



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Third Session

Standing Committee
on
Alberta's Economic Future

Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act

Tuesday, September 19, 2017
10 a.m.

Transcript No. 29-3-26

**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)
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)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UCP)*

* substitution for Richard Gotfried

Also in Attendance

Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (NDP)
Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)

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>

10 a.m. Tuesday, September 19, 2017

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. I would like to call the meeting to order and welcome all members, staff, guests to the meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. I would like to recognize 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 this committee. I would ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record, starting with my deputy chair to my right.

Mr. van Dijken: Good morning. It's MLA Glenn van Dijken from the constituency of Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

Mr. Schneider: Dave Schneider, Little Bow.

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

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

Connolly: Michael Connolly, MLA for Calgary-Hawkwood.

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

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

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

Mr. Horne: Good morning. Trevor Horne, MLA for Spruce Grove-St. Albert.

Ms Dotimas: Jeanette Dotimas, communications for the Legislative Assembly Office.

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

Also, I realize that I haven't introduced those on the phones, so if I call your name, please introduce yourself for the record. Mr. Panda.

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

The Chair: Mr. Coolahan.

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

The Chair: Mrs. Schreiner.

Mrs. Schreiner: Good morning. Kim Schreiner, MLA, Red Deer-North.

The Chair: Mr. Gill.

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

The Chair: Dr. Starke.

Dr. Starke: Yes. Good morning. Richard Starke, MLA, Vermilion-Lloydminster.

The Chair: Before we move to the items at hand, would a member like to approve the meeting agenda? Moved by Member Connolly that the September 19, 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. Members on the phone? That motion is carried.

Moving on to the minutes from the previous meeting, we have the minutes from our last meeting on September 5, 2017. Are there any errors or omissions to note? Seeing and hearing none, would a member like to move adoption of the minutes, please? Moved by Member Fitzpatrick that the minutes of 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 the opposed, please say no. On the phones? Excellent.

Also, just as a procedural note I will note that Mr. Yao is an official substitute for Mr. Gotfried. As a clarification we did find the notice for that.

Mr. Yao: Hooray.

The Chair: So you're official now. Congratulations.

Moving on to the next item of the agenda, a review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act. Hon. members, in the August 8, 2017, meeting the committee established a subcommittee for the purpose of hearing evidence from Albertans as part of the review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act. Clause (h) of the motion that created the subcommittee required that a report be made to the committee with a summary of the public meetings held. The report of the subcommittee was made available to all committee members on the committee's internal website.

The subcommittee heard from 113 presenters at its four meetings held in Grande Prairie, Edmonton, Calgary, and Lethbridge. The subcommittee heard from Albertans on a variety of issues, which are detailed in the report. The report details the responses of presenters to Bill 203: those in favour, opposed, undecided, or unclear. The report categorizes the responses based on rationale. It also provides metrics on the responses of presenters from the four communities the subcommittee visited.

With that, I will open it up for any comments or questions in regard to the subcommittee's report. MLA Dach.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to know a couple of things with a bit more clarity. Bill 203 proposes that we end daylight savings time and stay on mountain daylight year-round, yet it seems that there's no actual consensus from the previous submissions on whether there is a preference for staying on mountain daylight or Mountain Standard Time. Did you note in your summary whether a clearer picture of which time zone is preferable actually emerged?

The Chair: Did I notice, or did . . .

Mr. Dach: In the summary report, I guess, was it noticed as a result of the subcommittee's deliberations that a more clear picture of a preference for a time zone actually emerged?

The Chair: I'll allow subcommittee members to answer that. The summary does have the detailed response of where everyone landed.

MLA Fitzpatrick, if you wanted to comment.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Thank you very much, Chair. I'll answer your question, but I'm going to begin with some comments.

This was a private member's bill, and I personally had many, many people come through my office. In fact, the first day that I was in my office, there were a number of people who came into my office and said: stop changing the time. After the first day, then, every time the clock changed, I had a stream of people coming in, letters, e-mails, what have you, and I began to ask people where they wanted to go if, in fact, we were able to stop the time change. What I found was very similar to what occurred during the meetings.

There were a couple of things that stood out. One was that about 75 per cent of the people who responded said: stop changing the clock. However, there was – and I think the Grande Prairie Chamber of Commerce pretty much summed it up during the Grande Prairie consultation. They said that they didn't know where to land on it, so they did a survey with their membership, and their membership came back with: one-third did not want to do anything – they wanted status quo – one-third wanted to stop the clock changing and wanted to go to Mountain Standard Time, and one-third wanted to go to Central Standard Time. I think that was very much reflected in the submissions en masse.

What did surprise me was the depth and breadth of perspectives on each possibility within that spectrum. To me, it was quite an eye-opener, and I certainly hope that that responded to Member Dach's question in that it wasn't absolutely definite. It was one-third, one-third, and one-third.

Thank you.

Mr. Dach: Thank you. That very definitively answers my question. I appreciate it.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yeah. Thank you. As a member on the subcommittee that travelled throughout the province, one thing that we did have is a summary of our oral presentations that came forward to us. In the summary it is indicative of the total number of responses. We had 113 responses. Those that were in favour of Bill 203 were 33; those opposed, 69; and undecided, 9. So a little bit different than what we saw from our written submissions coming in from the public.

We had more information that was available for Albertans to respond to and to help them make a decision based off some of the impacts that were being identified to industry from the people that we had presenting to us at this committee. More information that becomes available, in my opinion, allows Albertans to make an informed decision on what direction they would like to see us take.

From the subcommittee point of view we saw that it was two-thirds essentially saying no and one-third saying yes, a little bit different.

10:10

The Chair: Member Carson.

Mr. Carson: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I guess my question is maybe for research services, or if somebody on the subcommittee would like to answer it, either is fine. I'm just wondering if there were any certain issues that were making people more in favour of

getting rid of the time change, whether it be health or economic, whatever it might be. Just looking for some feedback.

Dr. Amato: I think that the summary of our oral presentations shows that there's a division amongst a number of issues, and I don't think that there's anything very clear that comes up as a definitive answer for why the majority of people were essentially opposed to this bill in their oral presentations.

The Chair: Excellent.

I'll open it up if there's anyone on the phones who has any questions or comments.

Hearing none, are there any other questions or comments?

Ms Fitzpatrick: I'd just like to follow up. First of all, I attended all four of the sessions when the subcommittee went out, and certainly the perspective was a little bit different in each of the four places that we visited. The issue of change of time twice a year was talked about a lot as an inconvenience, but it was also talked about in terms of the disruption of one's life. Several people talked about medical concerns, being on medication and how that affected their lives. People talked about children in school being a bit unruly in the days following the time change.

