

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

10:03 a.m.

[Chairman: Mr. Dunford]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll now call the meeting to order. I apologize for being a few minutes late. Just a couple of thoughts or comments before we proceed. We discussed that we would start each meeting asking any member if they wish to read into the record any recommendations. Is any member ready at this point to read in a recommendation? Okay.

Also, at the organizational meeting we entered into a discussion about voting. We were using a procedure of aye and nay. We have now been advised that it makes it easier on *Hansard* if we have a show of hands. So when we are voting on any motions or later when we get to the recommendations, then we will ask for a show of hands.

Comments?

MR. MITCHELL: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The starting time is supposed to be 10 o'clock. I don't know that we'll go to 12, but if we do and we need more time, I'd like to add on the time that we started late. If you'd allow us to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will certainly do that. I think we established that precedent in the earlier hearings, so we will certainly continue. Yes, it is my desire to provide the committee members with two hours as scheduled, so I'll make sure we arrange that.

Lance.

MR. WHITE: Two items of business. One is that if we are to start late, it should be only because the presenter has some difficulty. In this case, the presenter today is here and on time, ready and raring to go, I assume. The meeting should start if you have a quorum. It's rude to be late. We all know that.

The second item is that there is something to be said for scheduling things that actually work for people. Surely people can set their schedule well in advance. What we've got here are two areas that I have some difficulty with. Earlier we changed the Treasurer's attendance one time, and now it's changed again. There are people one has to meet, and this is awfully short notice to have to totally cancel an afternoon of appointments, particularly constituents' appointments. Most of these people that one goes to see have taken part of the day off. Now I have to tell them that they can't take that part of the day off to come and talk to their MLA. Surely you as chairman have to put your foot down and say, "Look; if you're going to schedule something, then if you have to schedule it three weeks later, well, so be it, but not so close at hand." It's really uncalled for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments by any other members about the start time of this meeting or the schedule that's been circulated?

I will accept the responsibility for starting three minutes late. I didn't have an opportunity to meet with our legislative assistant until we arrived here at the Chamber. I appreciate what that might do to people's schedules at noon and will attempt to have the call to order at the scheduled times.

As far as this continual state of flux that we're finding our schedule in, I have heard your comments, Lance, and will continue to do the best I can to arrive at a schedule that we can meet and actually get our work done and that we have accepted in terms of our membership on this committee.

Okay. Now, we're here today to meet with the Hon. Dianne Mirosh on the Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation. Dianne, we are on a first-name basis in this committee. If you wish to make some opening comments, you are invited to speak at any length you desire so long as it's less than 15 minutes.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having us here. I'd like to introduce Keray Henke, who is sitting here with me. Keray, who is from the Executive Council and Premier's office, is helping me wind down the Alberta Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation. As all of you know, we have repealed legislation and have subsequently made some commitments that we are obligated to fulfill by law.

The Alberta Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation was first proposed in the throne speech of 1989, and an extensive public consultation process was undertaken. The mission of this foundation was to enable communities to strengthen their families by applying knowledge about substance abuse. Now with our budgets, our finances the way they are and our commitment to reduce our spending and to deficit reduction -- this particular foundation was announced in the Treasurer's speech prior to the election, and the commitment to wind it down was made at that time. So now we have fulfilled that commitment and have since hired a trustee to fulfill the contract obligations we have, some of them taking us to the year 1996-97.

I have handed out to you the list of grants awarded and the grants that we're obligated to. Our expenditures to date, Mr. Chairman, are roughly around \$1.46 million. We have not spent all that money, but those obligations to this point are that much. We have actually spent \$400,000 of those dollars on administration costs of starting up the foundation, and the other million that we have left in there is to fulfill these grant obligations. The \$5 million that was originally set aside will no longer be needed or necessary for this foundation.

Those are my comments. Kerry, did you want to add anything?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.

Before we get started, just one announcement for the members of the committee. We will alternate from opposition to government members, and we'll go back and forth as long as questions are forthcoming. You are given the opportunity for a main question and two supplementaries. However, we have tried to be reasonable and to provide latitude also. So just to let everyone know, the chair has been lenient as to whether a supplementary follows from the main. You could use a supplementary to approach another subject if you wish. Still, what we're saying is you have three questions each time, and then you'll fall to the bottom. Then we continue to rotate the list.

The other announcement I would make. We have guests in the gallery. I want to indicate to them that you are observing the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act, and we are today hearing from the Hon. Dianne Mirosh regarding the Alberta Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation. You might notice that we are a little more informal. If the Speaker were here running the proceedings, we would be in our places and of course would be properly attired. As it is, being informal, we are allowed to remove jackets, and also people are allowed to sit where they feel comfortable. So if you happen to be checking your sheets as to who is present in the Chamber today, you'd best look at the wonderful profiles we've provided rather than the seat location.

Now, having said that, we would look, then, for the first question. Mike Percy.

10:13

DR. PERCY: Madam Minister, I understand that the legislation that is winding up the foundation allows that the board will remain in place. I'm curious as to why that would be the case, because if it's being wound up and placed with AADAC, one would think some of the savings that would emerge would be for consolidation of the board.

MRS. MIROSH: That's a good question. There was a little bit of confusion there. The board initially was 11 members. That board has been totally wound down. By virtue of that legislation, in order to finish up these contracts and fulfill our obligations, we have appointed one trustee, and that is the board.

DR. PERCY: That is the board.

MRS. MIROSH: That is the board.

DR. PERCY: In your opening comments, Madam Minister, you mentioned that the expenditures on start-up administration were \$400,000, and there was approximately a million dollars, then, that was allocated in grants. Of that \$400,000, how much was really purchase of assets -- equipment, computer equipment, and those types of assets -- as opposed to either stipends to board members or just administrative costs for full-time employees?

MRS. MIROSH: I'd be happy to give you a copy of the annual report following this meeting. To answer your question, salaries were \$55,900; equipment was \$17,800. The rest of the grant of \$350,000 was contracts and services.

DR. PERCY: A final supplemental then. Those contracts . . .

MRS. MIROSH: I would just like to add that the executive director and all the staff who worked for this foundation have left. We've made a settlement with them or relocated some members. They are no longer here, so I can't answer the line-by-line decisions other than what is stated in the annual report.

DR. PERCY: The contracts and services that you referred to: are those payments, then, to the senior officials, or are those research contracts? I wasn't quite clear, because I thought the million dollars that you referred to -- those are the grants?

MRS. MIROSH: That are before me.

DR. PERCY: And the \$350,000 that you referred to in terms of service contracts: are those for staff?

MRS. MIROSH: No. They're contracts that were hired in order to establish the foundation and services to help a number of people just to understand what the grant was for. So the contract was in establishing the grant relationship.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Denis Herard.

