyways, we'll say that. With that timeline it could be one to two days for these submissions, and then to figure out if we're going to do public meetings, that can take several weeks because we have to find venues, we have to find time, we have to find staff. With that tight timeline we won't have time after the oral presentations to find places to do public meetings if we decide to do even four public meetings, which is a low bar compared to public meetings that have occurred in the past. So I don't believe that this motion would really work if we are still sticking to the timeline of October 4.

Mr. van Dijken: Well, I believe the intent of the motion is to identify that by going out to public meetings within the province without full information and without having done a robust identification of what the consequences could be resulting from this bill, by going out without that information available to us, we are possibly not doing the due diligence necessary, to hold public meetings that will lead us to any kind of a greater solution than what we have in the submissions that have been presented to this date. We have over 13,000 submissions to this date, and I'm not sure what we plan to gain by going out to hold public meetings unless we have more information to present to the public. So I would suggest that the intent of this motion is to ensure that we are fully equipped to have that fulsome discussion with Albertans. Otherwise, I would suggest that the over 13,000 submissions that we have are essentially the same as what we would hear going out in public meetings.

Connolly: If I can just reply, the purpose isn't solution seeking; it's input gathering for understanding. Yes, we have 14,000 submissions. With this timeline we will have these oral presentations before we go to do public meetings. However, if we're going to do public meetings, we have to find venues and we have to find staff. If we plan on doing the subcommittee like Mr.

Dach suggested, we have to figure that out. So it's a very tight timeline if we're trying to do this before October 4.

I realize that some members of this committee are busy with a leadership race; however, we still have to do the work of this committee, and we have until October 4 to do that. So we have under two months to do it. That means that we have to do this oral presentation, probably, before the end of August. We'd probably start public meetings. We would have four in September. We would need a week or two to create a report. We have to give the report on October 4. We have to finish our public consultation, and we have to finish the oral presentations about two weeks before October 4 so we can actually create that report. With the 14,000 submissions and all this other input from Albertans it's going to take some time to do that report.

I believe that if we pass this motion, we won't have time to do all that we need to do to seek input from Albertans.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair, Richard Gotfried for comment, please.

The Chair: Absolutely, Mr. Gotfried.

Member Connolly, I caution you to make sure you stay on the relevance and avoid the commentary as well.

Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. I feel that this motion is really designed to do what is contrary to what we want to accomplish, and that's to ensure, at the end of the day, that everyone in this province who has opinions on the issue feels that they had an opportunity to be heard. The whole intent of the oral presentations at public meetings is to ensure that no one feels that they didn't have the opportunity to fully expand their arguments with the committee present.

So we're seeking the greatest level of understanding possible of all the arguments that stakeholders wish to make in an in-depth, in-person way by actually making the effort to go to these four locations throughout the province, and by being on record, with the committee recording their comments, and ensuring that, at the end of the day, when a decision is finally made and recommendations are made by this committee, no one feels that they didn't have the opportunity to fully expand their arguments.

So I really wish that we would get on with the effort to do that by following through with what we initially had intended and moving forward to get these public meetings organized and to not create a further step that's unnecessary.

The Chair: Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I think that the saying goes: you can have it fast or you can have it cheap, but you can't have both if you want to get it right. I think that we need to take a look at the issues here, and I agree with Member van Dijken that for us to go out and do a road show without even having, perhaps, you know, some highlights of some of the more technical issues that could be done during oral presentations, would be just going out and seeking more opinions, which is valid. But there are other ways for us to get opinions if we want to do that, and there are ways to get everybody's opinion if we choose to do that. So what I'm suggesting with this amendment or with this motion is that we don't try and do it fast; we try and do it right.

Obviously, if you want to ramp this up and try and do both concurrently, you know, I don't think any of us are afraid of rolling up our sleeves and getting this done by the October 4 deadline if we so choose. However, if we go out to those organizations that have evidence-based information, and associations or individuals with, again, the safety of Albertans, the mental health of Albertans in

mind and/or the impact on businesses – because it doesn't just impact businesses; it affects jobs – we should be cognizant of those issues that are brought forward, not just the preferences and opinions but actual factually based information, research, or things that will impact Albertans' lives, livelihoods, safety, or mental health.