One of the other things that I noted was that even when people talked about the bill and they talked about stopping the clock, there were lots of different perspectives on where it should go and lots of different reasons why it should go one way or another. Certainly, in the presentations we had from businesses before we went out and did the around-the-province consultation, there were people who talked about the economic impact one way or another. It was a really broad picture of the impact of a bill such as this.

I have to say that I really applaud MLA Dang for bringing it forward because if the number of people who went to his office was anything like the number who went to mine – it was certainly an issue that rose very quickly in my riding, and I'm really happy that he brought it forward because it brought us to a really in-depth conversation. During the consultation we were able to ask questions both for and against. I really appreciated being able to do that and to do that in each of the four meetings. I was really pleased with the response, the number of people who came, and certainly having almost 14,000 responses to the survey that was initially done really speaks to it being a hot-button issue in Alberta. I'm glad that I was part of this process to be able to come back here and to have this discussion today.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. Panda: Chair, can you put me on the speakers list, please?

The Chair: Yeah. I'll have you after Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yes. Thank you, Chair. One thing that needs to be noted is that in the public meetings there was a great deal of confusion. There were some people that came forward with concerns over confusion on the bill, the Alberta Standard Time Act, essentially an act to end daylight savings time. There were a number of presenters – I was in Grande Prairie and Edmonton and listened in for Calgary – who expressed concern over the confusion that was in the public. People were, yes, in favour of ending daylight saving time, not recognizing that it was not ending daylight saving time but that it was continuing daylight saving time ad infinitum.

If we do move forward with something, my recommendation would be that we have very clear communications with Albertans

to ensure that they get a full understanding of what is implicated by Alberta standard time.

The Chair: Mr. Panda.

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Yeah. I'm just concurring with what the vice-chair said. I actually sat in for him in Calgary. If you look at the oral presentation summary, in Calgary the yes response was 12 out of 45, 30 out of 45 said no, and three said undecided.

When Member Fitzpatrick says that people didn't say anything about economic impact, I don't think that's entirely correct, because I sat there. I was hearing from people. Many of them were confused, and some of them were really annoyed. You can see that in the *Hansard*. They said that the question was not clear to them, and many of them said: how come you didn't educate us on the economic impacts? Once all the businesspeople and other stakeholders started talking about business impacts, that was the result, that 30 out of 45 said no.

When the member keeps referring to thousands of people coming to her office or Mr. Dang's office and saying that we should get rid of daylight saving time, probably if they were informed about the economic impacts and social and other impacts, the result would have been different. Even if you consider them as the vast majority, looking at the 4.2 million population of Alberta, that 13,000 representation, which is very important – every single submission is important. But if you look at the big picture, they're – what? – .3 per cent or something. That's why I wanted to put it in context.

As members of this committee we have to present it in a way that people are informed, and we have to give them accurate information. Thank you.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. I have to speak up because there are two things that you just said that I had not said. I did not say that there was no economic impact, and I didn't say that thousands of people came to Mr. Dang's office. I said that people came to his office. He did an initial survey when he was doing his research for this bill, and he had close to 26,000 people respond within his constituency.

The third point I want to make is that even when people said yes or no, when asked a second question, "Would you agree with it if it went to one side or the other?" they did respond and said that, yes, they would if, and then they gave a response as to whether they'd go to Mountain Standard Time or Central Standard Time.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yes. Thank you, Chair. One thing that we haven't discussed also is that some of the presenters came forward with the concern of being out of sync with the rest of the country, the rest of the continent, and we did hear a couple of times, when I was present, where possibly this needs to be a national discussion to ensure that we do not necessarily move into being out of sync and facing potential consequences, economic and social impacts, that might occur by being out of sync. That was one of the things that we did hear at subcommittee level, that having a national discussion about this before we move ahead alone might be in the best interests of Albertans.

10:20

The Chair: Member Connolly.

Connolly: Yeah. It seems that we're just going in circles right now. Do you think we could just move to deliberations and

recommendations? It feels like everyone is moving towards the same page. I think that might work.

The Chair: I'll just make sure that there aren't any other questions for research services. Those on the phone?

Mr. Coolahan: I just have one comment to make, Chair.

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

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you. Just on the economic impacts, I too was on the subcommittee and attended all four meetings. I just want to say on the economic impacts that we heard a lot of – nobody actually presented definitive economic impacts on this; it was all potential impacts. I know Mr. van Dijken kind of alluded to that, too, so I just wanted to put that out there.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: Yeah. I didn't sit as a member of the subcommittee, but I did get a chance to sit in on Friday in Lethbridge. I think we heard 20 people. That's the count I kept, and my count is that about 13 or 14, certainly over half – some people didn't quite clarify – were more than happy with the status quo.

Now, what I did notice – and I listened to the Calgary meetings. I didn't listen to them live – I listened to them later – and I didn't listen to every word. And I listened to Edmonton. Edmonton wasn't nearly as bad, but in Calgary and Lethbridge I heard both times people say that they weren't exactly aware that the meetings were going on. Now, look, I'm not throwing rocks here. I'm just saying that this is something to consider next time we do something like this. I don't know how many people came up and said: well, I didn't even know this meeting was on. Somebody from Calgary said: well, I just heard it on the radio, so I drove over here. You know, not a big deal, but, I mean, 113 people in four cities isn't a lot, and maybe that shows more about what people are thinking about as far as changing time is concerned. But I think we probably all expected to see a few more people than that at the meetings in these four cities. That's just one observation of mine.

It became clear, listening to all those people speak, that they weren't exactly clear on what the bill meant and on what the implications would be. Just another observation.

As I said in Lethbridge, I did put this questionnaire up on my website when the bill was first introduced, and I think 255 people responded. Now, of course, you can't tell where those people came from in the world. It was linked to my Facebook page, so I assume that's how they got there. At any rate, about 75 per cent were in favour of the status quo.

Well, those are the observations I had, with what little I had to do with the subcommittee. I did try and keep abreast of what was going on throughout the rest of the province, and those were my observations from Lethbridge, anyway.

Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you.

Any other members wishing to comment, ask questions? Those on the phone?

Seeing and hearing none, we'll move on to the next item on the agenda, deliberations and recommendations.

Before I move forward, my apologies procedurally. Is there a consensus on the report as being accurate and to receive the report? It's the first time we've received a report at this speed, so thank you to research services, who did a lot of work over the weekend to make sure that we had this on time.

