

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Title: **Monday, March 15, 2004**

**8:00 p.m.**

Date: 2004/03/15

[The Speaker in the chair]

head: **Motions Other than Government Motions**

### Special Constables

503. Rev. Abbott moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to introduce legislation which would make special constables accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board and require special constables to take enhanced weapons training thereby creating the appropriate conditions under which the province could consider allowing the option of arming special constables with better defensive weapons such as Tasers.

Mr. Magnus moved that the motion be amended by (a) striking out “make special constables accountable” and substituting “provide the option of making special constables accountable” and (b) by striking out “enhanced weapons training” and substituting “enhanced training” and (c) by striking out “thereby creating the appropriate conditions under which the province could consider allowing the option of arming special constables with better defensive weapons such as Tasers.”

[Debate adjourned March 8: Mr. Cenaiko speaking]

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-*Buffalo*.

**Mr. Cenaiko:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The current special constable requirements need to be altered to recognize the difference between those involved in supplemental policing and those performing specialized duties.

The policing review committee saw a way to improve service levels throughout Alberta by creating deputy constables. The committee proposed legislation to create a supplemental level of policing that would be part of the local police service. These officers would perform specialized duties such as traffic enforcement, responding to low-priority calls, delivering prevention programs, or acting as school liaison officers. These officers would also have to meet provincial recruiting and training standards. Establishing a second tier of law enforcement would be very helpful in rural Alberta, where the population is small and spread over a large geographic area.

The concept of deputy constables supports the changes proposed in Motion 503. A two-tiered police service will improve the response times to provincial and local priorities. The growth of organized crime, drug production, and drug trafficking are major concerns for police services in all areas of Alberta. Creating a responsible and accountable supplemental level of policing will help police officers effectively tackle larger crime issues. I think these new positions would also be effective as a developmental program for future police officers.

The role of the special constable will change if recommendations from the policing review are implemented. Currently special constables fulfill their duties and do an incredible job assisting Alberta's broad law enforcement initiatives. In the future some of these special constables may be elevated to the new position of deputy constable.

The second part of the amendment to Motion 503 asks the

government to require special constables to take enhanced training. As the responsibilities of this second tier of policing expand and evolve, the minimum requirements may change for the deputies with more responsibilities. Motion 503 would not hand over the use of lethal force to special constables without any strings attached. The Solicitor General may decide that a policing diploma from Grant MacEwan or Mount Royal College may be a minimum requirement.

The second statement in the amendments to Motion 503 regarding enhanced training for special constables will generate the most controversy, but it should be noted that the amendment takes out any mention of weapons. As a former police officer I'm fully aware of the consequences of discharging a lethal weapon. Police officers are trained at length during the recruit phase and qualify three times a year for their entire career in law enforcement. I believe that this philosophy can also be taught to deputy constables before they are armed with lethal force.

Their responsibilities will most likely increase, and their importance to law enforcement initiatives will be more prominent. I support the idea of equipping constables with better defensive weapons, but I do not think we should do this overnight.

Some may argue that the original wording for Motion 503 would needlessly arm special constables with a potentially fatal prohibited weapon; this would give too much power to untrained personnel. As other speakers have pointed out, special constables are already equipped with nightsticks and pepper spray. These weapons can cause severe or permanent injury. It's also been pointed out that special constables aren't even supposed to be in situations that would require the use of a restricted weapon.

In fact, I believe the amended wording for Motion 503 is consistent with the future of policing in Alberta. The face of policing in Alberta is changing. Recommendations from the policing review give more prominence to special or deputy constables.

Financing in law enforcement is also changing. A new funding formula for policing between the Alberta government and the municipalities was referred to in the 2004 Speech from the Throne. If funding for policing becomes a provincial responsibility, then introducing legislation making special constables accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board would also seem to be a reasonable amendment to the Police Act.

Mr. Speaker, the public's expectations for law enforcement have increased. The government should seriously consider new initiatives and alternatives to raise the level of service and enforcement to meet these expectations. Making special constables accountable to the government would be the first step. The next step would be deciding which special constables or deputy constables would require additional tools.

I agree that special constables should avoid dangerous situations. This may be easier said than done in some circumstances. For example, what are special constables who stumble upon poachers supposed to do? According to the Solicitor General's department they are supposed to tactically reposition. In other words, they are supposed to leave the area as fast as possible and contact the local police service.

In this case, these criminals are armed and likely in a remote location, and I find it hard to imagine how special constables are supposed to tactically reposition themselves when they're in the middle of nowhere and in very real danger. In these circumstances enhanced training would be required. This enhanced training may allow constables to arm themselves with better defensive weapons. Sometimes the mere presence of a weapon can be enough to avoid confrontation.

The amended wording considered in Motion 503 points out that officers would have to complete enhanced training and under the

Police Act would be accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board rather than their employer.

As the face of policing evolves, the new level of law enforcement will require additional training and stronger educational requirements. As I mentioned earlier, deputy constables could be responsible for enforcing traffic laws and low-priority calls. These situations could be very dangerous for any police officer.

This amended motion, Mr. Speaker, is a reasonable consideration for the Alberta government as we reform law enforcement in Alberta. I believe that the proposed amendment fits better with the Alberta government's vision for the future of policing, and I encourage all members to vote in favour of Motion 503.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre. We are on an amendment, hon. members.

**Ms Blakeman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think context is really important when we examine proposals that are brought before this Assembly. In fact, I was going to refrain from commenting on the motion that's been proposed, but the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo raised an issue that reminded me how important context is because he referred to the MLA policing review committee. That's the context that I think is missing from the discussion which I as a member of the Assembly think I need in order to understand where the member's proposal would fit and, in fact, the amended proposal would fit.

Two very different things have come before us in connection with this Motion 503: the original motion, which had three parts to it, including arming special constables with Tasers, and then the amended motion, which has removed the part about Tasers and retained the part about accountability to the Law Enforcement Review Board and enhanced training.