I think we need to make sure that people are not just making their own knee-jerk decisions based on, "I don't want to change my clocks" and actually come forward with evidence-based things that will impact their lives in a way that is more meaningful, to give people some thought-provoking information here to allow them to make the best possible decision.

That's why I would like to see this motion passed. I think that's all I need to say on it. I would suggest that we just move on and make a decision on it.

The Chair: Any other questions or comments?

Connolly: We would have the oral presentations before we go to do public meetings.

The Chair: Any other questions or comments?

Ms Fitzpatrick: Call the question.

The Chair: I'll just leave it open for the phones.

Mr. van Dijken: Is there an amendment to the motion?

Connolly: No.

Mr. van Dijken: There's a statement that we're going to have oral presentations before the public meetings.

Connolly: Because oral presentations are much easier to organize than public meetings, we just need time to organize the public meetings.

The Chair: Any other discussion?

Mr. Cyr: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Cyr.

10:20

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the past we were doing public consultations with the Alberta heritage trust fund committee. We found out that something like 15 or 20 people were showing up to these public consultations. Is there, like, some sort of optic that shows that we're going to have more than 20 or 30 people, to spend \$160,000 or \$400,000, whatever the number is? It seems to me that unless we are looking at booking stadiums to get the feedback that is beyond the 13,000 we already have for submissions, we're going out and spending taxpayer money. I'm always for public consultation; there's no doubt. But if we end up with 80 people and spending a lot of money, is that something that we can consider a success for Alberta? I do have concerns about these public consultations going on. I'm asking: what exactly are the metrics that we are holding so that this is going to be a success?

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other members?

Seeing and hearing none, Mr. Roth, if you can read it for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Mr. Gotfried that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future hear oral presentations from selected stakeholders prior to making a decision on whether or not to hold public meetings.

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 defeated.

Mr. van Dijken: I request a recorded vote.

The Chair: Okay. We will start with my deputy chair to the right. Make sure you say your names for the record.

Mr. van Dijken: It's van Dijken. In favour.

Mr. Panda: MLA Prasad Panda. In favour of the motion moved by Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Carson: MLA Carson. Not in favour.

Mr. Shepherd: MLA Shepherd. Not in favour.

Mr. Dach: MLA Dach. No.

Ms Fitzpatrick: MLA Fitzpatrick. Opposed.

Ms McKittrick: MLA McKittrick. Opposed.

Dr. Turner: MLA Turner. No.

Connolly: Connolly. No.

The Chair: All right. Those on the phones? Mr. Taylor?
Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: McPherson. No.

Mr. Gotfried: Gotfried. In favour.

Mr. Schneider: Schneider. In favour.

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

The Chair: That motion is defeated.
We're back on the subject matter. I'll open that up for discussion.

Mr. Schneider: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: There's something we haven't talked about here, and I think it's worth while bringing up. In 1967 the government of the day put forward a referendum at election to determine whether or not to go on to daylight saving time. That was defeated in 1967. That act was repeated by a different government in 1971. Not that the government made any difference, but that was the second chance that Albertans got the chance to decide whether or not they were in favour of daylight saving time. They voted yes. Seeing that daylight saving time was brought in by referendum and the fact that this committee wants to hear from all Albertans, I'm prepared to make a motion. I won't make it right this minute, but I believe that it was brought in by referendum, and it seems reasonable to have it taken out by referendum if that's what Albertans decide.

Now, what I would like to do if it's all right, Mr. Chair, is make that motion, and then we can possibly have a discussion. Is that reasonable?

The Chair: Mr. Schneider, that would be what we'd determine through the deliberation process. Unfortunately, the committee does not have the power to mandate this at this time.

Mr. Schneider: So the committee does not have the power to recommend to the Legislative Assembly that a referendum be held

in order to determine whether or not Albertans want to see daylight saving time continue or be disbanded?

The Chair: We can during the deliberation process but not at this time during this meeting as this one is for determining the next steps moving forward with both the written and public submissions that have been provided or to what capacity we move forward with public meetings and oral presentations.