MR. HERARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, can you explain the factors that led to the decision to abolish the Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation?

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Denis. I would. It is because, first of all, the cost of \$5 million was felt to be unnecessary since a lot of the grants that are being awarded, the ones before you, are being duplicated by AADAC. The chair of AADAC is here with us, and she'll probably attest to this, but a number of these distress centres,

recovery centres, and societies against drugs are already funded agencies through AADAC.

MR. HERARD: I think a lot of people in Alberta would feel that there's still a need for research and programming with respect to the issues of family life and substance abuse. In fact, I think some of them would say that perhaps it's not all substance abuse anymore. Perhaps it's even other types of addictions, to lottery machines and so on. How will the need for research and programming be served now that that foundation no longer exists?

MRS. MIROSH: Well, I appreciate that comment. There probably is a need for research. Again, this can probably be fulfilled through the commitments that AADAC has to servicing the community in drug and alcohol abuse. It'll be a combined effort between this mission and AADAC's mission.

MR. HERARD: My last part of that question would be: what about addictions to other things like gambling? Is that going to become part of AADAC as well?

MRS. MIROSH: That's under review right now by the minister responsible for lotteries and AADAC. Yes, AADAC will be playing a significant role in addiction to gambling.

To go back to your other question, just so the research component and the mission of this foundation are sustained, Executive Council, cabinet, has appointed Jack Agrios, who is the chair of this foundation. He now sits on the board of AADAC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Grant Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Clint. Dianne, I want to begin by saying that I am very frustrated that we are here today talking about doing away with the Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation when we never should have structured it in the first place. Members of this committee on a number of occasions argued vehemently that this was a duplication of bureaucracy which ran in the face of everything that a Conservative government should structure, that it certainly tells us that it wants to do. Today I want to say, "We told you so." It was unnecessary to have structured this in the first place. It's a waste of money because it could have been done under AADAC. My first question is: how much money did we spend, that we didn't have to spend, because this government set up an agency which, strictly speaking, was a duplication of what already exists in AADAC? Anything done under this agency that was different than that could have been done by AADAC without the additional administrative cost. Could you please tell us what exactly was spent that didn't have to be spent?

MRS. MIROSH: Well, Grant, we don't always agree on everything. This was a commitment that then Premier Don Getty made to the people of Alberta for reasons that he felt were important, and they still are. I can honestly look you in the eye and say that there isn't one dollar that was spent that was unnecessary. If you look at the piece of paper I just passed around, the grants that we've awarded to people, each one of those community distress centres -- anybody who's doing research will argue that this was money well spent. Right now when we're under times of financial restraint, we do have to review everything, and that's why this is before us.

MR. MITCHELL: Dianne, I think you said earlier, of course, that you've laid off five or so staff, some of whom were brought from AADAC, given new jobs in this foundation. Then you said that

there was severance as a result of that. How can you argue that no extra money was spent? Clearly severance was paid on these, and rightly so, for letting these people go. Could you please tell me how much was spent in severance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. While you're thinking about that, we've had some visitors come into the gallery once again. I want to of course welcome them on behalf of the committee that is meeting here this morning. We are the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. As a committee we are a little more informal than what you might normally see if we were in session. We are allowed to remove jackets. We are allowed to sit in different spaces than what we're ordinarily assigned. So if you're trying to match up people with where they're sitting, I would suggest you review the portraits of people that have been provided. We are here today hearing evidence from the Hon. Dianne Mirosh, and it's regarding the Alberta Family Life and Substance Abuse Foundation. You're welcome and Merry Christmas to you.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that severance pay is not public knowledge, but I can tell you that there were two laid off and one resigned. The executive director who was responsible for this foundation came from AADAC and has worked for the government a number of years. He did receive a combined amount for the accumulated years that he spent with the government.

MR. MITCHELL: Who's advising you that severance pay isn't public knowledge? Why wouldn't it be public knowledge? I'm not asking for specifics with respect to a given employee, but I'm asking for an overall amount that was paid in severance. I mean, you can make the decision. Surely your staff doesn't make a decision about that.

MRS. MIROSH: Only one individual received severance pay. There were two part-time people that were employed that did not receive severance pay. So giving that information does divulge that one individual, and that was accumulative years he spent with the government over and above what was spent with this foundation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; thank you.
Carol Haley.

MS HALEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question to the minister is: when will the amalgamation of the foundation and AADAC be completed?

10:23

MRS. MIROSH: Well, if the trustee who's been recently appointed is successful in negotiating these contracts to the end of March 1994, then there probably will be no need to carry it over to AADAC. If, however, he is not successful and the commitments over the next three years have to be sustained, then that will be the responsibility of AADAC, to follow those contracts through after March 1994.

MS HALEY: Okay; thank you.

The supplementary is: could you please tell us what effect the amalgamation will have on heritage fund involvement?

MRS. MIROSH: The effect is that you will no longer need to forward any dollars to the foundation. In effect, we're not going to exist. The \$5 million that was originally committed to this foundation would thus end.

MS HALEY: So AADAC will be funding the ongoing programs?

MRS. MIROSH: No. The heritage trust fund dollars have been already established, the million dollars, in order to settle these awards and grants. So those dollars are already in place for that from the heritage trust fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Now, I hope I haven't overlooked anybody. I have Grant Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Clint. Dianne, I'd like to pursue the extra costs issue further. Clearly, when you set up the foundation, you had to lease office space. I doubt that the office space was leased on a 17-month lease. I expect that some of that lease still exists. Could you please tell us how much money we spent for extra space we didn't need for those 17 months and how long that lease will continue for space we certainly don't need now?

MRS. MIROSH: Well, that's right, but we were lucky and were able to sublet it. The foundation commitment for office rental lease payments, 1994, was \$31,802, and the remaining amount was \$18,000. So there's total commitments of \$50,000. It's in the annual report, and I'd be happy to get you a copy of it. It's all detailed in here. We are now negotiating subletting through public works.

MR. MITCHELL: So you haven't sublet yet. You're negotiating it.

MRS. MIROSH: Well, public works has taken it over, so I haven't been involved.

MR. MITCHELL: Who is?

MRS. MIROSH: Public works has taken over all the assets and the lease commitment, so I have not been involved in that negotiation.

MR. MITCHELL: So what you're saying is that you can't tell us how much extra money this is going to cost us over the duration of that lease, until that lease has gone?

MRS. MIROSH: Right.

MR. MITCHELL: My next question. Clearly, the foundation didn't operate without extra equipment. I'm sure there are computers and desks and leasehold improvements; who knows? I guess you'll know. Could you please tell us how much extra money we spent on equipment that we didn't need? Because clearly AADAC had equipment when the foundation was running.