All right. Hon. members, we have arrived at the time in our process where we need to discuss our findings and agree on the recommendations for Bill 203. Just to refresh our memories, on April 3, 2017, the Legislative Assembly referred Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future in accordance with Standing Order 74.2. Standing Order 74.2(1) states:

When a Bill is referred to a standing or special committee after first reading, the committee may conduct public hearings on the subject matter of the Bill and report its observations, opinions and recommendations with respect to the Bill to the Assembly.

Subsection (2) further states:

Upon the concurrence of a committee report that a Bill be proceeded with, the Bill shall be placed on the Order Paper for second reading.

Before I open the floor for discussions, I'd ask Mr. Koenig to give us a quick reminder of the status of this bill and what it means for the scope of the review. Mr. Koenig.

Mr. Koenig: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll just provide some brief comments for the committee to go forward. Bill 203 received first reading on March 14 of this year, and as the chair has mentioned, the bill was then referred to this committee on April 3. That was before it received second reading, and under Standing Order 74.2, when bills are referred prior to second reading, there are essentially two options for the committee. The committee can recommend that the bill proceed, that it go back on the Order Paper where it left off, or that it not proceed. If the Assembly concurs in a recommendation to proceed, it would go back to debate. I believe there were 57 minutes remaining. That would be finished, and then it would go for a vote at second reading. If the committee recommends that it not proceed and that's concurred in by the Assembly, then it drops off the Order Paper, and it moves no further along in the process.

I'll also mention as well that the committee, in addition to recommending whether the bill proceed or not proceed, can provide any observations, opinions, or recommendations. Just keep in mind that because the bill hasn't received second reading yet, this is quite general in scope. It would not be at the level of commenting on the text of the bill or recommending amendments. It would be more generalized in nature. If there are more general observations, the committee could make those at this time.

If there are any questions from members, I'm happy to answer them.

The Chair: Any questions?

Seeing and hearing none, Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think, considering how many Albertans have responded to this bill, we can certainly say that it struck a nerve with many, many people. As I understand, over 30,000 Albertans have engaged with the government at some level to provide their input and their feedback on this bill. MLA Dang has certainly struck a nerve with Albertans with this private member's bill, and he's done a good job. He did a lot of engagement prior to the bill hitting the floor. It's because of his good work that the bill has ended up with our committee here, so I really want to commend him. It's not often that private members are able to introduce legislation, and, yeah, he did a great job with this.

We ended up hearing from lots of people – private citizens and business interests – and I know that anyone with small children certainly has some skin in this game. The time change is really disruptive to family rhythms and routines. Well, there's certainly a lot of aluminum foil that goes up on windows in order to try and make the change the least impactful possible. I understand from

MLA Fitzpatrick, too, in her feedback from the hearings that were in the different communities around Alberta, that the impact the time change has on individuals can be really quite extreme, depending on what their own circumstances are and their health status. It's certainly something we need to take into consideration.

The other thing that we heard very, very, very clearly from business interests is the possibility for negative impact from making a change to observing daylight savings time in isolation. We heard from stakeholders like WestJet and the Calgary and Edmonton international airports that their ability to be competitive could be quite severely compromised by Alberta making a change to observing daylight savings time in isolation, and that's certainly not something we want to see happen. We certainly don't want to see that happen at this time in our province's history, when the economy is front of mind for many, many people.

We heard from our NHL teams, and Alberta is certainly very fortunate to have two NHL teams. B.C. has one; Saskatchewan has none. We're doing really well, and that's not something that we want to compromise at all.

10:30

Through the latest round of hearings what we heard from tourism and skiing, from Banff specifically, is that changing the time zones would also impact their competitiveness. Tourism is certainly an important part of our province's economic diversification, and we don't want to do anything to compromise the competitiveness of our tourism industry. This is, after all, Alberta's Economic Future Committee, so I think that that consideration needs to be front of mind as we move forward. Alberta has often played a leading role in our country, and I think it's still appropriate for Alberta to take a leading role, and this is an issue that spans not just the country but the continent as well.

To that end, I'd like to move a motion that

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future recommend that Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, not proceed and that the government of Alberta engage other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States to develop a co-ordinated approach to eliminating the practice of observing daylight savings time.

The Chair: Sorry. If you can read off right after "not proceed."

Ms McPherson: Not proceed. I've just got to find my place.

The Chair: Underline the important part of that.

Ms McPherson: You might want to bold that part.

And that the government of Alberta engage other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States to develop a co-ordinated approach to eliminating the practice of observing daylight savings time.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Chair, moved by Member McPherson that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future recommend that Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, not proceed and that the government of Alberta engage other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States to develop a co-ordinated approach to eliminating the practice of observing daylight saving time.

The Chair: I will open up that motion for discussion. Member Connolly.

Connolly: Well, thank you very much, Chair. Like all of you, I've heard a lot about daylight savings time in the past few months and even before then. I remember that when we put out our first budget, in October 2015, I received more e-mails about the time change than I did about the budget. It's interesting to see that even in these

few months in my constituency, going out to events and talking to constituents, it was always top of mind. That was the only issue that they wanted to talk about because it affects everyone's daily lives, and it's really something that people seem to be very passionate about.

Even though many of my constituents believe that we should get rid of daylight savings time right away, it wouldn't be prudent to do so by ourselves. I very much agree with Member McPherson's statement and motion because we do have to work with the other jurisdictions in Canada. We've heard from many of our stakeholders that doing it unilaterally would not benefit Alberta the way we hope it would.

So I'm very much in favour of this motion, and I hope everyone on the committee supports it as well.

The Chair: Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: Yeah. I can safely say that if I got 10 e-mails regarding a daylight saving time change, that would maybe be stretching it. Of course, it's a different part of the world; it's an agricultural area, where people get up when it's time to go to work. Maybe it isn't as relevant, but it is a portion of the province, and it is a riding. I've got to be honest: we didn't hear a lot about time change at all one way or the other.

I wonder if it's appropriate to ask what the cost of the travelling to the four cities was before we move on.

The Chair: Do we have the finalized number yet?

You can bring that up in other business. We want to still keep this focused on the motion here.

Mr. Schneider: Sure. I'll make sure that I do that. Thank you.

Mr. Yao: I just want to say that I echo the sentiment of my fellow MLAs. This daylight savings time change that we do biannually is only slightly inconvenient for most of us. To change it to a system of not adapting to the season: this only will affect citizens that work outside the confines of our province, and those are businesses like our transportation hubs and our airlines. The one impact that is most concerning in this private member's bill is the economic impact, and that's one that's affected when we're not in sync with the rest of the continent. I commend the government side on this motion to push this bill down because it isn't the most efficient use of our government resources at this time.

