

[Chairman: Dr. Elliott]

[12:15 p.m.]

[Several minutes were not recorded]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was going to contact each of the officers in order to determine their travel plans. That was one thing I was going to do, and I've done that. That came through on my letter to you people under the date of October 20.

The second thing I was to find out was from the Ombudsman's office was with respect to the terms of reference concerning the commission appointed following the death of the Taschuk baby. The third thing I was going to do was ask the Chief Electoral Officer for information concerning salary comparisons. I understand that is still coming.

The fourth thing I was to do was to visit personally with the Ombudsman as a follow up to his letter to us of August 16, 1983, where he made reference to the two of us having a meeting to review things like the term of office and the fact that the date was coming up when his second five-year term would be coming to a close. I have done that.

It was the meeting with the Ombudsman that you were zeroing in on, Mr. Thompson, because of some of the things that have come up in the House the last two days. My meeting with the Ombudsman was delayed while he was in Israel on that tour to Europe. He came home from that and left his office again for a week. My meeting with him last week was then delayed until — would you believe — nine o'clock this morning. So this morning I was over visiting with him. We reviewed that letter, and we also had occasion to review the other things that have happened in the last two or three days.

That is an accounting of my activities. Did you have a specific question, or should I carry on with what we talked about?

MR. THOMPSON: You just handle it the way you want, Bob. I'm interested in what happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Let's carry on then with this discussion we're in about my visit with the Ombudsman. In his letter to us of August 16, he made reference to the fact that his date would be coming up next April. Because of his activities with the international ombudsman organizations, he was wondering about the possibility of an extension; in that letter, he implied to the end of the calendar year 1984. With the visits he has had with the House leader, and probably with others, the suggestion is now that an extension to the end of August has been mentioned, and that is acceptable to him.

MR. THOMPSON: August 31.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would meet his commitments with respect to his involvement in these meetings in Sweden, and Finland too for that matter. Finland comes in early July; the Swedish conference is in late June and terminates July 1, I think. So with that discussion he has been having, those are the dates that have basically been fixed.

Yesterday we saw the introduction of a Bill to accommodate the extension of that contract up to six months. Isn't that what that said — what Bill Payne tabled yesterday?

DR. CARTER: Yes, it's up to six months. I'd just underline the fact that the Ombudsmen's conversation not only with you but with the Government House Leader was that he has accepted the proposition of going until August 31.

MR. CHAIRMAN: August 31, yes.

DR. CARTER: Okay.

MR. NOTLEY: Bob, did he express any indication that he'd want another term?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I would not put in that way, Grant. I would have to say that he expressed interest possibly in other offices — I don't know how far to push that in terms of the record — which I imagine would be a natural and normal follow-up thing, because he is younger than some of us around this table.

MR. NOTLEY: You mean other offices with the government of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

DR. CARTER: Does that mean Leader of the Opposition?

MR. NOTLEY: Well, why not — next election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He did say, and I won't hesitate to quote, that he would have no part of an elected office. He's not that kind of politician.

MR. NOTLEY: He's a very wise person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That answers your question with respect to certain specific elected offices.

MR. NOTLEY: It does, however, limit his scope in terms of any of the offices this committee would have. There is no possibility, of course, because none of our offices would be open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wasn't referring specifically to what this committee had to offer. He is obviously discussing possibilities within the government totally.

MR. NOTLEY: I guess the only reason I raise it, Bob, is that if he expressed an interest in continuing for another term, we'd have to assess and evaluate whether or not that would be useful. If he is not interested in another term as Ombudsman, then what he does in terms of seeking employment inside or outside government is none of our business as a committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would say that this topic you and I are on right at this moment was worked over elsewhere by others before it came to me as chairman of this committee. So if he had expressed or in fact had an interest in this, I don't know about it. It wasn't part of our discussion this morning. In fact, this morning he even implied that two full terms of 10 years was challenging, interesting, and obviously time for a change, not only for him as a person but for the office itself. There comes a time when the change should be made, and he implied that now is the time.