MRS. MIROSH: Well, there was \$17,823 spent on equipment, and that equipment has been taken over by public works as well. I believe the computer is in my office now. The rest of the equipment is with public works, and they dispose of it the way they do any equipment.

MR. MITCHELL: Earlier we were told that there were no extra costs, and now I'm up at about \$49,000 extra costs that we didn't need to spend. Could you please tell us, given that there were two boards -- there was a board of the foundation and a board of AADAC during that period of time -- what exactly we spent on stipends, per diem and expenses, for board members that we didn't have to spend because we had an AADAC board?

MRS. MIROSH: I was told by the chair, Mr. Agrios, that none of them took stipends. There were costs for travel incurred. They had very few meetings, so there was very little spent on the board. They did it basically on a volunteer basis.

MR. MITCHELL: What were the expenses?

MRS. MIROSH: I don't have the breakdown of the exact expenses of the board. There were only three meetings, I'm told.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Like, it's kind of hanging there. Is that going to be provided then?

MRS. MIROSH: I can get that information for you. There were only three meetings held. There were not a lot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Ed Stelmach, and then Mike Percy.

MR. STELMACH: Well, thank you. Good morning. In 1991-92 the foundation spent a portion of the dollars that were budgeted for at about \$400,000. Then in 1992-93, of the \$5 million that was allotted to the foundation only about \$1.5 million was spent. What was the reason for spending substantially less than the budgeted amounts for the foundation for those particular years?

MRS. MIROSH: First, 1991-92 was the start-up of the foundation. Establishing the office, the equipment, the staff, the board contracted services out; 1992-93 was basically the distribution of the grant dollars.

MR. STELMACH: The million-dollar budget that's been approved for the foundation for 1993-94: will that money be spent? What will it be spent on then?

MRS. MIROSH: There are obligations that actually go over the next three years, such as the Jellinek Society. It takes us beyond this fiscal year, past March. We want to wind it down. We've asked for all of that money to be put into this budget so we can have it all completed by the end of March 1994.

MR. STELMACH: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; thank you.
I have Mike Percy.

DR. PERCY: Madam Minister, with regards to the program itself, that was to undertake innovative research into issues related to substance abuse. One question I have relates to the allocation of grants and the focus of research, because looking at the list of grants, it appears to be heavily weighted towards academic research into substance abuse. My question is: to what extent, then, were programs or studies undertaken to focus on at-risk groups, particularly, for example, isolated northern communities? I see there is the High Level project listed here, but other than that it appears to be very much a sort of urban oriented research program. Can you tell me to what extent these studies then were really much broader in focus and really targeting at-risk groups in northern communities or other isolated areas?

MRS. MIROSH: I think the board was hoping to get into that if they had time to spend the rest of those dollars, but the board, with Jack Agrios as chair, made these decisions at arm's length from government. I feel that they felt these research programs were important. There are two actually. The Action North Recovery Centre was one that reached the north, and then there was one other. Was there one other? No, that was the only one. So I really can't answer that question because it was a board decision that I wasn't directly involved with.

DR. PERCY: The second question, Madam Minister. It sounds peculiar coming from somebody from the academic community, but in many instances you can study a problem to death without actually doing anything. A wide array of studies have been undertaken as to substance abuse, the factors which trigger a propensity to become subject to abuse. To what extent, then, were the programs concerned both with researching specifics in the province but also just trying to implement programs that would work? I would think the real issue is implementation of good programs as opposed to rediscovering the wheel.

MRS. MIROSH: You bring up a good point, and I'm glad you said that about the academics. You would know more than I would. There were some excellent studies done. Hopefully, they will be carried through with AADAC in that AADAC is already funding a number of these programs, and the results of these studies will be implemented through AADAC.

DR. PERCY: A final question. Did the board when it was considering and reviewing research projects have at its disposal, in a sense, an array of studies that have already been undertaken, that have already looked at these issues in other jurisdictions which were appropriate? Or did we in a sense just choose those projects that looked good for Alberta and which were really in a sense repetitive of projects that I know have been undertaken in northern Manitoba, northern Saskatchewan, northern Ontario, for example?

MRS. MIROSH: Yes. The board actually had an expert advisory committee. This expert advisory committee brought to their attention reviews of research proposals. The committee members selected by the board consisted of experts in the field of substance abuse and family from Canada, the United States, England, and Switzerland. Their names are Dr. Maureen Baker, School of Social Work, McGill University; Dr. Eric Single, Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse; Dr. Fred Glaser, University of Michigan Substance Abuse Centre; Dr. Carol Matusicky -- I may have mispronounced that name -- British Columbia Council for the Family; Dr. Sverre Fauske of the International Labour Office, Geneva; and Mr. John Marsden, The Turning Point, London, England. So they had a lot of expertise they drew on. I didn't even know you were going to ask that question.

10:33

DR. PERCY: Now I know why there was \$350,000 in up-front costs, given the geographic distribution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bonnie Laing.

MRS. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Mirosch, I was wondering: were there any research projects that had a potential for revenue regeneration?

MRS. MIROSH: Not to my knowledge, Bonnie, but that's certainly something I can check. You, as the chair of AADAC, would certainly be the recipient of any if that were the case.

MRS. LAING: Okay. Thank you. That was my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sine Chadi.

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, in your opening comments you mentioned that we have spent or committed \$1.46 million today. You also mentioned there were a number of future grant commitments in place. I'm a bit confused as to what the

number is in terms of dollars of these future grant commitments, or have you counted that in that \$1.46 million?

MRS. MIROSH: Well, what you have before you is that some of these grants have been paid out only in portions. We still owe a significant amount of money to some that we haven't paid. The total of that will be about a million dollars. That's what we have asked the heritage trust fund for. We're trying to settle the three-year commitment and complete it by the end of March, so some of them have been given a small amount this year and are supposed to receive more next year and then two years subsequent. We want to wrap it all up, so it's a million dollars we've asked the heritage trust fund to give us to support the winding down of our obligations.

MR. CHADI: Madam Minister, you mentioned as well that we're looking at the amalgamation now of this program with AADAC. I'm wondering: are the future grants and the funds that are still owed to some of these commitments going to be administered through AADAC, or are we still going to do it through the trustee? It would seem reasonable to me that if we're going to do the amalgamation, we just go ahead and do the amalgamation and allow AADAC to go ahead and do their job.

MRS. MIROSH: That's a good question. The trustee's contract arrangement is only until the end of March 1994, and his final findings will then be turned over to AADAC. I would like to remind the committee that AADAC funds a number of these agents as well, so a number of these agents are already getting a double hit, which was a surprise to me. The Jellinek Society is one of them.