Yeah, I'm very in support of this motion. Thank you.

The Chair: Any members on the phone?

Mr. Panda: Chair, can I speak?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Panda.

Mr. Panda: I would like to thank and compliment the members for, first, putting in this bill and for their reasonable approach in causing no further harm when the economy is already hurting. I really appreciate that because that's the will of Albertans. I mean, they mentioned to us that before we bring in any policies, we should do a thorough economic impact analysis and identify if there are any, you know, impacts to growing the economy and creating jobs.

I'm in support of where this member's motion is heading. My only concern is when you say that the Alberta government should engage other jurisdictions in Canada and North America to eliminate the daylight savings time. Just before jumping to that conclusion, maybe in that motion we may amend it to say: engage other jurisdictions in finding out the opportunities and challenges

of eliminating this daylight savings time. We just can't come to the conclusion that we have to eliminate it.

You know, after doing all of this exercise, we couldn't even find out: what's the exact economic impact, and what's the cost-benefit analysis? Making the same mistake again, asking the government to go out and engage other jurisdictions to eliminate this daylight savings time – I don't know if it is appropriate to come to the conclusion that we have to eliminate it. When we engage other jurisdictions, we have to find out the economic impacts, what the challenges are, and what the opportunities are. If the member is open to that amendment, I'll be happy to work with your team to propose that amendment.

Thank you.

The Chair: I just want to verify: are you opening this up as dialogue, or are you actually moving an amendment?

Mr. Panda: I'm just throwing an idea there, if the member is open to amend that motion.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you.

Mr. Panda: When we're trying to set things right, let's not make a mistake one more time.

The Chair: Okay. Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before I speak to that, to comment, I would like to make sure that we clarify that this is a private member's bill. This is not a government bill. This is not government business. It was referred by, I believe, a unanimous vote in the Legislature to this committee. I wouldn't want to mislead people that this is government business. It is not.

As far as amending the motion, what we understand is that there are a number of other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States that are considering the same thing that we're considering here, which is a move away from observing daylight savings time.

10:40

It is obvious that it has an impact on people's daily life. There are concerns about safety after the change in time. The impact on people needs to be taken into consideration. We don't want to discount what people have told us, but we also don't want to move in isolation without considering what the wider impact is across our economy. Because of that, it makes sense to engage with British Columbia or the Northwest Territories, California. These are some of the jurisdictions that we understand are considering similar moves. I believe it makes a lot of sense for Alberta to lead that conversation rather than just be in a reactive position.

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, I would echo the concerns of MLA Panda. When I first looked at the motion, the motion essentially is instructing the government to develop a co-ordinated approach with other jurisdictions. I want to thank the member for bringing forward the motion, but I think it's important that we recognize that we need to start the discussion about a co-ordinated approach to eliminating the practice as opposed to instructing the government to develop a co-ordinated approach.

I would suggest that we take a look at replacing the word "develop" with "discuss," if the member is willing to move in that direction, as a friendly amendment.

The Chair: Are you moving the amendment?

Mr. van Dijken: Sure. I'll move that amendment to remove the word "develop" and to input the word "discuss."

Mr. Coolahan: Mr. Chair, it's MLA Coolahan, when I have a chance.

The Chair: Yeah. I've got you on the list, Mr. Coolahan. Mr. Roth, if you can read it into the record for the sake of those on the phone.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Mr. van Dijken that the motion be amended by striking out the word "develop" and substituting "discuss."

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

Connolly: Well, I just think it's semantics. I have no problem with it. Yeah, I'd support the amendment, but I don't really see a big difference.

Mr. Yao: I, too, was going to move forward with an amendment. I was going to suggest removing "develop a co-ordinated approach" and say that it would be "discussing eliminating the practice of observing daylight savings time," but if this reaches the same conclusion, I'm fine with it. I think this is a good amendment.

Mr. Coolahan: Just before I make a statement, I don't have the advantage of visuals here. What was the word change?

The Chair: Striking out "develop" and substituting "discuss."

Mr. Coolahan: "Discuss." Okay. Yeah. I'm okay with that. I just want to make a point to Mr. Panda's point concerning economic – what did he say? – not development but impact assessment. That's what it was. I think this exercise in the discussion would actually facilitate that, and more jurisdictions would be able to determine that through this discussion. If we remember when WestJet gave their presentation, they actually said that if it was co-ordinated with B.C., they wouldn't have an issue. That's what this discussion is facilitating, a co-ordination of the time zones, and it therefore would be able to hash out any economic impacts that it might have.

Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent.
Member McPherson.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm happy to accept that amendment. I don't think that it makes a substantive change to the motion, and we still have the gist of it, so I'm happy to support that amendment.

The Chair: Excellent. Any other members wishing to speak to the amendment? On the phones?

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

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Mr. van Dijken that the motion be amended by striking out "develop" and substituting "discuss."

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

We're back on the main motion as amended.

Dr. Starke: Mr. Chair, if you'd put me on the speakers list, please.

The Chair: Yes. If you want to go ahead, Dr. Starke.

Dr. Starke: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not a member of this committee, so I'm merely an observer to the proceedings today, but I felt it was important that I offer some perspective given that I tabled a petition just before Christmas of last year with some 700 signatures from all across the province that called for an end to the practice of changing the times twice a year.

I think it's important to acknowledge here that, you know, for many people the time change is not an issue. It is something that they've grown used to and in some cases have dealt with their entire lives, and it doesn't create any problem for them. It happens one night in fall and one night in spring, and you lose an hour of sleep and you gain an hour of sleep, and there's nary a thought about it after that. But it's also important to note that for some people it is an issue, and it is an issue that they have brought to our attention. I personally was surprised at the number of people that signed this petition and how strongly they felt about it.

I want to also make it clear that, you know, this was not something that was simply just brought forward by people from Vermilion-Lloydminster owing to our geographic location next to the province of Saskatchewan, which doesn't change time twice a year; these signatures came from all across the province.

I think that the approach that is being recommended by Member McPherson makes a lot of sense in terms of that the main concern with regard to those reporting the negative economic impact was that Alberta would be proceeding somewhat in isolation. I think it's wrong to say that we'd be proceeding totally in isolation because it's ignoring the fact that the province of Saskatchewan doesn't change time and hasn't changed time ever. So, you know, I don't think it's entirely proceeding in isolation, but I do think there is a lot to be said for at least discussing with the province of British Columbia whether this is something that they would consider.