MR. NOTLEY: And he is agreeable to the end of August?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, he is. His first preference was to the end of the calendar year. There's no doubt about that, because he mentioned that in our letter too. Somewhere along the way, the end of August has been settled on by all involved, and he is acceptable to that.

I asked him this morning if there was any question about that time frame causing him any pressure at all with respect to his commitment to the meetings overseas — I'm talking about Sweden and Finland now. His response was that all his work with respect to those meetings is before and there is little or nothing for him to do following up. He will

use the balance of the month of July to clean up his personal affairs in the office and the month of August for a vacation, and will be available for new employment in another job some place else, then, on September 1. That's the way the discussion went this morning.

I would say briefly that this morning's discussion was a review of the events of his involvement in the Office of Ombudsman up to this point. Our discussion did not pursue or challenge the area of decisions that have been made or challenge the negotiations that have taken place, or whatever he and others have had on this office.

I was left with the opinion, though, that he has not made a commitment yet to something in September. But then of course, I'm getting into his personal affairs now, and it would appear that he would be interested in discussing some government position somewhere — federal, provincial, or otherwise — something that would be of interest to him, something he would be prepared and willing to do, and something that would be a challenge to him. He certainly brings with him certain talents and experiences that could be useful in any one of many places.

DR. CARTER: Well, he certainly has enough lead time to be able to be able to look.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, and he acknowledged that too. By having these discussions at this time, he also advised me that he does have a . . .

DR. CARTER: It just fell in place. I just learned today that a fellow who was the former dean of a Vancouver Anglican Church went to be the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not another one of those.

DR. CARTER: We're a rather interesting group. He went to Washington, D.C., to be head of the College of Preachers. It's just been announced in the last couple of days that he is going back to Calgary to head up Christ Church. So that now leaves the College of Preachers as a vacancy in Washington, D.C., and I think that our Ombudsman was second or third or on that list of five who were trying to get that job. So that might give him possible lead time; it might not.

MR. THOMPSON: One more thing on your discussion with the Ombudsman this morning. Did the Cavanagh Board of Review come up at all?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it did, and the discussion went like this. He is being flooded by inquiries from all segments of the press and the media. His position is that he is saying nothing, that what he will have to say will be in the form of his annual report; and we at this table will be the first to see his annual report. Until that annual report is made available — and they're writing it now. He said it goes to print, or something like that, in January or early February. He would then present it to us, table it here. We would receive it on behalf of the Legislature, and as chairman I would table it in the Legislature.

He pointed out that he was certainly mentioned in the report, and not always favorably. He acknowledged that. He also mentioned that his office is well equipped and well prepared to comment in the annual report on all these statements. In fact, he gave me an example. The Cavanagh report has quite a large number of recommendations. I think he used the words something like 30, 35, 40 — something like that; I haven't read it that carefully toward the tail end where the summary and recommendations are. But he was making reference to the fact that 60 or 70 per cent of these recommendations dovetail right in with the material in his files; they just hit right on with the recommendations from the Ombudsman's office. So he is going to be able to display that he feels quite good about his position with respect to the Cavanagh Board of Review report.

So yes, John, that topic was mentioned and that's the nature in which it was.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions then on this topic to this point?

DR. CARTER: Well, I guess it's with regard to the mechanisms of a search committee. I don't know; Grant, you've been here before. What do we do? Do we just recommend that the chairman talk to the Government House Leader and that they establish a motion in the Assembly?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, I think so. I presume that the committee as constituted — since it represents both; Walter is on this committee — might be the vehicle for a search committee, unless you want some other committee for some reason. But it has to represent both sides of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're you finished, Grant?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the most important part of this search committee issue to me is that I think there's some kind of urgency about getting the darned thing out there and announced. If we go fading away into the sunset in the next week or two and don't meet until next spring, it kind of complicates the whole thing. Possibly you as chairman of the committee could urge the House leader that we as a committee feel it's essential that the committee is announced and off and running before the House adjourns.

MR. NOTLEY: This committee could well do it, John, but we couldn't do it on our own. We would have to have a resolution of the House to direct us to do it. That would be the appropriate thing.

MR. THOMPSON: That's what I'm getting at.