MR. CHADI: That's interesting. Madam Minister, I would question, then, that if some of these are getting a double hit, why are we actually doing it? Do we have to go through with these commitments? Can we not back out of them?

MRS. MIROSH: The previous board made these commitments, and we are obligated by those contracts this board committed to. The trustee's job is to try and settle it the best we can do financially and otherwise. There is a program the Jellinek Society started, a nonresidential aftercare program for women and children. That's our largest commitment right now, and it opened October of this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Heather Forsyth.

MRS. FORSYTH: Yes. Madam Minister, I just have one question. Has the foundation provided funding for any research into the effectiveness of the adolescent substance abuse treatment programs available in this province?

MRS. MIROSH: The Calgary Distress Centre/Drug Centre will receive \$339,800 -- it's supposed to be over four years -- and this was to evaluate or develop an evaluation of the youth drug program. AADAC as well is supposed to receive dollars to evaluate their provincial adolescent treatment program, and that's \$374,900.

MRS. FORSYTH: I guess my concern right now is the fact that if we treat youths now, we're stopping the problem ahead of time. Have you considered putting any money into a drug rehabilitation program now for the teenagers, similar to Whitespruce in Yorkton?

MRS. MIROSH: Not under the Alberta family life and substance abuse centre, but certainly with AADAC we are examining those youth programs. There will be a detailed review on that.

MRS. FORSYTH: I'm pleased to hear that. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Don Massey.

DR. MASSEY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. May I ask: what use does the government make of research that's funded out of this?

MRS. MIROSH: The use that government makes of any research? I'm led to believe that this research is certainly there to help places like the Calgary Distress Centre, the Action North Recovery Centre, the Jellinek Society, Business Against Drugs so businesses can get involved. Any of the agencies that are involved with drug and alcohol abuse have access to this research, and they can apply the research to hands-on care.

DR. MASSEY: I guess I was thinking of a broader level in terms of policy. I look at the Burton study on trying to determine a picture of alcohol and drug use in Alberta and seeking Alberta's opinions on that. Certainly I imagine access to alcohol would be one of the concerns he would address, and I wonder if that played any role in the government's privatization of the liquor stores.

MRS. MIROSH: I don't know that he got into privatization of liquor stores. We only gave Dr. Burton \$34,475 to analyze data to provide a detailed picture of alcohol and drug use in Alberta. We have not seen the final results yet, but once we do, I certainly will table all these studies in the House.

DR. MASSEY: I guess just a last question then. There isn't any mechanism in place to make sure the result of the money spent here is funnelled to the appropriate government agencies when they're making decisions?

MRS. MIROSH: We get paid for this research, and I believe that's our obligation: to make sure it's funnelled to the agency of AADAC that will be carrying over the obligation of this foundation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Victor Doerksen.

MR. DOERKSEN: Thank you. Just reading the April '93 report, it makes a brief comment that says the minister and Dr. Hewitt answered many questions about existing and potential programs, including a program to combat smoking by young children. You're probably aware, as I am, that we've been receiving some mail supporting Ty Lund's Bill, I think it is, on smoking. Was there any report or recommendations that came from the foundation in terms of policy considerations?

MRS. MIROSH: With regards to smoking?

MR. DOERKSEN: Yeah.

MRS. MIROSH: No.

MR. DOERKSEN: So what was this program they were making reference to all about then?

MRS. MIROSH: I don't know. I can't answer that question. I'm not sure. Dr. Hewitt didn't have time to complete a lot of the programs and research information he started. I believe it's incomplete.

MR. DOERKSEN: Don also mentioned the alcohol side in terms of access, and I've received a fair amount of support in terms of raising

the drinking age. Again, were there any recommendations coming out of that foundation on policy toward those kinds of issues?

MRS. MIROSH: Not at this time. What they were doing, though, is they were involved in a very active program with the private sector in creating knowledge on drinking and driving. There was a combined partnership effort with this committee. There is a campus alcohol abuse prevention project, and a first report from this campus alcohol use and prevention program contained information on attitudes regarding campus alcohol use. That's specifically related, I guess, to the universities and colleges. A second report was supposed to have come from the University of Calgary and Lethbridge college by the fall of '93. We have not received that yet.

10:43

MR. WHITE: Madam Minister, when was the annual report you referred to published?

MRS. MIROSH: It was tabled in the House in '92-93. I think it was the spring session. Did you want a copy of it?

MR. WHITE: Well, it's a little late now. I would have liked to have read it before I had a chance to question you. But it was tabled and I should have been able to find it. There isn't anything more recent. When do you expect to publish?

MRS. MIROSH: When we wind it down. It will be the '93-94 annual report. This one was tabled in the House prior to the election.

MR. WHITE: With your permission, there are no subsequent questions directed to the publishing. I just wanted to know if that was something that was fairly new.

More to the questions that Denis had with regards to problem gambling, not directly related to either the mandate of AADAC or the mandate under which this foundation was set up but to do with addictions. Addictions, whether they be any of the substances, all relate to the person. At least AADAC's philosophy tells me it's all related to the person. Tell me: why was it, then, that either this foundation or AADAC was not charged with the responsibility of analyzing the effect of problem gaming and gambling in the province and, while looking at the problem, therefore designing the solution?

MRS. MIROSH: The mandate and role of this foundation was established by a committee that went through public consultation. They came up with a mission statement and objectives and goals based on what they heard from the public. Gaming at that time, when this was set up, was not a significant issue of the day. That was in 1989. We were just establishing video lottery machines, but it was not considered as important as drug and alcohol addiction. So the mandate was set up based on the results of that public consultation.

MR. WHITE: Since that time, it would seem reasonable to most of us, and perhaps yourself in hindsight, that almost everything dealing with addictive behaviour and therefore antisocial behaviour would and should fall under one umbrella, under your department's umbrella. Then why was it that the studies were done by the minister responsible for lotteries as opposed to either one of the agencies that have had a great deal of experience dealing with setting up the goals and objectives of these studies?

MRS. MIROSH: This foundation was very slow in getting established. Really, they were just getting wound up when we

decided to wind them down. Had they been able to continue meeting those goals and objectives, I think you would have seen that change in moving into gambling addiction. Now that we have repealed this legislation, AADAC will certainly fulfill that role and has already started.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Ed Stelmach.

MR. STELMACH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, in all the research projects that were funded by the foundation, is there any potential for some revenue generation?

MRS. MIROSH: The Member for Calgary-Bow asked that question because she's the chairman responsible for AADAC. It's certainly an area that I'm not aware of, but if there is revenue generation, it will certainly go back to AADAC. I will check that out.