Mr. Schneider: Okay. Just to follow up, it's not an appropriate time to ask Parliamentary Counsel to determine what the costs may be for a referendum at the next election?

The Chair: If you want to bring that up in other business, we can have them provide that research for us. But we would have to defer that to other business.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you.

Connolly: In regard to the referendum it would cost between \$2 million and \$6 million to hold a referendum even at election time.

However, I would like to move a motion if it's possible. I would move that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future . . .

The Chair: Member Connolly, I apologize to interject. Is this in relation to moving forward with public meetings?

Connolly: Public meetings. Yes.

The Chair: The process is quite detailed, and we want to make sure that we provide Parliamentary Counsel with the proper direction, so I would suggest to the committee that as you draft that, to ensure that it's drafted to your full intent, we call a recess for you to work with Parliamentary Counsel to determine that.

Connolly: Sure.

The Chair: Okay. We will take a five-minute recess and reconvene at 10:35.

[The committee adjourned from 10:27 a.m. to 10:36 a.m.]

The Chair: All right. I'll call the meeting back to order.

Just to provide context for members, with a motion of such magnitude it has quite a bit of context and moving parts and needs to make sure it provides correct direction for leg. services. Subsequently, I wanted to allow Member Connolly the opportune time and the ample time to ensure his intent was provided in that motion.

Member Connolly, if you would like to read your motion out for the record.

Connolly: Sure. I move that

- (a) a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be established and composed of Mr. Graham Sucha, MLA, as chair; Mr. van Dijken; two members of the ND caucus; and one member of the UC caucus;
- (b) each caucus shall provide the names of the members on the subcommittee to the chair and committee clerk by August 11, 2017;
- (c) the presence of a majority of the members of the subcommittee, including the chair, is necessary to constitute a quorum for a meeting of the subcommittee;
- (d) the temporary substitution provision in Standing Order 56 shall apply to the subcommittee;

- (e) all meetings of the subcommittee shall be reported by *Hansard*;
- (f) the subcommittee shall not be empowered to make decisions on behalf of the committee but shall be authorized to hold meetings with the public and receive evidence;
- (g) the subcommittee shall hold public meetings on Bill 203 in the following locations in Alberta on the dates determined by the chair after consulting with subcommittee members: Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Grande Prairie;
- (h) the subcommittee shall report back to the committee with the summary of the public meetings held.

The Chair: With the motion on the floor I'll open that up for discussion. Members on the phone?

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: I just want to be on the record here that I'm concerned about the cost of these given that representation from the major centres and possibly even Grande Prairie does not seem to be our challenge. Our challenge seems to be in places like border towns and the far north, and I think we can achieve that without having public meetings. We can do that by reaching out to those targeted areas. Everybody in the major cities has ample opportunity to see their MLAs, which are much greater in numbers and in much smaller geographical areas in the major cities. I just want to be on record that I'm not in favour of us incurring additional costs when we already have a huge response from the public. We have an opportunity for the public to reach out to us, and we now have an opportunity for oral presentations from selected groups.

Mr. Panda: Mr. Chair, Member Connolly suggested that we hear oral presentations before we start the public hearings, so I just want to amend this motion with that, that we should hear the oral presentations before we start the public hearings, as suggested by the hon. member.

The Chair: Mr. Roth, can you read the amendment out for the record?

Mr. Roth: Surely, Mr. Chair. Moved by Mr. Panda that the motion in clause 7 be amended by inserting "after hearing oral presentations from stakeholders" after "Bill 203."

The Chair: Does that meet the intention of your motion, Mr. Panda? Excellent.

I'll open up that amendment for discussion. Member Connolly.

Connolly: Yeah. I don't think I have a problem with the amendment. It doesn't really change the intent of the original motion, and it's much easier to create oral presentations in the month of August and then start organizing public meetings for the month of September.

Mr. Dach: I'm just wondering what the intent is of this amendment. Is it to hold separate oral presentations that would otherwise be heard anyway at the public meetings we intend to hold? I don't really understand the intent.