I will share with the committee that after I tabled the petition, I received an e-mail from a group in British Columbia that is pushing for a similar change to eliminating the change of daylight saving time. They've got over 27,000 signatures on the petition that they're circulating, so this is not something that is limited to Alberta. This is not something that only we as legislators have heard about. This is something that other legislators and other jurisdictions are hearing about as well.

The concern that is being expressed: I think it's wrong to discount it. I think it's important that we acknowledge it as being real but that we also acknowledge that if we are to go to a situation where our clocks don't change, it would be least impactful economically if it is done in a co-ordinated manner across a number of jurisdictions. Certainly, if British Columbia and the province of Alberta were to decide together at the same time that we were to eliminate the practice of daylight saving time, that would result in, you know, a significant western bloc of provinces that are doing that. There was mention made also of some of the western states. We have a number of different cross-jurisdictional organizations. We have Ports-to-Plains, we have PNWER, and we have the Council of State Governments, where we attend these conferences and we exchange with other legislators, and I think this very much should be a topic that, at the very least, we have a discussion on.

10:50

You know, I will say that in our constituency here we have heard the full range of responses from "Please eliminate this; this is a big problem for me personally, and I don't think it has any merit to carry it forward" to "Why are you wasting your time on this? There are bigger problems in Alberta." So I think we have to acknowledge that there is the full range.

I mean, the one thing about daylight saving time that, you know, I will say in deference to the people that brought in the petition to me and who have discussed this issue with me since that time is that it is an issue that strikes all of us twice a year, and not every other issue does.

I think the approach that is being recommended by this motion is one that is prudent and, I think, recognizes that proceeding on our own, you know, in a hasty manner would be ill advised, but at the same time I think it's important, really, that we acknowledge that there are Albertans that are concerned about this issue and that don't want to see us just sort of set this aside and forget about it. This motion clearly calls that we open the door to discussions with other legislators from other jurisdictions to see whether they, too, are hearing what we are hearing from some of our constituents and whether it would be prudent to work with them on some form of co-ordinated approach so that if daylight saving time, if that practice, is to be ceased, we do it in a manner where we do it together as opposed to piecemeal.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you, Dr. Starke.

Also, just as sort of a side commentary, I serve as the vice-president for PNWER, as you alluded to earlier, so I can present this report to the organization as well once the committee makes its mandate.

Member Connolly.

Connolly: Thank you very much. First of all, I want to start by saying that it's snowing outside. Isn't that horrifying?

Secondly, I very much agree with exactly what Dr. Starke was saying and subsequent to what Mr. Panda was saying in that we've heard from thousands of Albertans. I know in our daily lives, especially in Calgary in our ridings, which are right beside each other, I hear from people daily who want to get rid of daylight savings time. Yes, I think that the vast majority of people in North America, whether they be in the United States or Canada, want to get rid of daylight savings time. However, they are not aware of the economic impact that it will have.

So I think that this motion, which will approach other jurisdictions to talk to them about how to end daylight savings time, will not only be beneficial to Alberta but be beneficial to the vast majority of North America, who do want to end daylight savings time. The vast majority of people who said that they don't want to end daylight savings time only said that it doesn't really matter to them and that they don't really care. However, the majority of people – it was 75 per cent-ish – say that they want to end it, so I believe that we should be moving forward to end daylight savings time. However, that would mean that we have to talk to other jurisdictions. That's why I think that this motion is incredibly important and that we should move forward on it.

Ms McPherson: I'm just wondering: if we've had enough discussion, we could call the question.

The Chair: I'll just double-check. Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Schneider: Well, I'm not going to belabour anything. I want to move along with this, too, but I just want to question the previous speaker as to where the information comes from that the vast majority of North America wants to change the time.

Connolly: Every poll that I've seen has shown that the majority of people want to end time – I've spoken to many people across the country and across North America that say that the majority of people want to end daylight savings time. Personally, I know that

in our caucus and even across the way many people want to end daylight savings time. However, it's not prudent to do it on our own, unilaterally. Even on TV the other night – well, not the other night. It was, like, a year ago on *Last Week Tonight* that they were talking about how many people believe that we should end daylight savings time because, like Dr. Starke was saying, it does impact people twice a year and it does have an impact on children and especially on elderly folks. I was talking to many people in my constituency, many seniors who say that time change can take them about a month to really get into equilibrium. That really bothers them, especially with their medications and things like that.

From what I've heard and from what I understand, the vast majority of people in North America want to get rid of daylight savings time; however, we can't do it unilaterally. We have to do it altogether. And that's why, I think, there are about 27 states that already have a bill on the floor to get rid of daylight savings time. However, that's also a national thing, so they would have to do it federally as well. Really, looking into how we can do it here can help improve how to do it in the United States as well.

The Chair: Any other questions or comments on the motion?

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

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

the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future recommend that Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, not proceed and that the government of Alberta engage other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States to discuss a co-ordinated approach to eliminating the practice of observing daylight saving time.

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.

Hon. members, now direction for the report of the committee. Now that we have made a decision on a recommendation for Bill 203, we need to give research services the instruction they need to draft a report for our consideration.

Dr. Massolin, if you would like to give us an overview of this process, please.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd be pleased to. The committee has arrived, of course, as you've indicated, at the point at which it's ready to prepare a draft report, which it'll finally approve and that will be tabled in the Assembly, ultimately. Research services is available, of course, to draft the final report for the committee.

Now, just to give you a sense of what the report could contain, based on previous reviews of this nature – in other words, bills that have been referred to legislative policy committees prior to receiving second reading – there is a section called order of reference, which basically talks about referral of the bill to the committee, another section on committee activities, which will also include the public meetings that the subcommittee engaged in.

Finally, the most significant, I would submit, section is on the recommendations, which is basically the motion that the committee just passed. We can put out that committee report – I'm looking at Sarah – fairly expeditiously, and pending the committee's approval, that could go forward as an intersessional deposit.

Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent.

MLA Fitzpatrick.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay. I'm going to begin by saying thank you very much, Dr. Starke, for your comments because it kind of leads into what I really need to say. When I took on the work of this committee, I had to look at things with an economic lens. But in Grande Prairie I would say that that economic lens kind of got knocked a little bit when a woman came to the mike in a wheelchair. She has MS and caregivers who come to her home. She has to take medication at a specific time every day, and for her the two times a year when the clocks change, her life is impacted physically and psychologically. Her comments certainly affected me.

We certainly have to take into account the economics of doing this, but I absolutely have to take into account what she said. She's an Albertan, and she's affected by the change in time. I have to say that I can still hear her comments and the emotion that was in those comments. For her, it takes a month on either side of the time change, and that month she is incredibly affected by it. But you know something? She's not the only Albertan that's affected in that way.