MR. STELMACH: Is there any potential for all the money that goes into this research that is, quite frankly, done by the academic community at the expense of the taxpayer? Is there any way of setting up some sort of strategy, a plan to deal with it, so that we get a decent return in the future so this money isn't just funnelled through some very few select people?

MRS. MIROSH: I think the idea of revenue generation through the foundation was through donations outside community and through businesses. We would put in a set amount of money and there would be matching dollars from the business community. That was the only way we could generate any revenue whatsoever. People would, through some tax concessions, donate to this foundation, but I haven't seen any donations so far -- oh, the one project, the \$70,000 from distillers, I am told, but that is being spent on advertisements and awareness programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're happy, Ed? Okay.

Now we're back to a rotation on the front benches here. Grant Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. Dianne, the report shows that the total that has been spent on this to March 31, 1993, is \$2 million. Could you briefly just tell us how much of that has actually gone into work, into studies or program delivery, as opposed to administration?

MRS. MIROSH: It's \$1,460,417.

MR. MITCHELL: Gone into actual work?

MRS. MIROSH: Grants.

MR. MITCHELL: Grants.

MRS. MIROSH: And that's before you.

MR. MITCHELL: So what that says -- and maybe you could confirm this -- is that \$540,000 in one year, which is the period of this report, has gone into administration, duplication of what AADAC was doing and could still be doing and probably did at the same time. Just \$540,000.

MRS. MIROSH: It's over two years. But there was consultation done with a number of groups on injection drug users in Calgary, medical effects of cocaine, crack, and collaborative research like I

mentioned -- the campus alcohol program -- and the International Symposium on Economic Costs of Substance Abuse and development of standard serving information for alcoholic beverages in Canada. These are the consultation services that we paid. The cost of that was over and above the grants, so the actual expenditure on salaries was \$55,932 in 1991 and \$23,054 in '92-93.

MR. MITCHELL: You just mentioned that there was an international symposium on . . .

MRS. MIROSH: Economic costs of substance abuse.

MR. MITCHELL: Where was that held, and who attended on behalf of Alberta at how much cost?

MRS. MIROSH: That's still to come, but we spent money on it. The Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse -- we forwarded dollars to help fund an expert seminar, which is coming this spring, 1994. We have committed to that to discuss the economic cost of substance abuse. The foundation agreed to host this event in Banff, and we have made that commitment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're owed a supplementary.

MR. MITCHELL: Oh, I am?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, unless I miscounted.

MR. MITCHELL: Oh, sorry. Okay.

MR. WHITE: I warn you; never give up a supplemental.

MR. MITCHELL: No. That's great. Usually I try to get a fourth, and this time I didn't even try to get my third.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll have to watch more closely. [interjection]

MR. WHITE: Don't worry; we're watching.

MR. MITCHELL: I wonder if you could just confirm that you are going to report to the committee on how much money in expenses has been paid to the board members.

10:53

MRS. MIROSH: Well, at the year-end when everything has wound down, it is my intention to report to the committee since it's heritage trust fund money. That will be the next fiscal year. Mr. Chairman, I really plan on being as frugal as I can in working with the trustee and trying to be fair with all these people to sustain the programs they have and trying not to spend as much money as we have put before you. We have no staff. I'm it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We know you're trying hard, Dianne.
Mike Percy.

DR. PERCY: Madam Chairman, with regards to the question brought up by Ed Stelmach, in terms of in a sense the revenue generated -- I mean, there are two sorts of revenue flow generated by this type of applied research. There are certainly the higher incomes that arise from lower absentee rates, and a lot of those gains accrue to the government through taxes, also to the private sector specifically through higher productivity. Then there are those sets of costs or benefits that arise from forestalling addiction among youths to tobacco, to alcohol, and the like. Those accrue to society

as a whole, so it's the proper role of government to go in and try to implement programs that will lead to lower addiction rates regardless of the substance.

Now, a question I have concerns the role of the private sector in terms of the benefits of reducing substance abuse, the absenteeism, lower productivity, mishaps, et cetera. There's a very clear benefit for the private sector to be actively involved in that portion of the benefits. What did the foundation attempt to do in this regard? If the chairman and the minister will allow me a little latitude, what is AADAC attempting to do in terms of innovative relationships with the private sector to get programs in place because clearly they are beneficiary?

MRS. MIROSH: Yes, they are. As I already mentioned, \$70,000 is set aside by the Alberta distillers, in partnership with this foundation, to make aware the drug and alcohol addiction through ads, newspaper literature, and TV. This is a very important part of AADAC's responsibility as well. The chair of AADAC is on this committee, and she will fulfill the obligations AADAC has in partnership with businesses. Especially now that we have privatized liquor stores, we expect they will play a significant role in funding some of these addiction programs. It is felt that education awareness programs are the most beneficial. This is where the business community wants to spend their dollars.

DR. PERCY: Following up on that, my first supplemental. I would think newspaper ads probably are not particularly effective as they're one-shot vehicles, and programs in place by firms would be more successful.

MRS. MIROSH: Well, it's not newspaper ads but the inserts they put into papers. It's a whole awareness program: booklets they insert into the newspapers and they're delivered with the newspapers. They've been quite effective.

DR. PERCY: For example, you would think one vehicle for ensuring there are programs in place would be within government and attacking absentee rates and the problems that arise from substance abuse affecting the productivity of workers within government. Does the foundation or the government have programs that are in place, operational within government departments?

MRS. MIROSH: You mean business with government and reducing . . .

DR. PERCY: No, just within government departments.

MRS. MIROSH: Certainly with Health there are some programs. We overlap with Health. We overlap with social service programs in consultation with psychologists, counseling. There are a number of overlap departments that AADAC must work with. This foundation did not get directly involved in any government departments, as it didn't have the time to do that, but started in consultation with psychologists and counselors who work with the Family and Social Services department. Also, there's the Department of Education setting up programs through CALM. The CALM program in high schools teaches drug and alcohol addiction. Businesses participated in that program at the education level of the younger group. We see drug addiction starting at the age of 12. So every single department in government basically plays some role, even the department of the Attorney General with drinking and driving and drug programs. So we've overlapped in many, many areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mike, to be fair to you, you were in the preamble of your first supplementary and then the discussion took place about the newspaper. Was that going to be a question? You have another one now if you want to do that.

DR. PERCY: Well, I would just follow up, then, what the minister has stated. I was curious. It wasn't integration of the foundation work or AADAC with program delivery by various government departments; it was whether within government departments themselves there are programs set up to deal with substance abuse by government employees. That would appear to me to be an easy way to in fact have pilot projects in place and try and enhance productivity. The government is probably no different than any other firm in terms of having problems in that regard.