DR. CARTER: Better yet, if it's made up of this committee, we don't need to re-educate anybody else.

MR. THOMPSON: But the point I'm making, Grant, is that I think it has to be done fairly soon.

MR. NOTLEY: Oh, I agree.

MR. THOMPSON: Because if not, where are we sitting?

MR. NOTLEY: I couldn't agree with you more.

MR. THOMPSON: It's not our responsibility, but it's our concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the way I see it.

MR. NOTLEY: Presuming that the Bill will pass to extend the term until the end of August, Bob, it would probably be useful if you could talk to Neil and have him introduce a government motion that would more or less parallel the debate on the Ombudsman, if that's the caucus feeling. I think it would be a bit silly to start from square one with a new committee, because at least we've worked on it and have some understanding of

what's involved.

MR. THOMPSON: Or at least have members from this committee on there, whether you have the total committee or whatever.

MR. NOTLEY: If you have a resolution in parallel with the debate, that would be a good idea. John is right; we should be making it clear that there is a lot of work involved in setting it up: advertising, the process of selection, and what have you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. Walter Buck was telling me last night that 10 years ago he was on the committee. Were you on that one 10 years ago too?

MR. NOTLEY: No, I wasn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That committee worked up something like 90-plus applications. There is a lot in just plain hours to be spent, and then there is some travel time in there too.

MR. NOTLEY: I was on the one to choose the Chief Electoral Officer, and we had over 100 applications for the Chief Electoral Officer. We must have spent a week or so just with formal interviews with the committee, plus all the other meetings to go through the various stages of screening out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well. I've heard the discussion involving a couple of recommendations here. How would you like this to be formally recorded from this meeting then?

MR. NOTLEY: Maybe I could move that the chairman contact the Government House Leader to expedite the process of either confirmation of this committee or appointment of a committee to recommend a new Ombudsman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: John, do you have a comment on that? Does that fit what you were thinking?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. That's basically it. We would hate to have it overlooked, and all of a sudden there we're sitting — not us, but the process is just sitting back and going to the House over this again. All I'm doing is agreeing with Grant on this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. I'm sorry I invited you into discussion on that motion before I accept it as a motion. Would you second that, John Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: If it's necessary to second it, I'll second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on that motion?

MR. THOMPSON: Just the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the motion? That's carried.

I think that puts our committee in a good position to take a position on the issue. I'll be happy to follow through on that.

Is there any other concern about that topic at this time? Hearing none, then I'm going to recommend that we go to the Auditor General and his orders. We have a number of them before us.

David and Bud visited with the Auditor General on two different occasions at least. With their knowledge and with the staff's tremendous capability to keep the record

straight and keep us on the right track, I will turn this over to David now. Where are we with what we can or cannot do on these orders?

DR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The other sheet we should keep beside us is our list of follow-up items. We're dealing first with item 2 on the follow-up item sheet; then this should just go in sequence of what we have in our right hands.

As mentioned, Mr. Miller and I went over on a couple of occasions, and we worked through what the parameters of these various organizations were, so we felt satisfied that the ones that are being exempted, and approval has been requested today — that works quite well.

In the case of some of the other areas of trying to charge more audit fees or to get various groups to take on their own audit fees, that would not mean they would increase their request to the government for more money to offset the audit fees. A number of letters are still going out and being returned. Negotiations are in place with some of those organizations, but notice has been given by the Auditor General to those groups. I couldn't give you a list of them at the moment. Notice is being served that they've been getting a free ride here, and it's time they faced the realities.

So with those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I would move that approval under Order A.G. 1, organizations exempt from being charged a fee — which would include Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation, Alberta Children's Provincial General hospital, Alberta Educational Communications Corporation, Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, Alberta Opportunity Company, Foothills Provincial General hospital, Glenrose Provincial General hospital, improvement districts trust, provincial cancer hospitals, Special Areas Board, and University of Alberta hospitals — be approved by the Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices.

MR. THOMPSON: I second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Any questions on the motion? Those in favor? The motion is carried. Next one, David.