11:00

Certainly, a number of people who've come to my office, not just from my constituency but some of the surrounding constituencies, talked about that difference and the difficulty that they have when the time changes. Certainly, some people came and talked about inconvenience, but it's those Albertans who came and talked about how something impacts them so incredibly that I have to consider. We've heard it time and time again. We also heard from teachers about how kids are unruly for the first few days after the time changes both times during the year.

If I may, I'd like to provide some feedback on what's captured in the report in terms of some direction to the committee and to our report. I'd like to make a motion for us to consider, that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future acknowledges that roughly 75 per cent of the submissions en masse to the committee were in support of abolishing daylight savings time and identified that it has a negative effect on their physical and mental well-being, their children, families, productivity at home, at work, at school, and the safety on roads.

I don't know if you got all that.

The Chair: I'll note that, from a traditional standpoint, just kind of consulting with Parliamentary Counsel, it's not typical for us to include things like this in the report. However, it's not out of order to direct them to do so.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Okay.

The Chair: Dr. Massolin.

Dr. Massolin: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Perhaps we can seek some clarification on the nature of the motion and its intent. I believe, if I understand the intent correctly from Ms Fitzpatrick, the intention here is to indicate this in the report as opposed to having the committee acknowledge something or another. I think the language in the motion should reflect that the report include or contain such a statement. If that revision could happen before any further steps are taken. We can help with the language on that if that's the true intent of this.

Ms Fitzpatrick: It is.

The Chair: Before I open it up for dialogue, I'll just allow us to finish up the wordsmithing so we have the accurate motion on the floor.

MLA Fitzpatrick, does this reflect your intent?

Ms Fitzpatrick: I do want "en masse" in there.

The Chair: You can read that into the record for those on the phone, Mr. Roth.

Mr. Roth: Sure, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future direct research services to include in its report regarding the committee's review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, that approximately 75 per cent of the submissions en masse to the committee were in support of abolishing the observance of daylight saving time and identified that it has a negative effect on their physical and mental well-being, their children, families, productivity at home, at work, at school, and safety on roads.

The Chair: All right. I'll open up the motion for discussion. Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I will be voting against this motion. I believe it doesn't even accurately reflect the research that has been done and the responses that we have received. The responses talk about, you know, where we have people in favour of changing the status quo of observing daylight saving time, but many of them would prefer to stay on the status quo if they were not able to receive the time zone that would work for them.

You know, Member Fitzpatrick brings up the lady in Grande Prairie with the medical condition that required that she would be better served by staying on a single time year-round. But I also reflect on the member of the public that we had from Edmonton that talked about how it was critical for her that the proper time zone be chosen because she was a person that was only allowed to drive during the daylight hours and that Bill 203 would not work for her in that she would not be able to drive until later on in the morning in the winter.

This motion is part of the confusion that we have in Alberta today, where Bill 203 was not about abolishing the observance of daylight saving time; Bill 203 was about ensuring that daylight saving time went on ad infinitum in Alberta. We are in the Mountain Standard Time zone.

11:10

Some of the people, of the 75 per cent – and I'm not sure that that's an accurate percentage number – reflected on negative consequences to their physical and mental well-being, their children, families, but not all 75 per cent reflected on that. It is inaccurate to make that kind of a statement, that 75 per cent of the respondents were reflecting on these as the negative impacts that daylight saving time is having on them.

There's a lot of work that needs to be done to make a motion like this be reflective of the research and the responses that we have received. I believe that the report will tell the story in and of itself and that this type of a statement is not necessary in our report going forward. I would suggest that this type of a statement in our report going forward would diminish the accuracy of the report and call the report into question.

Thank you.

Mr. Yao: I believe that this motion by Member Fitzpatrick just is unnecessary, and it doesn't reflect the opinions of everyone. I didn't have a chance to look at submissions because I was not on this subcommittee, but I question this statement.

I guess that if this government, the government side, were truly concerned about the negative effects of time changes on the physical and mental well-being of children, families, productivity at home, and whatnot of our citizens, they would take a look at the larger workforce and look at the number of people who are working

more than two nights in a row. Now, at first you might think that that's nothing, but you have to recognize that we have a large workforce right across this province that's working extended hours, extended shifts on nights, which greatly, dramatically affects their cycles and affects their productivity. It has been well studied even as far back as 20, 30, 40 years ago. I myself was part of a profession that indicated that anything longer than two nights a week was detrimental to people.

So if this government side was truly concerned about the effects of time and sleeping on families and children and whatnot, you should look at our workforce and identify that, because you'll find that this large workforce is a commuting workforce, and they are working extended night cycles in order to enable that commuting. If you truly want to affect something like that, affect families, you should take a closer look at our commuting workforce.

Thank you.

The Chair: Member Connolly.

Connolly: Thank you very much, Chair. I have to admit that it isn't 75 per cent. Out of the 13,562 submissions that we received from the August 2017 summary report, 10,090 were in support, so that's actually 74.3990562 per cent. So I apologize to Mr. van Dijken. And then there were also 201 that had no opinion, so that would be about 1 per cent.

However, I do think that this motion does report on what we received and what we all, actually, agreed to. We all voted on it unanimously at the August 2017 – I think it was August 9 – meeting, when we agreed on the report.

An Hon. Member: August 8.

Connolly: August 8. I apologize.

That's what was in the report, so I will support this motion.

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yeah. Thank you. The number is close to 75 per cent, but the inference by the motion is that the 75 per cent identified these qualifications for removal of observance of daylight saving time, which I do not believe is accurate. I do not believe that 75 per cent of the submissions that we received identified these negative impacts on them as individuals, so in my estimation the statement is inaccurate, and by including this in the report, the report is inaccurate.

Thank you.

Mr. Schneider: Mr. van Dijken took a lot of my thunder. Anyway, I would have to agree that I didn't see 75 per cent of the responses identifying a negative impact. Now, this motion sounds vague. It's a little bit nuanced, it sounds like. The wording is not precise and it almost leads to confusion, so I'm afraid I'm not going to support it the way it's written either. I just don't believe it tells it the way it is.

Connolly: What if we add the words "but not limited to"? So "75 per cent of the submissions en masse to the committee were in support of abolishing the observance of daylight savings time and identified that it has a negative impact on the physical and mental well-being . . ."

Ms McPherson: . . . a negative impact, not limited to . . .

Connolly: Yeah: "has a negative effect, not limited to . . ." I guess we'd take out "on."

The Chair: Are you moving an amendment?

Connolly: Yeah. So "has a negative effect on, but not limited to, their physical and mental well-being," et cetera, et cetera.