Connolly: I'm not going to try to speak for you, but I believe this is just the oral presentations that we agreed upon in the last hour to be held here in Edmonton, having them before we go to public consultations in Calgary, Edmonton, Grande Prairie, and Lethbridge. Correct?

Mr. Panda: Thank you. Yeah. The Member for Calgary-Hawkwood made a statement, and then the deputy chair clarified that. When I read this motion, that information was missing. I'm just asking him to include what he said before.

Mr. Dach: Thank you.

The Chair: Any other discussion on the amendment? Members on the phone?

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

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Mr. Panda that the motion be amended in clause 7 by inserting "after hearing oral presentations from stakeholders" after "Bill 203."

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

We are back on the main motion. I will open that up for discussion. Any members on the phone?

Seeing and hearing none, I will call the question on the motion.

My apologies. Mr. Roth, if you can read that for the record, please.

10:45

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

- (a) a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future be established and composed of Mr. Graham Sucha, MLA, as chair; Mr. Glenn van Dijken; two members of the New Democrat caucus; one member of the United Conservative caucus;
- (b) each caucus shall provide the names of the members on the subcommittee to the chair and the committee clerk by August 11, 2017;
- (c) the presence of a majority of the members of the subcommittee, including the chair, is necessary to constitute a quorum for a meeting of the subcommittee;
- (d) the temporary substitution provisions in Standing Order 56 shall apply to the subcommittee;
- (e) all meetings of the subcommittee shall be recorded by *Hansard*;
- (f) the committee shall not be empowered to make decisions on behalf of the committee but shall be authorized to hold meetings with the public and receive evidence;
- (g) the subcommittee shall hold public meetings on Bill 203, after hearing oral presentations from stakeholders, in the following locations in Alberta on the dates determined by the chair after consulting with subcommittee members: Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Grande Prairie;
- (h) the subcommittee shall report back to the committee with a summary of the public meetings held.

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.

Mr. van Dijken: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. We will start with the member to my right, my deputy chair. Please ensure you say your name for the record.

Mr. van Dijken: MLA van Dijken. Opposed.

Mr. Panda: Opposed. I'll explain why.

Mr. Carson: MLA Carson. Agreed.

Mr. Shepherd: MLA Shepherd. Agreed.

Mr. Dach: MLA Dach. Yes.

Ms Fitzpatrick: MLA Fitzpatrick. Yes.

Ms McKittrick: MLA McKittrick. Yes.

Dr. Turner: MLA Turner. Yes.

Connolly: Connolly. Yes.

Ms McPherson: McPherson. Yes.

Mr. Schneider: Schneider. No.

The Chair: MLA Taylor?

Mr. Roth: He's not on the line.

The Chair: MLA Gotfried, a recorded vote has been requested on the motion that was read out. Can you say your name for the record as well as your stance?

Mr. Gotfried: Yes. Richard Gotfried. No.

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

The Chair: That motion is carried.

Mr. Panda, did you have any comments?

Mr. Panda: Yeah. Mr. Chair, are we into other business now?

The Chair: We'll be moving into that following next steps.

Mr. Panda: Yeah. I heard some comments from all the members here, and I was really concerned about the cost, the timing, and the other issues that some members raised about mental health and other concerns, and then we have a deadline of October 4, so I'm not sure if this committee has the capacity and resources to do this on time. That was my concern. Maybe we'll bring it up in other business, then.

The Chair: Yeah. I'll bring it back up in other business.

Mr. Panda: That's why I opposed that.

The Chair: Yeah. The one thing I do want to outline, as a reminder to the committee, is that this was a mandate set forth by the Legislative Assembly, so we cannot change our timeline as well.

Hon. members, we'll move to section (e), next steps. Following the conclusion of public and stakeholder consultations the next steps of the committee typically involve deliberation on feedback that we receive. Does anyone have any questions or comments about the next steps in the committee's review of Bill 203? MLA Shepherd.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let me just say that I appreciate the opportunity to stop in for this meeting today and to act as a substitute on the committee for Mr. Coolahan and have a chance to weigh in a little bit on something that I've certainly heard about quite a bit from my constituents.