DR. CARTER: Item 3 on the follow-up items. Under approval Order A.G. 1, organizations exempt from being charged a fee, I move that Glenrose Provincial General hospital staff benevolent fund and Glenrose Provincial General hospital staff charities fund be given necessary approval by this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion.

MR. THOMPSON: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, John. Any question on the motion? Those in favor? Thank you. It is carried.

DR. CARTER: Item 4 on the follow-up item list, Mr. Chairman: again I would move that organizations exempt from being charged a fee under the guidelines of approval Order A.G. 1, namely the Grande Prairie Regional College foundation, be approved by this select standing committee.

MR. NOTLEY: I second the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any question on the motion? Those in favor? The motion is carried.

DR. CARTER: The next page is really A.G. 2 instead of 1. There are explanations

there. This then is a matter of the appointment of the Auditor General as auditor of these organizations, whereas the previous order was organizations exempt from being charged a fee.

Under approval Order A.G. 2, the appointment of the Auditor General as auditor of various organizations, I move that this Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices do hereby approve that action with respect to Glenrose Provincial General hospital staff benevolent fund and also to the Glenrose Provincial General hospital staff charities fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion.

DR. CARTER: That was my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon. Thank you. And John seconds it, thank you. Any question on that motion? Those in favor? The motion is carried.

DR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Item No. 6 on the follow-up agenda is again with respect to the appointment of the Auditor General. On this listing, we see Grande Prairie Regional College as being pro forma, to be congruent with the fact that the Auditor General acts on behalf of those post-educational facilities in the province.

The explanation with respect to the administration of a new oil reference price and the program on the special old oil price — the best argument for the request for the appointment of the Auditor General as auditor of those two organizations and/or programs is the fact that it then keeps out the federal government auditor and other costs incurred with respect to bureaucracy and accounting systems. So Mr. Miller and I thought that was a reasonably salient argument.

In that respect, I would move the appointment of the Auditor General as auditor of various organizations, namely: the Grande Prairie Regional College foundation, the administration of the new oil reference price program, and the special old oil price program, and that that all be approved by the Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices, with due apologies for my tongue being twisted.

MR. NOTLEY: I second the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Grant. Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any question on the motion? Those in favor of the motion? The motion is carried. Thank you. David.

DR. CARTER: That's it for that information, Mr. Chairman — with great appreciation to our loyal secretary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we continue with the follow-up items before us? Could we go back to item No. 1?

Requested by Dr. Carter - That the Auditor General forward the final close-off figures to the chairman of the committee as soon as they are available.

Is that it in front of you now, David?

DR. CARTER: This summary document, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that meet what you were asking for?

DR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the record will show that we've agreed that item No. 1 has been complied with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I go to item No. 7?

DR. CARTER: That is information which is yet to come, but conversation has been held with the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. So 7 will remain on our list of items.

Number 9: Dr. Ivany send the chairman the terms of reference for the commission. We have something in a letter, but the Ombudsman told me this morning that he is going to provide additional information on that topic. I'm going to suggest that No. 9 be deferred, and we'll pick it up later.

Item No. 10: we did that. Item No. 11: further discussion on Dr. Ivany's visit to Lloydminster. Is the correspondence acceptable?

MR. NOTLEY: I agree with it, but I wonder if we might defer that until Mr. Miller is back since it was his.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a good idea because that was his. Thanks, Grant. That's what we need.

DR. CARTER: But the appreciation that the information has been perceived.

MR. NOTLEY: Indeed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item No. 12: the attendance at various conferences. I provided a letter to you dated October 20 where I followed up on that request to get information on conferences. I draw your attention to the two that are coming up soon: the Auditor Generals' meeting in Toronto on November 27 to 30, where visitors are welcome; and the next one to that is the Chief Electoral Officer meeting December 7, 8, and 9 in Montgomery, Alabama. Those are coming quite soon, and we should make reference to them today.

I don't have a reading about travel to other countries for these kinds of committees from the people concerned with funding and that sort of thing. I've already had a message from the Ombudsman that it's assumed that one or two of us will be going to the European meeting next June and July, but I don't know about this one in Montgomery, Alabama. I'd have to check out whether there are restrictions on our travel; I don't know.