What we're missing here is the final response from the government on the recommendations from the MLA policing review. Originally that report was produced by the committee in July of '02. By October of '02 we had a response from the government that they were considering some things and sending the rest back out into the community for an additional feedback loop, and that's the last we ever heard of it.

So I don't have any idea, and I'm listening carefully to the member, who I believe was a member of that policing review, and I'm thinking: am I getting dropped hints here? Is there something that I am supposed to be gleaning from what the member is saying that's in context or not in context? I really don't know, Mr. Speaker, because we don't have that final report and the government's final response to it before us in which to consider this recommendation.

That's not the only part that's missing from this discussion. The other part is the police staffing levels and the implementation plan for that. Now, that's something that's been asked for by the Auditor General, and he's made it very clear that, you know, he can't sort of pass any kind of comment on value for money around policing in Alberta because we don't have any idea. Well, he said, actually: we have no idea whether we're safe in Alberta right now because that plan is still not forthcoming from the Solicitor General.

It's not that I haven't tried, Mr. Speaker. I've tried a number of times to ask the Solicitor General to provide not only the final response to the MLA policing review and the police staffing levels and the implementation plan but, in fact, the corrections review that was done and, finally, the report that was done on the victims fund. So very difficult to comment on the motion that's before us while we're missing that information.

**8:10**

In response to my most recent set of questions to the Solicitor General, we were told to hold tight; the budget's coming, and somehow that would answer all questions. Well, I hope that's coming with the tabling of those four reports or studies because without those I don't know how we can be discussing this motion here tonight. It's completely without context. It's not tied to anything. We can't tell whether we've got more policing, less policing, who's funding it, who's not funding it. It's just floating out there in space and it's to my mind not a terribly useful exercise without understanding where it might be fitting inside of some plan, which we have yet to get from the Solicitor General.

Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

**Mr. Lord:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to rise and contribute to the discussion regarding Motion 503 and the amendment that's currently before us.

Now, in the original motion my colleague the Member for Drayton Valley-Calmar proposed that two courses of action be taken. The first suggestion was to make special constables accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board, and secondly, special constables would be required to take advanced training. This training would better equip special constables to carry out their duties.

I am prepared to fully support the general direction of the hon. member's motion provided that this amendment passes tonight. I do feel that special constables should be made accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board. Special constables are being given a greater level of enforcement powers, and this should be balanced with greater responsibility to a governing body. I think this idea holds great merit, in fact, and that it should be investigated further.

So if this motion passes in its proposed amended form, I would then be able to support the second part of the motion as well. In the original wording I had reservations regarding the second goal of the motion as I am very reluctant to consider arming any person other than a police officer with a weapon capable of delivering a lethal charge. I'd like to take this opportunity to outline the reasons that I feel that only police officers should be armed with weapons such as Tasers.

Now, a Taser is often regarded as a nonlethal weapon; however, that's not always the case. These weapons are capable not only of temporarily incapacitating an individual but also of delivering a lethal charge. In certain cases Tasers can be lethal weapons, and I feel that this Assembly should be aware of that and be wary of arming any person who is not a member of a police force with a lethal weapon.

Mr. Speaker, special constables provide an invaluable service for a variety of employers, including municipal governments, police services, and the SPCA. They are charged with the enforcement of city bylaws, patrolling our provincial parks, and recently the Solicitor General has granted special constables a greater level of authority to enforce traffic laws in certain circumstances and situations. The functions that special constables perform serve to alleviate the burden of enforcement that is felt by regular police forces and do it in a far more cost-effective manner.

It is more cost-effective for several reasons, but one of the major ones is that the duration and therefore the expense of training for a special constable is actually quite a bit shorter than for a normal police officer. Special constables receive one month of training at the Alberta Justice Staff College as opposed to a five- or six-month training course that regular police officers are subjected to. This

level of training gives special constables the knowledge necessary to perform their specific duties.

The enforcement provided by special constables allows organizations such as municipal police forces and the RCMP to put greater focus on areas of major crime such as drug trafficking and theft. While special constables do perform certain tasks that regular police officers perform, it is important to note that special constables are not police officers, and this is reflected nowhere more prominently than in the selection process and the level of training that applicants are subjected to.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly outline the selection and training regimen of applicants looking to become an RCMP constable, for example. The selection process is divided into roughly six steps. The first is comprised of writing the RCMP police aptitude test. This exam measures candidate skills in areas such as logic, reading, comprehension, written communication, mathematics, and use of personal judgment. This test is used to screen the usually very large number of applicants by determining whether they possess the basic core skills that will allow them to succeed during the training program. If a candidate is successful at this stage, he is then allowed to officially apply to the RCMP. It is during this time that candidates need to pass the physical abilities requirement evaluation, or the PARE test, which tests a candidate's physical strength, stamina, and agility.

Provided they meet the requirements for the PARE, candidates will then move on to a formal interview, which is composed of two parts: suitability for the job and a security component. This interview is conducted by an experienced RCMP officer who uses the interview to get the most accurate picture of the applicant's abilities and assess their potential to function as an RCMP officer.

The suitability portion of the interview measures applicants' aptitude in eight areas including oral communication skills, integrity and honesty, leadership and interpersonal skills. All of these competencies are necessary to be able to carry out the duties of an RCMP constable. Many candidates are screened out at this stage and not necessarily because they're ill-suited to be a police officer but because they do not yet have the life experience necessary that allows people to make good judgment calls.

Now, if the applicant has the skills and life experience necessary and he or she passes both the suitability and security portions of the interview, then their medical and psychological health would be assessed through a battery of tests to ensure that they are also physically and mentally fit for the rigours of police work.

While this is happening, RCMP constables are conducting an extensive background check on the applicant's entire life. This is to ensure that he or she has not been giving false information during the interview and that they would not pose a security risk if they were to eventually become an RCMP officer.

After successfully passing all of these screening procedures, the candidate is then engaged as an RCMP constable and goes to Regina for training, which lasts for a full 22 weeks. During this time, trainees are barracked with their troopmates and start at 6 in the morning and finish at 6 in the evening. It's a rigorous training process that covers not only the basics such as law and how to handle a firearm but also gives officers the skill they need to assess situations they might encounter.