MRS. MIROSH: This of course is out of the jurisdiction of the foundation at this time. It now moves into partnership programs with departments and business, with AADAC, which is not what we're here to discuss. The foundation certainly did not get involved in any of those programs but probably would have.

DR. PERCY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Sine Chadi.

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I'm having a bit of a problem trying to determine the actual numbers that have been spent so far on this program. In the 1993-94 estimates it clearly states that the actual amount spent in the 1992-93 fiscal year was \$1.544 million. Then it says that the total amount expended to March 31, 1993, was \$1.969 million. Almost \$2 million was expended to that point in time. Now, your opening remarks and subsequent comments refer to the amount of money spent to date as \$1.46 million. I've got three or four different sets of figures here. Please tell me what is actually correct here. How much did we spend so far in this program?

MRS. MIROSH: Exactly \$1,460,417 is all we've spent. We have obligations to spend more; we just haven't spent it. Thus the trustee is there in place to wind down the expenditures, and those we have committed to will probably get less. So as we sit here, the actual amount spent to date on grants is \$1,460,417. Those other numbers that you have there -- we just haven't spent that. They're obligations in place, but we haven't spent it.

MR. CHADI: Okay. Do we put in our estimates, then, the actual number of dollars spent being \$1.54 million? That is a figure in these estimates that is approximately \$100,000 more than what you say we've spent to date. This here is for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993. Here we are in December of 1993, and we say the total we've spent so far is \$100,000 less than what we said as at March 31, 1993. Explain that.

MR. HENKE: The numbers are derived from two different sources. The \$1.4 million the minister is talking about is coming out of the financial statements of the foundation. The \$1.5 million you're talking about is coming out of the financial statements of the government on the heritage fund. The heritage fund has in fact given \$1.5 million to the foundation. The foundation hasn't spent all of that money, so the minister is giving you the information about the actual program expenditures made by the foundation. There's some justifiable difference between those two numbers.

MR. CHADI: Has the trustee that's been appointed prepared any projections at all as to the total amount this program or this foundation is actually going to need? I know we've set aside \$5 million. Have there been some projections now saying, "This is the amount of money we're going to spend; this is what we'll need, and no more"? What is that figure?

MRS. MIROSH: I've given you the grant obligations that we have on that sheet of paper. As you can see, the Calgary Distress Centre/Drug Centre oversees X number of dollars over four years, the Action North over three years, the Jellinek Society over three years, and so on. So the trustee has in place the amount of money of \$1 million that we have asked from the heritage trust fund to commit the rest of our obligations, which is less, really, than what you see before you.

MR. CHADI: So you're saying that if we've spent \$1.469 million to date and a further \$1 million is required, then the total amount this will cost Albertans is \$2.469 million or thereabouts, but that's the limit.

MRS. MIROSH: Another \$1 million is what we would like to settle on.

MR. CHADI: Mr. Chairman, that was only for clarification purposes. One more question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was still your second one. Nice try.
Don Massey.

DR. MASSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In total, this was a large piece of research funding. Can you tell me: was it part of a total provincial priority program for research?

MRS. MIROSH: Which are you referring to?

DR. MASSEY: The money from the fund put into these various projects. The question I'm asking: is it part of a priority program that the government has established for research in the province?

MRS. MIROSH: No.

DR. MASSEY: So is there such a plan?

MRS. MIROSH: Not unless AADAC has one. I'm not aware of it. This was decided by the board of directors of the day, and it was chaired by Jack Agrios. They made these commitments at arm's length from government. So there is no government policy established that gave this foundation criteria in order to fund research projects.

DR. MASSEY: Just to follow then. Have you any idea of what percentage of government-funded research this made up?

MRS. MIROSH: You mean the total amount of government money research just for the foundation? That's very small. I can't give you the exact amount, but I can also tell you that the TRT -- when Fred Stewart was the minister, he also was involved in some of these research programs within government policy. This board, that I'm aware of, did not work directly with any government department in research, but certainly Mr. Stewart then was examining ways of setting priorities in research projects.

MR. WHITE: Madam Minister, I think earlier in your statements you did say that although the objectives of the foundation were laudable, it's time to move on to funding in other areas.

This foundation and AADAC being so similar that they overlapped, why is it, then, that with the funding for this organization dwindling and AADAC's budget also dropped substantially, in the neighbourhood of 15 to 20 percent, I believe, in the last two years, we haven't seen any statement from the government saying that the problem is any less than it was when the then Premier declared that \$5 million was a goal in this area? How can the differences in the need and the money be justified?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Lance is always an interesting situation. We'll let him go ahead, and if you don't wish to answer that one . . .

MRS. MIROSH: The need is there. The need will always be there. When you put money into programs like this, it doesn't cure alcohol and drug addiction. I wish it did; then it wouldn't cost the government anything. But the time has come where we just don't have the kinds of dollars to spend on programs that we'd like to. The community at large is now starting to come up with some innovative ideas that don't cost the government as much money and are very creative. I can give you an example. It has nothing to do with the foundation, but a good example is AARC in Calgary. Perhaps you should take a little trip to Calgary and we'll take you through this program totally funded by the community: fund-raising, the parents pay into it, and now even judges award sentences to youth who are convicted of drug addiction to this program and other programs in AADAC. The problem isn't less; it's just that the community at large is now contributing more. They're contributing more of their time. There's more awareness. The universities are contributing more for less dollars, as we're all doing.

MR. WHITE: Then if the need hasn't diminished and there being other innovative ways of putting it together, is it not time perhaps, with the windup of the foundation, to ask the trustee -- no, more than that: to instruct the trustee -- to review all the programs that are out there at present to see if deliverance of the actual service is much more important to the province in dealing with this problem, particularly with the dropping in the funds, than the continuation and the completion of some of these programs? The ones I cite in particular are the ones that are looking to midlife balance and family commitments to work, retirement plans, career demand, and that sort of thing, and the development of testing methods to teach doctors how to find alcohol and drug abuse early in their patients. I guess the question, rephrased, is: cannot you instruct the trustee to evaluate each and every one of these programs, to say "Yes, it should be continued" or "No, we should put it into perhaps AADAC," and to, say, look at getting more counselors on the front line in deliverance of the service as opposed to studying it?

MRS. MIROSH: The trustee was hired to do a specific job, and that was to wind down the financial contributions to these organizations. His contract does not go further, to investigate the actual workings of these various community organizations, but certainly it is within AADAC's mandate. Once these studies are completed, we will receive these studies. They will go to AADAC, and they are in a better position to evaluate these programs. As we look at our three-year plan, they are evaluating those priorities and those programs that AADAC delivers and that other agencies deliver. AADAC, as I have mentioned before, already funds a number of these programs, as well as the foundation.