The Chair: Sorry. Member Connolly, the words you wanted to add were "not limited to"?

Connolly: Yeah. So it wouldn't be striking anything out. It would be adding: ", not limited to," after "on" and prior to "their." It's actually ", but not limited to,." I think you have to leave "on" in.

The Chair: Does that match your intent?

Connolly: I think we still need "on." I don't think we need to strike out "on." And I would add: ", but not limited to," after "on."

The Chair: Member Connolly, does that match your intent?

Connolly: I believe so.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Roth, can you read the amendment and then the motion, if it were amended, for those on the phone.

11:20

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. The amendment I have reads: moved by Member Connolly that the motion be amended by adding ", but not limited to," after the word "on." The motion, if it were to be amended, would read: moved by MLA Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future direct research services to include in its report regarding the committee's review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, that approximately 75 per cent of the submissions en masse to the committee were in support of abolishing the observance of daylight saving time and identified that it has a negative effect on, but not limited to, their physical and mental well-being, their children, families, productivity at home, at work, at school, and safety on the roads.

The Chair: Excellent.

I'll open up that motion for discussion. MLA van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Chair. I believe that no matter how much massaging we do on this motion, it will not be clear to Albertans as to the intent of this statement in the report of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future. Seventy-five per cent of the written submissions before public consultation took place, oral consultation here in this room, and public consultation by the subcommittee in travelling in Alberta possibly might be somewhat accurate, but at the end of the day after we took oral presentations here and when we went on the road, we saw that there were many individuals that had a change of heart. The more Albertans saw the implications of Bill 203, the more they recognized that just abolishing daylight savings time was not going to be satisfactory for them.

You know, I again reiterate that, sure, we can add the words "but not limited to." It's still not accurate. In my opinion, the statement is still not accurate, so then we have to massage it even more, where we massage: approximately 75 per cent of the written submissions. Then we've got to massage it a little more to make it accurate: well, 75 per cent of the written submissions before oral presentations. Where does it end? To me, the report will encompass the work that's been done by the committee, and by adding this statement into the report – we're directing our staff to add this statement in – I believe it's not going to give an accurate reflection on what the report has included inside of it.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Schneider: I'll just reiterate what I said before. I don't believe the motion is accurate, to be perfectly honest. I think we understand that around 75 per cent of the submissions were in favour of abolishing daylight saving time. I don't believe that 75 per cent of the submissions actually went into the detail of the negative effects and physical well-being of their children and families and such and such. Now, if I can be proven wrong, I'd be more than happy to retract my statement, but I don't think we have captured the facts in this motion, and I can't support it the way it is.

The Chair: Any members on the phone?

Mr. Panda: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Would you give me an opportunity to speak?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Panda. Also, just as a reminder, this is about the amendment specifically.

Mr. Panda: Yeah. I'm also speaking to this amendment. First of all, I think the motion itself is not necessary, and then this amendment, although we're trying to clarify, might help a little bit, but it's not giving the full picture. It's confusing, and amending the wording of the original motion itself, in my opinion, is unnecessary. With this amendment we're causing additional confusion. Frankly, in my opinion, this is negating the spirit of the first motion we approved from Member McPherson. By doing this new motion and its amendments and subsequent massaging, it's unnecessarily confusing people, and it's negating the spirit of the previously approved motion. I don't know what purpose it's going to serve.

Let's move on with this by putting it to the question.

The Chair: Excellent.

Any other members wishing to speak to the amendment?

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

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Connolly that the motion be amended by adding "but not limited to," after "on."

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 motion as amended.

Mr. Dach: I just wanted to say, Chair and to all committee members, that the intent of this motion really is to ensure that the large volume of Albertans' opinions was captured in the report, and that is to say that the majority, by far, of Albertans spoke very clearly to say that they did not want to continue changing the clocks twice a year. We wanted to respect that and acknowledge that we heard that loud and clear, notwithstanding the fact that there are other elements to the deliberations that we have to consider; that is, the stakeholders, who brought to bear the question of the economic impact that it may have on them.

It's a matter of respecting the large volume of opinions from Albertans, which we wanted to particularly ensure was shown in the report. There was such a huge response by Albertans on this issue, and we wanted to make sure that they weren't discounted, that we did indeed hear them as a committee, and that we took their large volume of concerns into consideration while we deliberated to make the motion to proceed only when other jurisdictions go

ahead. This amended motion, I think, reinforces the sincere wish to make sure that Albertans know that we heard them loud and clear.

The Chair: Mr. van Dijken.

Mr. van Dijken: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. It's not a large number. We've got 75 per cent of 0.3 per cent of the population that responded in written submissions prior to being fully informed on the implications of moving in the direction of Bill 203. In my estimation of things it is not a large number when we have 13,000 responses out of over 4 million people. We have 0.3 per cent of the population giving their opinion before they're fully informed, before we had actually received information on the consequences of Bill 203. In my opinion, we have no need to water down a report to somehow make the 75 per cent of the 13,000 people feel good that we heard them.

The report will be what the report is, and to put in a statement like this in the report, to me, reflects poorly on this committee and the work that is actually being presented in the report. I want to be on record that I do not support this type of a statement in a report that is being professionally put together for this committee based on the actual responses in the written and oral submissions that we received. We are going to continue the discussion, and we will continue to have reflection on the consequences, both here and throughout the country, with further discussion with other jurisdictions. I want this report to be completely accurate and not to be misleading with a statement such as this showing up in the report that, really, in my opinion, adds nothing to the report.

Thank you.

11:30

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

Having heard none, I'll call the question on the motion as amended. Mr. Roth, if you can read it in for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by MLA Fitzpatrick that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future direct research services to include in its report regarding the committee's review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, that approximately 75 per cent of the submissions en masse to the committee were in support of abolishing the observance of daylight saving time and identified that it has a negative effect on, but not limited to, their physical and mental well-being, their children, families, productivity at home, at work, at school, and the safety on the roads.

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

Mr. van Dijken: Make it a recorded vote.

The Chair: That motion is carried.

We have a request for a recorded vote. Before you state your position, say your name for the record.

Mr. van Dijken: MLA Glenn van Dijken. Opposed.

Mr. Schneider: MLA Dave Schneider. Opposed.

Mr. Yao: Yao. Opposed.

Ms McPherson: Karen McPherson. For.

Connolly: Michael Connolly. For.

Mr. Carson: Jon Carson. For.

Ms Fitzpatrick: Maria Fitzpatrick. For.

Mr. Dach: Lorne Dach. In favour.

Mr. Panda: MLA Panda. Opposed.

Mr. Coolahan: For.