It is these skills that I believe to be of utmost importance because they determine when an officer feels it is necessary to use any of the weapons they are equipped with. Teaching someone just to fire a gun or a Taser is a fairly basic endeavour and can be accomplished with relative ease. What is of greater importance is to make sure that that person possesses the skills that will allow them to evaluate a situation to determine whether it is necessary to use a weapon and to

have the diplomacy and leadership skills to be able to defuse confrontations before they happen.

Mr. Speaker, police forces utilize a rigorous physical and mental training program to prepare their constables for police work. In addition to this, the trainees are screened to ensure that they not only have the necessary skills but also the necessary life experience that leads to better judgment calls and decision-making in high-stress situations. The training that Alberta's special constables receive simply does not compare to this. If we are to arm them, we would need to expand training to a level that is on par with that of regular police constables, in which case they may as well just be members of the RCMP or municipal police force.

Additionally, the physical requirements and conditioning would need to be expanded as well. Police services demand a high level of physical fitness for their applicants and their officers. This physical training serves police officers well for chasing down and apprehending suspects, but it actually serves another important purpose as well. It ensures that the police officers are strong enough and that they have enough combat training that they will not have their weapon or weapons taken away from them and consequently used against them or other innocent bystanders.

If special constables are armed with a weapon that is capable of causing death, we would be derelict in our duty if we didn't train them physically as well as mentally to deal with that level of responsibility. Again, this would require expanding training for special constables to a level that is on par with that of regular police forces, and this is simply not necessary for special constables to be able to fulfill their duties.

Mr. Speaker, special constables play a key enforcement role in our society, but the fact remains that they are not given the same level of training that regular police forces receive. In addition, special constables are not subjected to the same mental, physical, and ethical screening standards that police candidates endure. As the Taser can be a lethal weapon, I feel that it should only be issued to police officers. Members of Alberta's police forces have the training, experience, and judgment skills to ensure that a weapon of this aggressive nature is only used in the proper circumstances.

It is for these reasons that I feel unable to support the original motion's wording. That's why I will be supporting this amendment. Having said that, in its amended form I feel that this motion will do much to assist special constables. I would urge all my colleagues to stand with me in support of Motion 503.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

8:20

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood.

**Mr. Masyk:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the merits of Motion 503 tonight. By introducing Motion 503, the hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Calmor has raised two very important issues: first, whether or not to make special constables accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board and, secondly, whether or not doing so is something that should require these special constables to take enhanced training.

Mr. Speaker, special constables are a part of our everyday lives. We may not fully be aware of who they are and where we might interact with them, but I can assure each and every one in this House right now, today, that all of us have dealt with at least one special constable. For those of you who are a bit puzzled, the several gentlemen and ladies who are stationed at the various security checkpoints here in the building as well as over in the Annex are all special constables. While we may think of them as security guards or simply by their names, their official title is special constable.

One can find special constables working in a variety of locations and situations from the bases of the Canadian Forces to the SPCA. There's no question that what they do is valuable work, and they certainly contribute to our collective safety and the efficiency with which a variety of organizations and agencies are run.

Mr. Speaker, I think that part of the reason for the great value inherent in the work and efforts provided by the special constables can be found in the fact that many but not all of them are former police officers, whether with the city police department or the RCMP. As a result, they have extensive experience dealing with the public. They have knowledge of police procedures. They know how to handle potentially volatile situations with grace and professionalism, and they know how to remain calm even under adverse circumstances. This may be one of the foremost attributes for special constables as a group. Many are former police officers whose training received during their time in the police academy prepared them for careers in policing and serves them well also in their careers after policing.

Standard police training, Mr. Speaker, is both rigorous and extensive. I think most people are aware that police officers must meet minimum physical standards with some regularity and some similarity. There are some stringent psychological standards that police officers must pass. Also among the standards that police officers must meet are those of certain weapons. Officers must routinely demonstrate that they maintain their adaptiveness at properly using their weapons. In fact, they are only granted permission to carry a gun, let alone be police officers, after meeting very strict weapons standards.

Mr. Speaker, under Motion 503 special constables would become accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board, and they would also be required to undergo and pass an expanded training regimen. In my view, an enhanced training program can only result in better special constables, making this yet another attractive feature of this motion. It is one thing to give anyone a weapon but quite another to show him or her how to use it properly and, perhaps even more importantly, when not to use it. It is, after all, a well-known fact that one of the primary functions of any kind of weapon is not that it can be discharged or used, but it's the ability to deter someone from doing something undesirable.

And so it is, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes the very knowledge of the presence of a weapon may be quite sufficient to give a would-be perpetrator pause before he or she, as the case may be, decides to disturb the peace and engage in some other kind of behaviour warranting more aggressive intervention short of detention or arrest. But what if that's not enough? What if the special constable finds himself or herself in a situation where discharging or otherwise using some weapon or other is deemed necessary? Then what?

Whenever we deal with would-be perpetrators and other potential criminals of whatever stripe or calibre, we have to consider what we may call "what if." I understand that at the present time special constables are under order to tactically reposition themselves whenever a what-if situation arises. That is, whenever a special constable finds himself or herself in a situation he or she considers threatening to life or limb, the sanctioned response by the Alberta Solicitor General is to leave the premises to call the police. As much as that may be the only mandatory response, it seems to me that that opens up the possibility that the perpetrator or perpetrators can get away quite easily while the special constable calls for assistance from the police or RCMP.

We have a motion before us that seeks to strike some sort of middle ground or middle link in the road of compromise between the current mandated response to tactically reposition themselves and call for back up, on one hand, and the prohibition on the use of

firearms by special constables, on the other hand. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the motion has been amended.

In its previous form I would have not been able to support it due to the lack of emphasis on the enhancement of all training rather than just the weapons training for special constables. At the present time special constables undergo a four-week training program before they are considered ready for the job. Not only are the physical and psychological standards they must meet considerably less stringent than those their counterparts in regular police forces and the RCMP must meet, but only one of the four weeks of training is devoted to weapons training.