MR. WHITE: The trustee is Mr. Jack Agrios; is it?

MRS. MIROSH: The trustee is Mr. Michael Welsh. Jack Agrios is now sitting on the board of AADAC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's it.
Grant Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: I'm interested in the work of the foundation on children's and adolescent addiction, particularly -- well, to be in with smoking. I wonder whether the minister could give us an indication of her position on banning the sale of what are called kiddie packs of cigarettes, packages of 15 to 20.

MRS. MIROSH: What's this got to do with the foundation?

MR. MITCHELL: Well, it would seem to me that if the foundation is concerned about drug, alcohol, and substance abuse, they would have an opinion on these kinds of issues: kiddie packs, vending machines, generic packaging, sale of cigarettes in pharmacies. How do you feel about that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd just advise the minister that we try to be as accommodating as we can to you. If you wish to answer that, you're certainly welcome to.

MRS. MIROSH: I'm allowed to give an opinion only? Well, as a nurse myself and as a person who is against smoking, I would ban all of those machines, I tell you, overnight. But society the way it is, it certainly is an area -- the smoking addiction has not been funded by AADAC and not by this program. Certainly there are a number of submissions that have been made to our special planning committee that we've reviewed and will continue to review on smoking. In my opinion, smoking should be banned worldwide.

11:13

MR. MITCHELL: Last year we pursued this, and comments were made about a program to combat smoking by young children. I wonder whether the minister could report to us on exactly what that program has done.

MRS. MIROSH: I don't know what the program has done, but certainly again it's part of education awareness to the youth. Specifically, funding that goes towards the smoking issue is smoking marijuana or the drugs that they inhale. [interjections] Smoking up drugs.

MR. WHITE: My last question is: you don't inhale; right?

MRS. MIROSH: I don't smoke, never mind inhale.

MR. MITCHELL: The minister has, I think, been outspoken about the Young Offenders Act and that that would somehow be a way to deter various crimes perpetrated by adolescent offenders, amongst them, undoubtedly, drug-related offences. I wonder whether the minister could tell us whether deterrents actually work or whether generally it's accepted that treatment is a more effective way of reducing drug abuse and drug-related crimes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Minister, before you answer that -- I get it. This is a test; right? This is to see just how far the chair will go with you on this.

MR. MITCHELL: No, it isn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you clarify then.

MR. MITCHELL: We have a minister who is responsible for this substance abuse foundation. This substance abuse foundation has made decisions about how substance abuse should be reduced or should be considering those decisions. The minister herself and her government are outspoken on the fact that the Young Offenders Act isn't tough enough. Clearly, part of the implication of that is that it's not tough enough to reduce adolescent drug-related crimes. I'm wanting to find out how the minister lines these two things up: deterrents versus treatment as a way of reducing drug abuse and therefore drug-related crimes amongst adolescents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The problem I'm having, though, is that to some extent, being a rookie, I'm trying to learn the rules as I go. You can see from the schedule that we're going to have quite a number of other ministers. If I don't start trying to provide some sort of parameter as to what both ministers and members can expect under my chairmanship, virtually we could have two hours filled up with things that were not related to the role and the task which I see we have here in front of us. Now, I don't want to be overly task oriented, but . . .

MR. MITCHELL: I do. I want to be really task oriented, and I think this is very task oriented.

MRS. MIROSH: Well, I would like, Mr. Chairman, to just keep this in the context of the foundation and the issue and effects of cocaine and crack and injection of drugs and long-term studies of substance abuse from the medical point of view. Alcohol prevention programs are in my view the way we go with our youth. I know early intervention is very, very important, and I can't think of a better place than in our education system. A number of these youth who are exposed to drugs -- from what I am told, it starts in the schools and outside the school grounds and now starts as early as age 12. It is, I think, our obligation as government and society to teach our youth about the effects of cocaine, crack, and any type of drugs, whether you inhale it by cigarette or inject it or just drink it. I think it is really important that we start at education, at educating our youth.

I think the best way and the best defence is that those children who have been rehabilitated teach other kids. This is what I see in the AARC program. Some of those kids who have been in that program are the very young offenders that you're talking about. They have actually burnt houses down. They have criminal records that are as tall as they are, and some of them are only 14 years old. They're prostitutes on the streets; they're pimps already. The best program that I've seen is peer counseling. Those kids know better than anybody -- any adult, any counselor -- what they face when they enter the streets of drug and alcohol abuse, which turns them into offenders because they need the money to sustain their habit. I would really very much, Mr. Chairman, like to have one of those youth who have been rehabilitated come and talk to Members of the Legislative Assembly. They could tell you what would work in prevention better than I could, because they know what's worked for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much. They should probably come and talk to Steve West.

MR. CHAIRMAN: See what I've started? See what I've let go here? I'm going to need a whistle; I guess I have a striped shirt.

MR. MITCHELL: I appreciate that answer.

My supplementary. I guess it's clear now that once the contracts that are committed are spent, the heritage trust fund is out of the drug abuse foundation and out of that kind of work. Is that the case, or is there a role for the heritage trust fund to play through AADAC in promoting education to youth, for example, or in promoting drug abuse programs of one kind or another?

MRS. MIROSH: I think that's a good question. Once we see the results of the research that we've paid for, perhaps there will be a role. Maybe we'll come back to the heritage trust fund for some additional funds for that role, especially in education and programs that AADAC has not got the revenue to fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mike Percy.

DR. PERCY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister. My colleague Don Massey had raised the issue earlier of priorities and where to allocate that last dollar. When one looks at that decision, obviously you would hope, then, that it would be determined by where the benefit is greatest for putting that last dollar that you have at your disposal. I was somewhat distressed to hear you say that really there's not an overall set of priorities that we have in this area. Looking at other tasks that are funded by the heritage savings trust fund -- for example, occupational health and safety research and education -- clearly some of the issues addressed by the foundation fall under Labour in that program because there are a lot of work-related accidents that arise directly from substance abuse. I was also distressed when you said that in the spring we're going to have a forum on the economic costs of substance abuse, when one would have thought that would have been front and centre and would have determined where the funds would have been allocated.

So after my long preamble -- my thanks to the chairman -- the first question: is there a set of priorities? Have studies been done, in terms of substance abuse, as to where the economic costs to our society are the greatest? Clearly, that should be the signal for where to allocate funds for AADAC or whatever agencies emerge that deal with the consequences of substance abuse. Do we know where the benefits are greatest?