However, in discussing the November 27 to 30 meeting with the Auditor General, he has led me to believe that there is certainly no problem if a member of our group would like to go. His first reaction was that he was not going to be there, but he said if we send a representative from our committee, he would change his plans and be there himself. Did that message come through in this letter? He was going to send one of his deputies — here it is — but if our committee was to have representation there, he would change his plans and also attend.

I'll ask you people to comment on those two meetings, please. John, would you like

to comment?

MR. THOMPSON: I think that the committee, especially some of our newer members — and I think we've done a pretty good job until now trying to get a real handle on the problems, how these different offices work. We have done it by going over to the various offices and visiting with these people. I think there may be some advantage in us getting a little broader view of what other jurisdictions do, and this type of thing. So I think there's some merit to having a committee member go to these conferences, with the stipulation that was made before, of course, that you report back and give the rest of us who haven't the opportunity to go some kind of feeling for what's going on at those things. It may very well be, if it is as technical, for instance, as the Auditor General says it is — we may find we have an interest in following up on this type of thing. But I think it would be a good thing for at least one member to go to some of these conferences to get a feeling whether there's any real benefit to the committee in having representation there.

Speaking to the one in Alabama, if there's any kind of restriction on travel outside the country, I would prefer sending someone to Sweden than to spend our time — I won't say waste our time — in Alabama, because I think probably the International Ombudsman Conference would be of more advantage than going to Alabama. That's my feeling on it.

DR. CARTER: Since we're in the first year of what probably will be a four-year existence — and following up on John's comment about the rapport that we have established with the three offices. We have requested from the three officers this information with respect to conferences. I think the committee should, in at least the first year and a half or two years, sample all of these conferences by probably just sending one individual, so that we have a further handle on what is really going on that affects them. Of course, we should all fly economy.

MR. NOTLEY: Not even economy — seat sale.

DR. CARTER: I think we should send someone with the Auditor General to the November meeting in Toronto. With respect to Alabama, because of the definition which we received from the Chief Electoral Officer as to what goes on there, I think we should have someone attend one of those meetings. There is another meeting next year in Seattle, I think. I don't know what pricing is on air fares and all the rest of it, but that one might be a little more appropriate to get to. Failing that, we can fly people to Vancouver and tell them to take the bus to Seattle.

I think at some stage of the game — if it isn't going to be Alabama, then we should send someone to Seattle to see what that conference is about. I would be equally willing if we as a committee felt should send someone to Alabama, fine, we'll send someone to Alabama. We'll have the chairman check what the appropriate way of doing it is. Of course, we could perhaps send the Leader of the Opposition to Alabama.

AN HON. MEMBER: And keep him there.

MR. THOMPSON: You'd get a real education down there.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm sure I would.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How do you feel, Grant, in terms of what we've done so far?

MR. NOTLEY: I think we have to be reasonably judicious in the ones we go to. I am a little worried about whether the Auditor General one will be too technical for members to gain much. But if the Auditor General feels that it will be of some value, that would

be a different matter.

Since we have had people go to the ombudsman's conference — and will undoubtedly to the international conference — we should have at least some representation at a conference dealing with the Chief Electoral Officer. I don't have a very strong feeling for either Montgomery or Seattle. I sometimes wonder what we would learn about government ethics in Montgomery, Alabama.

DR. CARTER: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: You hadn't thought of that.

DR. CARTER: No.

MR. NOTLEY: Just because of my personal timetable in the latter part of November, I couldn't go in any event, so it's quite academic as far as me having time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You say you wouldn't . . .

MR. NOTLEY: I couldn't go to the one in Toronto.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just thinking that one of the things I haven't thought of before is to ask for a report of the last meeting. Do they print proceedings? Do they have a transcript of some of the stuff? That information would probably be available. That would give us some insight into what they did last year or the last two years, or something like that, if we wanted to do that kind of research.