Mr. Speaker, members of this House who have any experience serving in the armed forces know how extensive and rigorous the weapons training is that soldiers must undergo. It is, to say the least, a rather lengthy and involved process. Before you get anywhere near a firing range, you learn the various parts of your weapon and how they function, how you take them apart and put them together, and how you properly clean and maintain your weapon. That's before you even get to use bullets. Once you graduate from blanks to live ammunition, the rigours and the emphasis on safety border on the extreme. By this time, several weeks or even months may have passed, but the soldier is still in training.

I would strongly suggest that any increase in arsenal availability to special constables must be preceded by a significant increase in the length of training that any special constable recruit must undergo. However, even though the amended motion calls for increased training, I agree with concerns about providing special constables with more weapons than at the present time. It has come to my attention that the policing review committee raised concerns about the difficulty of providing weapons training to deputy constables, as would be the official title of these new and improved special constables. As these deputy constables would be performing a variety of functions, their weapons training would have to be rather comprehensive to offer what could be called the one-size-fits-all approach to the said training.

A willingness to serve does not equal immediate street readiness, Mr. Speaker. One thing that we can all agree on is that it is never a good idea to place weapons of any kind in the hands of those who have not been rigorously screened and adequately trained, particularly so if the weapons in question are intended to be used to maintain peace. Mr. Speaker, I have no reservations about how or that we would properly screen special constable trainees as well in the future . . .

**The Speaker:** Excuse me, hon. member. I hate to interrupt, but our Standing Orders do provide for five minutes for the sponsor of a motion other than a government motion to close the debate. I now invite the hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Calmor to close debate on Motion 503, recognizing that we have an amendment to the motion before us.

**Rev. Abbott:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a great honour to be able to stand here and close debate on Motion 503. In fact, I do fully accept the amendments that have been put forward by the hon. Member for Calgary-North Hill. In fact, I think that what the amended motion does is basically stress the two main parts of the motion.

By making special constables accountable to the Law Enforcement Review Board, amended Motion 503 brings added accountability to the special constable level of policing and, thus, should improve public trust in special constables. Also, amended Motion 503

requires special constables to take greater training for the position. This would result in better prepared special constables.

8:30

So, Mr. Speaker, I see this as a win/win. Like I said, I accept these amendments, and I think that they will really help the special constables of Alberta. I really like what the Member for Calgary-Buffalo talked about with regard to deputy constables, and certainly some day that may be the direction that this province decides to go. But there's no question that these men and women are a very valuable part of Alberta's peace officer force. As we said earlier, there are in the neighbourhood of 2,400 of them in the province, so I know that accountability and training are something that they certainly need and look forward to.

I'll just close by saying thanks to everybody that participated, and I do appreciate your support on this motion.

[Motion Other than Government Motion 503 as amended carried]

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

**Mr. Hutton:** May I ask for unanimous consent first, Mr. Speaker?

**The Speaker:** The hon. member would like unanimous consent so that he may proceed to Introduction of Guests. Would anybody be opposed to having introductions?

[Unanimous consent granted]

head: **Introduction of Guests**

**Mr. Hutton:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two introductions to make this evening. I would like to introduce to you and through you to members of this Assembly a constituent of mine and a parent, Barb Strange. Barb is a parent of a child in grade 2 at the Child Study Centre, and she also has a four year old who is entering kindergarten this coming September. Barbara is present in the members' gallery and is part of the Education Watch initiative. I would ask her to please rise and accept the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

I'd also like to introduce someone who helps me daily with my research in my office and does it effectively, efficiently, and with a smile on his face. I'd ask Emir Mehinagic to please stand and accept the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **Motions Other than Government Motions**

*(continued)*

### **Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder**

504. Mr. Hutton moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to (a) continue to develop and implement strategies to reduce and ultimately eliminate alcohol consumption prior to and during pregnancy, (b) develop and implement initiatives to support Albertans affected by fetal alcohol spectrum disorder, FASD, and (c) continue to work with all levels of government, partners and stakeholders, and members of the public to create an environment that would address the systemic problem of women consuming alcohol while pregnant.

**Mr. Hutton:** Now, Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to introduce Motion 504, which aims to address an issue that is increasingly becoming more systemic and more prevalent not only in certain

communities within our province but our country as well. It is a problem that bears not only a heavy human cost but fiscal ones as well.

The purpose of Motion 504 is to support existing and encourage new strategies to combat fetal alcohol spectrum disorder, more commonly referred to as FASD. In my remarks today I would particularly like to applaud the Minister of Children's Services and the Minister of Health and Wellness, as they are partners and stakeholders, for all their efforts to educate the general public about the dangers of the consumption of alcohol during pregnancy and also for their support of those individuals who have the misfortune of being affected by FASD.

My personal involvement in the area of FASD began when I became directly involved with the Glenrose rehabilitation hospital, which provides care to children and adults suffering from the effects of this disorder. Over the years the Glenrose has provided care to thousands of patients and families who are affected by FASD, many of whom have come from communities in northern Alberta, Nunavut, Northwest Territories, and Yukon.

Many of the children that find their way to the Glenrose tend to come from low-income families and in many cases from First Nation communities. These are children who due to unfortunate circumstances will never have a chance to lead a normal childhood or a happy and productive life. The regrettable fact is that while hospitals like the Glenrose can provide these children with diagnosis and care services, they cannot provide them with effective treatment as there is currently no cure for this disorder. The effects of FASD are permanent, Mr. Speaker. At the end of the day all that the hospitals and treatment facilities can do is ease some of the suffering and pain experienced by some of these individuals.

When I became an MLA in Edmonton-Glenora, I soon became keenly aware of the fact that it is false to assume that the occurrence of FASD is more prevalent in lower income than in middle and higher income families. As a matter of fact, research seems to indicate that the disorder is just as common and potentially more common in prosperous communities as it is in lower income families. According to a national population health survey conducted by Stats Canada, researchers found that 25 per cent of all women in Canada with children under the age of five admitted to drinking while pregnant. The surprising figure is that 29 per cent of those women came from higher income families.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that transcends all social boundaries and whose effects are felt as much in the city of Edmonton as they are in communities in northern Alberta. However, before I discuss some of the social impacts of FASD, I would like to provide the House with a bit of background concerning this particular type of condition.