In reading the material and sort of taking a look at things, I was sort of interested to see the feedback that was there, but there was some additional information that I thought might be useful and that I thought perhaps counsel might be able to help us with obtaining, that being in regard to: I've been doing a bit of research, and I see that there are some legislative initiatives in parts of the United

States concerning daylight savings time as well. I hear that California has recently passed some legislation requesting that daylight savings time end in that state. They're looking, I believe, at staying on Pacific daylight year-round. I believe there are a number of other states that have similar initiatives, so I was wondering if it might be possible for the LAO to provide the committee with a bit of a briefing document on legislative changes that are currently being considered across North America as well as a bit of information on what the current daylight savings statuses for other areas of North America are.

Also, along those lines, since we have seen in some of the submissions that were brought forward that for a number of businesses it seems to be important for them that they are able to stay in sync with the rest of the business world, if we could also, then, include perhaps a briefing on how many nations world-wide are participating in daylight savings as well.

Just a bit of additional context that might help illuminate some of the stuff the committee is looking at here.

The Chair: Dr. Amato, do you wish to comment?

Dr. Amato: I think that it would be possible to provide such a briefing document for the committee for, hopefully, its next meeting.

The Chair: Okay. Excellent.

Since I know that this ties in with it, Mr. Schneider, I will open this up for your comments in relation to the referendum questions. Before you begin, I will allow Mr. Roth to just kind of follow up with the committee, because he did provide some details early on in the process, and then see if you have any further questions or any other details that you need.

Mr. Roth.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair. When the committee originally asked, I did some checking into just the previous comments from Elections Alberta, because they had addressed some questions of a different committee regarding the holding of referenda, and also got some information about, you know, different circumstances. One would be if a referendum was held in conjunction with a provincial or a municipal election. They said that a comparable cost would be, you know, if there was a senatorial selection attached to a ballot in Alberta. The number ranges, but approximately \$2 million, \$3 million was the number for a referendum attached to a ballot, was what they gave. In terms of a stand-alone referendum, so if there was no election and it was just a referendum on a particular matter, they indicated – it was actually last year in a previous committee – that the number would be approximately the same, \$23 million for a stand-alone referendum.

The Chair: Are those details available on OurHouse?

Mr. Roth: I can certainly post them, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Schneider, do you have any follow-up or any other questions?

Mr. Schneider: No. I appreciate the information from Parliamentary Counsel. That was kind of the information I was looking for. The random numbers that were thrown around throughout the meeting are what I was about to refute, but I appreciate the information. If I missed it when it was sent out before, I apologize for that, but I won't continue with the referendum idea at this time.

The Chair: We'll make sure those documents are available to you and our research staff on OurHouse as well.

Are there any other questions in relation to next steps?

Mr. Panda: Can I ask a follow-up question on that?

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

Mr. Panda: You said that if it is done in conjunction, it's \$2 million?

Mr. Roth: That was the information that I received from Elections Alberta.

Mr. Panda: Okay. So if there are other subjects, can we combine them in that? It's nothing to do with this. I'm just asking a general question here. In addition to the daylight . . .

Mr. Roth: You mean, like, multiple referendum topics?

Mr. Panda: Yeah.

Mr. Roth: Yeah. That I wouldn't be able to tell you for sure. I was just asked to find out if, say, a sole referendum was held on a particular topic.

Mr. Panda: Thank you.

10:55

The Chair: Excellent.

Any other questions? Those on the phone?

Seeing and hearing none, we'll move on to other business. Mr. Panda, I know you had some feedback that you wanted to address in other business. Oh. You're all right?

Mr. Panda: Yeah.

The Chair: Do any other members have any other business they wish to raise? On the phone?

Seeing and hearing none, hon. members, we'll be consulting with both the deputy chair and myself in relation to who will be sitting on the subcommittee, and then we'll consult with caucus members about the next meeting that we'll be holding as well as the public consultations.

With that being said, would a member wish to adjourn? Moved by Dr. Turner 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? That motion is carried.

The meeting is now adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 10:57 a.m.]