MR. NOTLEY: I would be interested on the question of — setting aside the comment about ethics in Montgomery, Alabama — some sort of agenda or program that Ken has received. It might be interesting, so we have some sense of what is coming up. If it were just a case of a non-descript bunch of people getting together, then it's too expensive. But if we have some top-flight people from the United States discussing government ethics laws, then it might well be worth this committee sending someone down. I think we would have to look at what the conference is all about. I presume, Bob, that you would have some kind of program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Grant, in response to your question, I would like to point out that it was one year ago today that I got this job.

DR. CARTER: Congratulations to all of us on our first anniversary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Today is "happy birthday" to my change in career. Because I have been working in my first year, I have enjoyed the patience of most people around here for the mistakes I have made. But I realize that starting tomorrow, I'm not going to have that patience, because you're no longer a greenhorn after the first 12 months. Or am I, Grant?

MR. NOTLEY: We're always greenhorns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Getting back to your comment, Mr. Notley, I have in my pile of mail, a letter from Ken Wark. We got it on October 27 apparently: enclosed is the latest correspondence on the conference in Montgomery, Alabama, with the agenda. I should have given it to the young lady on my right so it could have been in the package. It will follow. I haven't even read it, Grant. Please comment for all of us as you see fit.

MR. NOTLEY: We're getting George Wallace and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama.

DR. CARTER: With welcoming remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you want to expand on Wallace?

DR. CARTER: He was the the governor in on the busing.

MR. THOMPSON: Somebody shot him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am assuming that a lot of this stuff that ends up on the tape somehow gets sifted out so it makes sense. Does it?

MR. THOMPSON: Hopefully.

MR. NOTLEY: Hamel. Isn't he the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the people we met in Vancouver, Grant?

MR. NOTLEY: No, he's the Chief Electoral Officer for Canada. I think he's going to be at the conference.

DR. CARTER: Campaign financing debate — that's all American.

MR. NOTLEY: Lobbying laws. We hardly have any lobbying here, do we?

MR. THOMPSON: It really hasn't graduated to a profession here yet.

MR. NOTLEY: It might be useful, Bob, to have that photocopied and sent to members of the committee. We can meet easily enough in the next couple of weeks.

DR. CARTER: We can discuss that at another meeting, because there is still lots of time. I think I will make a motion, Mr. Chairman, that one of our members attend the meeting with the Auditor General in Toronto in November. I would like to suggest Bill Purdy because of his work in committee and in the House. It might be of some use for him to go in terms of the Auditor General's stuff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To Toronto. That's fine. That's a motion. We need seconder.

MR. THOMPSON: I will second it, but I have some reservations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Any comment on the motion?

MR. THOMPSON: The only reason is that when you put a specific name in the motion and Bill says: I'm sorry, I am just not going to go — I would prefer amending it to the point that we have the chairman try to find someone to go.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed. Yes, I think that's fair enough.

MR. THOMPSON: I certainly can't go. I don't know about anyone else.

DR. CARTER: The motion is amended. With unanimous consent of this committee, I withdraw the original motion. I resubmit a motion, which is that a member of this

committee attend ..

MR. NOTLEY: That the chairman be authorized to dig up a member of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. We have a motion, and we have a seconder — John. In favor of the motion? That's carried unanimously. That looks after the Toronto meeting with the Auditor General.

With respect to the meeting in Alabama with the Chief Electoral Officer, reference was made to having another get together.

MR. NOTLEY: I move that the chairman circulate the information to members of the committee and call a meeting at some point before adjournment or prorogation of the fall session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That sounds good.

DR. CARTER: Seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Dave Carter. Is there any question on the motion? All in favor? That motion is carried.

Getting back to Louise's score card, that looks after Item No. 12. We disposed of Item No. 13 earlier.

DR. CARTER: This is a point that Mr. Anderson brought up for discussion in this committee with respect to this item about the possibility of extending the Ombudsman's jurisdiction to municipalities. So that is a holding item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll hold that one. Item No. 14: I was to check with legal counsel regarding the possible extension, and that was dealt with today.

That looks after everything from this end of the table, gentlemen. Is there anything else that is to be dealt with today?

The meeting is adjourned.

[The meeting adjourned at 1:07 p.m.]