Mr. Speaker, FASD is an umbrella term used to describe a range of disabilities and diagnoses associated with parental exposure to alcohol. The development of such disabilities is directly related to a range of factors including the timing and the amount of alcohol consumed by a mother during her pregnancy, the use of other substances, the genetics of the mother and her fetus, and the mother's overall health. Furthermore, other aspects including economic, social, and physical status of the parent can also play a role in the development of the disorder. Consequently, FASD includes such diagnoses as fetal alcohol syndrome, partial fetal alcohol syndrome, fetal alcohol effect, fetal alcohol-related neurodevelopmental disorder, alcohol-related birth defects. Those all go under the heading of FASD now.

While being the leading cause of developmental disability among our children, FASD is one of the most poorly understood medical conditions in Alberta and across Canada. Children born with this

disorder face a number of physical and social challenges which in turn prevent them from functioning in similar manner and settings to those born without the disorder. According to the last statistics, 9 in every 1,000 babies born across Canada are affected by this disorder. In Alberta 3 to 6 out of a thousand are born with FASD, while 1 in 3 is born with FAS. To put this into perspective, experts claim that in North America alone approximately 1 per cent of the population suffers from some form of FASD, which is four times more than those affected by HIV or AIDS.

Unfortunately, at the present time we have no way of knowing exactly how many individuals living in Alberta or Canada are affected by this condition. This is largely a result of the fact that there are currently no set standards for detection of the disorder and because of the negative stigma associated with women who are known to have produced a child with FASD.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, while this scientific community has been able to determine the prevailing factors that contribute to the development of FASD, they have not been able to determine exactly what amount of alcohol is healthy for the fetus. The reason behind this lack of understanding is partly due to the fact that not all mothers can metabolize alcohol at the same rate. In other cases doctors have found that mothers who drank heavily during pregnancy have produced perfectly healthy offspring who show no signs of brain damage. Therefore, while we do not know exactly what quantity of alcohol consumed will end up hurting a child, we do know that alcohol does dehydrate and destroy brain cells, which tend to be extremely vulnerable during the development of the fetus.

We also know that of all the substances that can cause birth defects, which includes heroin, cocaine, and certain medical substances such as codeine, alcohol tends to be the one most dangerous for the fetus. As a result, some of the most common physical defects associated with babies affected by alcohol and, consequently, FASD include small birth weight, small head circumference, small, widely spaced eyes, flattened mid face with a short upturned nose, thin upper lip, and no noticeable curve between the nose and mouth. It is important to note that these particular physical defects occur usually if the mother was drinking within the first trimester and may not show up at all if she consumed alcohol within the second or third trimester.

The most common mental problems and challenges faced by individuals with FASD include attention deficit, memory deficit, hyperactivity, and difficulty absorbing concepts. While many of these children and adults suffer from certain behavioural problems, it would be incorrect to assume that the majority of them enjoy lower intelligence levels. As a matter of fact, recent data seem to indicate that only 15 per cent of the children with FASD have IQs under 70, while the vast majority enjoy IQs of normal or above-average range.

**8:40**

However, Mr. Speaker, this statistic is a bit misleading because while many children and adults who are affected by the disorder can perform well on tests and execute tasks that are repetitive or familiar in nature, they are unable to use their knowledge gained in the tasks to adapt to new situations or environments. Unfortunately, this means that many of them who have difficulties absorbing new concepts do not possess the ability to solve new problems and challenges.

On a more serious note, Mr. Speaker, their mental disabilities also tend to hamper their capacity to learn from mistakes and the consequences of their actions. Many of them display immature social behaviour, display poor social judgment, lack the capacity to control their emotions, and some tend to be inappropriately friendly to strangers. Consequently, many of those who suffer from various

forms of FASD tend to be socially unfit, unemployable, and even worse, vulnerable to high-risk behaviours and situations including crime.

Research done across Canada seems to indicate that a high percentage of homeless people and juvenile and adult offenders suffer from undiagnosed FASD. While there is no hard data available, some researchers estimate that as many as 1 in every 4 inmates found within our correctional institutions suffers from the effects of this disorder. This not only places a great pressure on our criminal justice system but also places great social and financial burdens on our society as a whole. The sad part about this situation is that if circumstances had been different, these people would have had the opportunity to lead perfectly normal lives.

While we are on the subject of costs, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the fact that since there is no known remedy for FASD, individuals affected by the disorder require lifelong care and treatment. This, in turn, means that the costs associated with FASD treatment are very, very high. More specifically, Health Canada reports that without taking into account the lost potential and opportunity of these individuals, direct costs associated with FASD over a lifetime are estimated at \$2 million per person. However, the figure includes costs related only to medical care services.

I fully support the government's approach in dealing with the problem and pursuing the strategies. With this in mind, I urge all members present tonight to support our future generations and vote in favour of Motion 504.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Gaming.

**Mr. Stevens:** Thanks, Mr. Speaker. It's with pleasure that I rise to speak to Motion 504 as presented by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora. In Alberta research suggests that anywhere between 19 to 113 children for every 1,000 are born with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder each year. Fetal alcohol syndrome and related disorders are the leading causes of developmental disabilities in Canadian children today. What gives us hope is that it's entirely preventable.

As the minister responsible for the Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission I'd like to add my support to this Motion 504. With the introduction of this motion the sponsoring member is asking this government to renew its commitment to this very important issue. At the outset I'd like to commend the Minister of Children's Services for all her department's valuable work to date and her continued dedication to educate the public on FASD.

This evening, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to highlight the contributions being made by my ministry including our participation on provincial and national FASD committees and other initiatives as well as contributions of the liquor industry. Alberta Gaming and the AGLC will continue to support efforts to combat FASD. My ministry is committed to addressing this issue. In fact, one of our guiding principles is to ensure that liquor policies reflect a commitment to social responsibility.