Mrs. Schreiner: For.

Mr. Gill: Prab Gill. Opposed.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Chair, the total for the motion, seven; the total against, five.

The Chair: Excellent. That motion is carried.

I will open it back up for discussion on the direction for the report of the committee. Are there any other questions on providing direction for the reporting? Mr. Dach.

Mr. Dach: Yeah. I'd just like to probably make a few comments here in saying that, as I'd mentioned earlier, we definitely heard loud and clear from Albertans that they don't want to change their clocks twice a year. There was some question as to which direction they wanted to go with respect to which time zone they wanted to land on. We also did hear from major stakeholders in the province. We did so by following a process which was very, very thorough. We had a private member bring forward a bill, which he did a lot of work on to get to the floor. Then the bill was referred to this committee, and this committee did what a committee is supposed to do, have thorough deliberations.

We heard clearly from Albertans and stakeholders, and they responded with what they felt was their interest in mind. What we heard from the stakeholders, notwithstanding the just loud and clear voice of Albertans that they didn't want to change their clocks twice a year, was that we needed to wait and synchronize our efforts with other jurisdictions, to move in concert and act together with other jurisdictions in moving forward on daylight saving time. I think it's important that Alberta lead the discussion now that we've come this close to making a decision.

As was noted earlier, there are a multitude of bilateral organizations in Alberta that we belong to internationally, particularly in conjunction with other U.S. states. Those discussions will take place over the ensuing months, and it appears as though in the next few months there will be other jurisdictions in North America which may make the decision to move ahead to eliminate changing the clocks twice a year.

I think it's good common sense that we do follow the motion that we've passed and wait until other jurisdictions are prepared, as we are, to move on the direction of our citizenry and no longer change the clocks twice a year.

I think that direction was loud and clear. The process has been very thorough. Mr. Dang has done an incredible job bringing forward a motion that initially his constituents told him about. He investigated more widely and found that it was important to all Albertans. This committee received the referral of the private member's bill for our deliberation. We've deliberated very thoroughly, and we've heard clearly and responded to that, and I think the report will reflect that thorough process.

Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you.

Any other questions or comments?

Hearing and seeing none, before we move on – oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Mr. Coolahan: I just have a quick comment, Mr. Chair, if it's all right.

The Chair: Yeah.

Mr. Coolahan: Just quickly, to build on what Mr. Dach was saying, you know, in spite of the gruelling schedule for that subcommittee I do want to thank Mr. Dang for bringing forward this private member's bill on behalf of his constituents and all Albertans. As Mr. Dach said, it's clear that there was a huge interest in this topic. Whether or not it was understood by everyone is still up for a little bit of debate, but there was clearly a lot of interest in this topic. We saw it in the submissions. We saw it in the presentations. Dr. Starke noted that he tabled a petition around this. I wanted to note, too, that there was also a petition brought forward in March 2015, which I believe had about 2,700 signatures on it. So this is something that's been around for a long time. It continues to capture the attention of Albertans, and it was, I think, a very thoughtful private member's bill.

As we know, if you've been lucky enough to present a private member's bill, a lot of your ideas come right in your front door, and this one really came into Mr. Dang's front door. He heard it loud and clear. I think he did the right thing as a private member to bring this forward, and I think the result that he's getting from this committee right now is also the right thing to do.

I just wanted to put that on the record. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments?

Before we move forward with a report from research services, we need a member to move a motion for the reporting. Member Connolly.

We have one drafted here. Mr. Roth, if you want to read that for the record, and then I can allow members to discuss.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Connolly that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future direct research services to prepare a report regarding its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, in accordance with the committee's recommendations and authorize the chair and deputy chair to approve the committee's final report to the Legislative Assembly on or before September 29, 2017.

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

Mr. van Dijken: Considering the motion that we just approved previous to this, I have some difficulty in fully supporting the motion that's put before us, reflecting on concerns that a statement in that report is possibly going to add confusion and is possibly not going to present the information in the report accurately. If I could see the wording of the motion, it might help me to make a decision whether or not I can proceed in favour of this motion.

I think what I would propose here is an amendment to remove the deputy chair from approving the final report. I'll move that amendment.

11:40

The Chair: Okay. Striking out "deputy chair."

Mr. van Dijken: "And deputy chair."

The Chair: Sorry. "And deputy chair."

Mr. van Dijken: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. I'll open up the amendment for discussion. On the phones?

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

Mr. Roth, if you want to read in the amendment for the record for those on the phone.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Mr. van Dijken that the motion be amended by striking out "and deputy chair."

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

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

Seeing and hearing none, I'll call the question on the motion as amended. Mr. Roth, if you can read that in for the record.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Mr. Chair. Moved by Member Connolly that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future direct research services to prepare a report regarding its review of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, in accordance with the committee's recommendation and authorize the chair to approve the committee's final report to the Legislative Assembly on or before September 29, 2017.

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

Before we move on to other business, I'm sure I speak for a lot of our members here when I thank research services and Leg. services for all the work that they've done in the past few months to really expedite this process and make sure that we have all the information that we need moving forward.

I'm going to move on to other business. Mr. Schneider, you had some questions in relation to costs.

Mr. Schneider: Yeah. I would just like to acknowledge that, you know, the committee formed a subcommittee, and we travelled around Alberta to receive some information. I think that it's fair that

Parliamentary Counsel, as soon as they can, provide an updated report as to what the costs were for that. What do I call that? I'm just not sure what the words would be.

The Chair: Yeah. On the subcommittee's work.

Mr. Schneider: Yeah. Sure.

The Chair: Mr. Roth could provide you with an estimate just because we don't have the finalized costs as of yet.

Mr. Schneider: Sure. I can wait for the finalized if you want, or if you want to provide an estimate, that's fine. Can we get both, an estimate and a final?

The Chair: You can get both.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This isn't a final figure because a lot of the pieces haven't come in yet. Looking at for the four public meetings – this includes advertising; travel; venue costs; Ciné Audio, who is required to do the audio and also to assist with the *Hansard* transcription – approximately \$60,000.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you. So Parliamentary Counsel will provide a final report to the committee when that's available, Mr. Chair?

Mr. Roth: The committee clerk, yeah.

Mr. Schneider: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Excellent. Is there any other business that members wish to bring forward?

Seeing and hearing none, the next meeting of the committee will be called at the chair's discretion. Thank you, all, for your work.

Would a member like to move a motion to adjourn? Moved by Member McPherson that the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future adjourn. All those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed, please say no. On the phones? Excellent. That motion is carried. The meeting now stands adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 11:44 a.m.]