MRS. MIROSH: That's a long question. First of all, with regard specifically to the foundation. The priorities I thought were asked for me to respond with regards to the foundation. We hadn't set any priorities for the foundation research because we weren't in business long enough to do that. There is research going on, over and above what this foundation is doing, through the research department in government. The priorities with regards to drug and alcohol abuse would be set by AADAC, and AADAC is not funded by the heritage trust fund. I haven't been getting into the AADAC budget because we're here to talk about the foundation. But I feel these are issues and questions that should be addressed, and as the minister responsible for AADAC I'd certainly be willing to do that. There are numerous studies done, not only locally and provincially but across the country and across the world, and I think it's probably time we did collect that data and set those priorities, particularly now, when our funding is shrinking.

As far as AADAC is concerned, the largest amount of dollars spent is in the rehab programs. We have 800 beds that we're funding for rehabilitation, and whether it's cost-effective or not, that's what we are examining at this time. We also know that people who have been rehabilitated from substance abuse want to give back to the community in some way or another. We also know that alcoholism is now considered a disease, so it is funded by workers' compensation.

So there are a lot of changes that are occurring and ongoing, and setting our priorities will be done by AADAC.

11:23

DR. PERCY: A first supplemental. The reason I bring this issue up again is again to address the issue brought up by Ed Stelmach, that the revenue generated from these programs is precisely the benefit of having those individuals out being productive, and in many cases it's not a clear dollar. You can't see the dollars. All you know is that your tax base is larger, people are living more productive, healthy lives, and the benefits are there. The only way you can demonstrate that, then, is by clearly having an idea of what those benefits are, and there's study after study out there that says, you know, what the benefits of rehabilitation are. I think if we have those data on hand, it's easy, then, to demonstrate that such programs are extraordinarily cost-effective from society's perspective, even though any one particular firm may not think so. So there's a real, legitimate role there for government.

I have no further questions.

MRS. MIROSH: I'll take that under advisement.

MR. CHADI: Madam Minister, you mentioned that the trustee is a fellow by the name of Michael Welsh. My question to you is: what sorts of qualifications has Michael Welsh? Has he come to you with qualifications as an accountant or a lawyer? Could you tell us something about this trustee?

MRS. MIROSH: I could give you his curriculum vitae, if you like. He is a lawyer from Edmonton.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Boo.

MRS. MIROSH: Yeah, boo.

He has a lot of experience in negotiating contracts such as this.

MR. CHADI: Is this a full-time position now, until the end of March I believe you mentioned?

MRS. MIROSH: It's not a full-time position. His job is very specific, and he has been asked to meet with each of these, the community and academe and others, to negotiate a settlement. His contract expires at the end of March 1994, and it's on an hourly basis.

MR. CHADI: Okay. You did mention that the trustee's job would be to wind down the operations of the foundation, and I go back to a question that was asked by my colleague Don Massey. It wasn't answered, by the way. What mechanisms are in place to integrate the research that had been done by the different recipients of these grants with the ongoing programs that AADAC would provide? What mechanisms have you got in place?

MRS. MIROSH: Well, each of the recipients has a contract they have to fulfill. I don't know exactly the details of each individual's contract, but at the end of the day we will deliver their research that we've paid for to AADAC. We can make that public, if you like. It probably will be made public. The Canadian Research Institute for Law and the Family, Dr. Susan McDaniell, the Continuing Medical Education Department of the University of Calgary, and Dr. Burton all have a contract, and it details what is done and the end result.

MRS. LAING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that perhaps we have completed our questioning on this topic, because I'm

noticing a lot of similarity coming forward in the questions. The minister is having to answer the same questions over and over and over again. I mean, we're talking about an entity that has been legislated out of existence. We're talking about the windup of it. The minister has given us all the details on that, and I really feel that perhaps we have covered the ground adequately. I don't think it's our place to sit here and listen to philosophical discussions. I admire the minister for the answers that she has given, but many of them I don't think she's been required to have even answered, since we're talking about a specific foundation. Those would be my comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your comments.
Don Massey.

DR. MASSEY: We're also speaking about millions of dollars, Mr. Chairman. One of the objectives of the foundation was the development of an information base on family life and substance abuse in Alberta. I'd like to ask: is that information base going to go ahead?

MRS. MIROSH: No. There will be no dollars for any. Once we have completed our obligation, the heritage trust fund will not forward any further dollars for any further programs.

DR. MASSEY: It seems to me that's one way the work of the foundation could be disseminated. You're saying that it won't be picked up by AADAC or any other agency?

MRS. MIROSH: Well, certainly once it's wound down, everything will be turned over to AADAC. But there are ongoing studies by the University of Calgary, the University of Alberta, and other agencies, some funded through AADAC, some funded from other sources.

DR. MASSEY: But this was a unique sort of objective for the foundation, in terms of establishing a data base.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MITCHELL: I'm interested in the current discussion about the definition of essential services under the Canada Health Act and how that will apply to . . . [interjections] No, I'm getting there.

MRS. MIROSH: This isn't health.

MR. MITCHELL: This is health; isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're on notice, sir, that you're going to somehow tie this in.

MR. MITCHELL: Clearly, the foundation's responsibility and the minister's responsibility was, at least in part, for treatment and how that would work and how that wouldn't work. I wonder whether the minister could give us an indication of how she would define what are essential treatment services in the area of the alcohol and drug abuse foundation under the Canada Health Act. [interjections]

11:33

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it doesn't have anything to do with it. Your supplementary.

MR. MITCHELL: Therefore, the minister is on record as saying that treatment has nothing to do with the foundation.

MRS. MIROSH: No. This foundation did not fund treatment; AADAC does.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your first supplementary, sir.

MR. MITCHELL: I guess I would like to know if the Calgary Distress Centre/Drug Centre isn't a treatment centre then? That's not a treatment centre. We've given them \$340,000 over four years "to develop and evaluate an integrated Youth Drug Program," but that's not a treatment program?

MRS. MIROSH: It's to "evaluate its effectiveness." Read the whole sentence.

MR. MITCHELL: So if something were effective, would it be an essential service?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sine Chadi.

MR. CHADI: Yeah. I'm going to move to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion for adjournment. A show of hands? We're adjourned.

Whoops; sorry. No, we're not adjourned. Just quickly, any member want to read a recommendation into the record?

MR. CHADI: But we just voted to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I know, but I'm using the tyranny of the chair because I have a couple of housekeeping things.

The next meeting: tomorrow morning, Vencap.

MR. CHADI: Just a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. The recommendations that we would be bringing forward: would they be recommendations relating to what was discussed today or to anything?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any time you want to bring a recommendation forward, you're entitled to do that.

MR. CHADI: Anything to do with the standing committee on the Alberta heritage savings trust fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can do it now or do it later.

MR. CHADI: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; we're adjourned. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 11:34 a.m.]