[Mr. Shariff in the chair]

Just recently we created a social responsibility division within the AGLC. The newly formed division will enhance our focus on social responsibility including new opportunities to increase awareness about responsible alcohol consumption. This includes monitoring emerging issues and trends and developing policies to address the social and economic implications of those issues and partnering with the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission and the liquor

industry to develop and deliver programs related to the responsible sale and consumption of alcohol and ensure that consumers of alcohol are aware of the prevention and treatment programs for alcohol abuse. As well, the ministry will continue its investigation into warning labels on alcohol beverages. I'm confident the efforts of the social responsibility division will serve to strengthen our commitment to FASD reduction strategies.

Alberta Gaming is also a member of the recently established Alberta FASD Cross-Ministry Committee. This committee supports a collaborative approach to planning and delivering provincial government programs and services. The AGLC also represents Alberta on the Social Responsibility Committee of the Canadian Association of Liquor Jurisdictions. As the provincial representative we put Alberta's initiatives on the table and bring back useful information on other jurisdictions' liquor-related programs and campaigns including those relating to FASD. At the annual meeting last fall Alberta announced that it will develop a new strategy for fetal alcohol spectrum disorder to be led by Alberta Children's Services.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the liquor industry shares our view that FASD is a serious issue and is proactive in promoting responsible consumption. A very good example of this is the Brewers Association of Canada, which considers FASD among its top three social issues along with drinking and driving and minors accessing liquor. Through its funding of FASD initiatives, the association is helping to raise awareness about this disorder. According to a recent survey by Ipsos-Reid, 98 per cent of women in Canada understand that drinking alcohol during pregnancy is harmful. In other words, awareness appears to be generally very high.

Once you build awareness, the challenge is to help direct behavioural changes. An example of this is the mother that has given birth to one FAS child. It's my information that the likelihood that she will have another is an alarming 776 out of 1,000 live births. Because of information like this, the Brewers Association has indicated that they will take a more targeted approach to future allocation of funds for education initiatives.

The Brewers Association will continue to promote the message that drinking responsibly during pregnancy should mean not drinking at all. Together with the College of Family Physicians they are promoting this message through the alcohol risk assessment and intervention program. This program gives physicians the tools they need to identify at an early stage those most likely to have a problem with harmful drinking. Currently it's used by 4,000 health professionals and all 16 medical schools across Canada.

A spinoff of this program is the Caring Together initiative developed with the Native Physicians Association. This initiative focuses on education about drinking during pregnancy within the aboriginal community. Most importantly, the program is culturally sensitive in that it combines western medical practice with aboriginal healing methods and native spirituality to promote responsible consumption of drugs and alcohol.

Mr. Speaker, education and information go hand in hand. Industry is committed to making sure Albertans get educated by improving the availability of FASD information. Over a three-year period with funding of \$350,000 the Brewers Association has supported the Motherisk program at the Hospital for Sick Children in Ontario. The most significant advantage of Motherisk is its toll-free help line, especially helpful for remote communities in Alberta where FASD information is hard to access. This along with FASD community programs and articles in magazines like *Canadian Parent* is helping Albertans and families affected by FASD.

Another key industry leader, the Alberta Liquor Store Association, is also making sure that Albertans get the facts on FASD including

partnering to run the Your Baby Doesn't Need a Cold One campaign in liquor stores throughout the province. This pilot project included FASD promotional displays and nonalcoholic beverages.

**8:50**

This April the annual ALSA conference and trade show will provide another opportunity for the liquor industry to find new ways to deal with FASD. I encourage the liquor industry and its associations to continue these and all other important efforts to prevent FASD.

Mr. Speaker, I support Motion 504, and the Minister of Children's Services can continue to expect support from Alberta Gaming as we explore new partnerships through our ministries and with industry stakeholders. Of course, I encourage all members to vote in favour of the motion. Thank you very much.

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Children's Services.

**Ms Evans:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure that I rise in support of Motion 504. I'd like to give a bit of brief background and then tell you about some of the exciting initiatives that Children's Services and our partners are undertaking with FASD.

I reflect the pleasure of learning so much about this from the now Minister of Learning, who, when he had this portfolio or this responsibility centre, pursued avidly and aggressively the issue of putting FASD on the map of the Alberta government. We owe him a great debt, and I say thank you. He is possibly the only one that drives a truck in his neighbourhood with a sign on the bumper sticker saying, "Don't spoil your child," and for that advocacy and that continuing support I am also grateful.

It's astonishing to know that right from biblical times, when in the Bible there is reference that a mother should not consume wine or alcohol or spirits because it might make the baby to turn out to be silly, throughout the ages at different times there have been whole societal structures that seemingly have ignored FASD. Today with our knowledge of the permanent brain injury of FASD, I think it's important to pursue the results of this motion and carry one step further every program that would accelerate education to absolutely everybody.

Tonight we've heard references to supports for people who have a disposition to diabetes and to effects of alcohol abuse, namely some of our native population. But today at the Glenrose they will tell you that it's most frightening to contemplate the martini moms, as they're known, who will sit in fancy neighbourhoods in fine houses and drink and then just pray at the time of that birth that the alcohol will not be demonstrated in any tangible way on either the face of the baby or on the resulting imprint of the brain. I find it astonishing that people can still believe that it might not have an effect: oh, well, it doesn't affect everyone. Well, why take the chance, Mr. Speaker?

This year we had a mocktail contest between a number of the media who on two separate days in Calgary and in Edmonton put together cocktails that were mixtures of juices or milk that were safe for a pregnant mom to consume, and through that we have been working to energize the media to be very aware of FASD/FASE. I think that to their credit they have done quite a fine job of putting articles in periodicals and talking about it with more knowledge than we had seen previously on this subject.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to reflect on something that for me is a cruel disappointment, and that is that when we ask for leadership from our federal government on this issue, we're met with platitudes and no money. We continue to ask for an allocation of funding

which has been promised under the FASD initiative federally, especially concerning our on-reserve funding formulas. Repeatedly we say, "Please provide us the support," and repeatedly it is not delivered.

We believe that women who continue to drink alcohol during pregnancy have many complex needs. Some do not want to confide in their partner that they have been indulging in alcohol, and we know from our discussions with addiction experts that many would have undertaken treatment if they weren't so conscious of the shame that that intervention might bring forward.

Frequently women who divulge that they have had an addiction or drank alcohol during their pregnancy will lose a male partner, and the partner will leave them alone to face the situation by themselves. As a result, Mr. Speaker, often they are unsupported women who have the babies and then turn them over to the province to take care of. I think that that's one of the most tragic circumstances of all because often that is an impediment for people who may wish to adopt a child. So we've given somebody a life sentence that is completely preventable, one hundred per cent preventable, and we should in fact as Albertans do everything we can to be aggressive in providing people with the information so they'll stop drinking.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to relate for the record an astonishing circumstance I find myself in when I go into schools. That is that I tell grade 6s about FASD. I tell them the effect of it. I draw the picture of the mother on the blackboard. I draw the picture of the brain, their beautiful whole brain, and then a brain that has had that compounding injury of FASD.

Now, during this period I look at the children, and I say, "How many of you pour alcoholic beverages for your parents?" I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that if you could go to any part of Alberta and put 52 kids in grade 6 in a class and ask them that question, you'll get over 80 per cent that will put up their hands. They, in fact, either pour their dad a beer or get their mother a glass of wine. The implication of that is that kids that are too young to know the effects of alcohol are pouring alcoholic beverages for their parents.

So then you ask them, "Well, you know, have you heard about fetal alcohol spectrum disorder if a mummy drinks when a baby is in her tummy?" And, believe me, they all know how it got there, and they may be on the threshold of making those decisions themselves.

**Dr. Taylor:** I didn't know that until I was 20.

**Ms Evans:** And I'm not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that some wouldn't have known that.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you tell them that if the mummy drinks alcohol, the brain on the blackboard that looks like Swiss cheese might actually be the result, and when you look back at the kids and you don't let them put their hands up, I'll tell you what you see: you see at least half a dozen kids that look sick to their stomachs. I think the reason they look sick is because they know full well they've been asked by somebody who's pregnant to pour them an alcoholic beverage.

So, Mr. Speaker, we've got a long way to go on the education of FASD/FASE in the province. We've made a good start both with the resources and the awareness, but I think this activity, this motion, and promotion of this can only accelerate it. I challenge hon. members on both sides of the House to contact our office, and we'll be pleased to provide you materials for your constituency offices and, what's more, a bumper sticker so that you too can join the wave started by the hon. Minister of Learning and carry the message.

Thank you very much.

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

**Mrs. Ady:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to be here tonight to offer my thoughts and speak in favour of Motion 504. I'd like to begin my remarks by commending my colleague the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora and also the Minister of Children's Services for bringing forward this motion and for the work that she's done around FAS and FASD.

Before coming into office, I don't think I was aware that such a condition existed. I don't think I'd ever thought I knew anybody that had the condition. I wasn't even aware that it ever happened, and I'm not certain how that happened or why that happened, but I'd never felt like I'd had exposure to it. Shortly after coming into office, I was made the chair of the Social Care Facilities Review Committee, so as I began to interview kids out there, I ran into the condition for the first time.

What was really surprising to me was that I actually did know about the condition. One of my good friends back at home had adopted a child. They had never been able to have children, and they were very excited when they got this little baby girl. She was a beautiful baby, but by age five and six they began to notice deficiencies in the child. We weren't certain what those deficiencies were, and as a church community we worked very . . .

**The Acting Speaker:** I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw, but the time limit for consideration of this item of business has concluded.

head: 9:00      **Government Bills and Orders**  
**Second Reading**

**Bill 20**  
**Minors' Property Act**

[Adjourned debate March 10: Mr. Hancock]

**The Acting Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

**Ms Blakeman:** Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and comment on Bill 20, the Minors' Property Act, that has been brought forward by the hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General. This bill is really a companion bill to Bill 19, which is the Public Trustee Act, and they need to be viewed together because they do refer to one another, but also they're both bills that are updating and consolidating and clarifying long existing pieces of legislation that need that update. They need to move into the 21st century.

So a couple of things that are changes to the existing act. Some of them I think might in fact be carried forward but are expanded. We've got the court confirmation of contracts, situations where minors have entered into contracts or people have entered them in, parents or guardians have committed them. Often that needs to have an overriding confirmation from the courts, and in fact that is anticipated and brought forward in Bill 20.

There's also a clarification of discharging a contractual obligation to minors, and I believe that the Minister of Justice had given the example of a minor taking a bike into a shop to be fixed and then trying to claim it back again. Under the existing legislation it was so broad that, in fact, strictly enforced and strictly interpreted according to what we had in the old act, the youth wouldn't have been able to get their own bike back even if they'd paid the bill for the repairs.

So this makes it clear where there's already a sort of contractual or implied contractual relationship how things can proceed there, especially around money – and that's money including wages and



benefits but aside from that as well – and also goods like the example that was used in the bike being fixed.

The bill is careful to always put forward the concept of best interests and that any decision that is made around a minor's property or money that's owed to a minor be contemplated in that context of best interest. The bill includes some reciprocal agreements back and forth between the Public Trustee Act, and it also looks at court appointment of a trustee, especially around the scope where they can appoint a trustee for just specific parts of a minor's property. In other words, mostly what this is anticipating is a large settlement that needs to be given full protection under the law, something like a settlement from a traffic accident or perhaps a large amount of money inherited through a will, for example. There might be other parts of the minor's property that don't need to get that kind of thorough safekeeping that's offered here, but in some cases it does need to be put under a trustee.

With the feedback loop that I've used, I haven't heard any concerns that have been raised thus far, but often once the minister speaks and we have a response from the opposition, people start paying attention. I may well hear some additional things over the next week or so, but given what I knew about the bill and had asked around about, I haven't heard any concerns raised thus far.

This is an update, a consolidation, a clarification, so I really wasn't expecting any great objections. I'm pleased to see the concept of best interest that is incorporated into it. At this point I'm willing to support Bill 20 in second reading, and I look forward to a more thorough examination of the clauses in Committee of the Whole.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 20 read a second time]

head: **Government Bills and Orders  
Committee of the Whole**

[Mr. Shariff in the chair]

**The Deputy Chair:** Hon. members, we'll call the committee to order.

**Bill 18  
Maintenance Enforcement Amendment Act, 2004**

**The Deputy Chair:** Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this bill? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

**Ms Carlson:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Happy to have an opportunity to speak to Bill 18, the Maintenance Enforcement Amendment Act, 2004. We've been waiting for this bill for some time. It makes some proposed amendments that we're very happy to see on this side of the House.

Certainly, maintenance enforcement continues to be an ongoing issue in our constituency office. It's sometimes the number one, sometimes the number two, and sometimes the number three issue. Custodial parents continually have a very difficult time in gaining access to the funds that are rightfully due to the children that they are trying to raise in a supportable fashion, and for years we've been asking for some strengthening of the rules that maintenance enforcement has at its fingertips.

Some of the things that we see in this bill are really good. I like the raising of the bar for the restrictions that we see in the different kinds of licences that noncustodial parents can be restricted in getting if they haven't kept up with their payments. There's no doubt that having the restrictions on the driver's licence has been a

positive step. Further, restricting hunting, fishing, and outfitter licences when debtors are in default is a good idea.

It's a new idea to me that lottery winnings of over a thousand dollars should go to support the family of a debtor who has maintenance arrears, but I think that's a good idea too, although certainly it's going to, I think, as some of these other ideas in this bill, increase the amount of paperwork, but it's a really good plan. If a noncustodial parent has a windfall, his children should share in that benefit if he's in arrears, I believe.

Some of the consistency that we see lining Alberta up with some of the other provinces is also supportable. The increased access to information sharing between banks, releasing information to police, providing addresses to courts, identifying reciprocal programs are all very good, I think. Deterrent fees are also very good, but those two, sharing the information and the deterrent fees, bring up for me the two still outstanding significant issues around maintenance enforcement, and those are the lack of co-operation and co-ordination we have between interprovincial jurisdictions.

It's still really difficult to find noncustodial parents who skip the province and try and hide. We have a great deal of problem dealing with other provinces in trying to find those folks. We've had some good co-operative efforts with B.C. and Saskatchewan, but other provinces farther away seem to be increasingly difficult, not increasingly easy, to work out situations with noncustodial parents.

So I would very much like the Minister of Justice to take this under advisement and to bring forward legislation soon that works at interprovincial co-operation in this issue. If we could get the other provinces to share information with us similar to the proposed amendments that we see in this bill, then we would put the money in the hands of the children and for their care in a much faster and far more appropriate fashion.

**9:10**

The other absence of information that I see here that I think is very necessary for us to talk about is the constant reduction we see of outstanding arrears for noncustodial parents. They let their arrears build up for months or years and then go to court and declare themselves to be under duress and have those arrears wiped out or significantly reduced and often then apply for a reduction of the monthly support payments that they should be making.

That penalizes the children, Mr. Chairman, and that rewards an offending parent. I think that that's just plain bad, and one of the most abhorrent things we do when we treat children badly in this province is to let those noncustodial parents get away with that. That's, to me, a crime and should be treated accordingly. Instead, we're letting them off the hook in these particular cases, and I don't see anything in this particular bill addressing that.

So I would again urge the Minister of Justice to take a look at that situation and to make it impossible in this province for noncustodial parents to weasel out of paying the money that is due to their children that those kids need in order to really live the lifestyle that they should be in terms of just generally being well-fed, well-educated, well-dressed, and available to participate in community activities. It's a real burden that we place on our future generation, and I think it's the wrong thing for us to do.

With those two points that I hope the minister takes a look at, if he'll take those under consideration, then I'm quite happy to support this particular bill. Thank you.

[The clauses of Bill 18 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

**The Deputy Chair:** Shall the bill be reported? Are you agreed?

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Chair:** Opposed? Carried.

**Bill 19**  
**Public Trustee Act**

**The Deputy Chair:** Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this bill? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

**Ms Blakeman:** Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. I think I spoke in second reading to this bill last week, March 10. As I mentioned during an earlier debate, after second reading I often do hear from people who seem to become alert to the fact that an issue is being discussed, and they now want to make comment on it. I had not had any concerns raised with me about the Public Trustee Act prior to my second reading comments, and I have heard no concerns raised between that time and this.

I had gone through fairly thoroughly what was being contemplated before in that we were looking at clarification of the legal status of the office of the Public Trustee. There are a number of sections that deal with cleaning up the trust funds, their rules of operation, and how trusts could be maximized for the use of the intended person. The sections that have been put in around the minor's property: those are reciprocal references back and forth between public trustees and the Minors' Property Act. There are additional sections on incorporating issues around missing persons and also around the mentally incompetent.

Those are really the new pieces to this legislation. The rest is merely updating, getting rid of some of the archaic language and some of the no longer in use statutes. I think it's a good idea that we revisit legislation on a fairly regular basis. This one was not regular. I think it was originally in place in about 1959, if I'm remembering the right one, and hasn't been updated since then.

I have no concerns at this time with what's being proposed, and I'm happy to support it in Committee of the Whole. Thank you.

[The clauses of Bill 19 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

**The Deputy Chair:** Shall the bill be reported? Are you agreed?

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Chair:** Opposed? Carried.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would move that the committee now rise and report Bill 18, the Maintenance Enforcement Amendment Act, 2004, and Bill 19, the Public Trustee Act.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Shariff in the chair]

**Mr. Lougheed:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports the following: Bill 18, Bill 19.

**The Acting Speaker:** Does the Assembly concur in the report?

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker:** Opposed? So ordered.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

**Mr. Zwozdesky:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a productive evening, and I would move that the Assembly now stand adjourned until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

[Motion carried; at 9:18 p.m. the Assembly adjourned to Tuesday at 1:30 p.m.]