

Item: Senate Minutes, October 1985  
Call Number: UA-5, Accession 2007-039, Box 6

Additional Notes:

This document is a compilation of Senate minutes, staff matters and miscellaneous documents for October 1985. The documents have been ordered chronologically and made OCR for ease of searching. The original documents and additional documents for this year which have not yet been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Senate fonds (UA-5) at the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections.

The original materials and additional materials which have not been digitized can be found in the Dalhousie University Archives and Special Collections using the call number referenced above.

In most cases, copyright is held by Dalhousie University. Some materials may be in the public domain or have copyright held by another party. It is your responsibility to ensure that you use all library materials in accordance with the Copyright Act of Canada. Please contact the Copyright Office if you have questions about copyright, fair dealing, and the public domain.

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**

**MINUTES**

**OF**

**SENATE MEETING**

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Friday, 11 October 1985 at 4:00 P.M.

Present with Mr. W.E. Jones in the chair were the following:

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Betts, Birdsall, Bishop, Boyd, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Chaytor, Cohen A.D., Cross M.S., Czapalay, Duff, Ferguson, Fingard, Haley, Hall B.K., Hare, Horrocks, Janigan, Josenhans, Kocourek, Kwak, Leffek, MacAulay, MacKay W.A., Manning, Misick, Myers, Nicola, O'Shea, Ozier, Parpart, Pedersen, Pross, Ritchie, Rodger, Ruf, Rutherford, Schroeder, Shaw L.R., Sherwin, Sinclair, Stern, Stewart, Stone, Storey, Stuttard, Tonks, vanFeggelen, Wien, Winham, Wood, Yung, Zinck, Christie (invitee).

Regrets: Caty, Forgay, Fulton, Green, Jones J.V., Konok, MacRae, Munroe, Pooley, Waterson.

85:106.

New Members of Senate

Mr. Jones welcomed the following new members to Senate:

Professor M. Forgay  
Acting Director,  
School of Dental Hygiene

Dr. Walter B. Green  
Director,  
School of Human Communication Disorders

Dr. P. N. Stewart  
Professor.  
Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computing  
Science

Dr. Reginald H. Yabsley  
Professor,  
Department of Surgery

85:107

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 9 September 1985 were approved upon motion (Horrocks/Rodger) with two typographical errors noted by Mr. Andrews; namely that 85:096, page 2, paragraph 3, line 5 should read: 1% and paragraph 5, line 1 should be **Andrews**.

85:108.

Question Period

Mr. Myers raised an issue which he viewed to be one of increasing concern in light of the Canadian government's decision not to participate in the American Star Wars project. He wondered if Dalhousie had a policy framework for defense related contracts and if there was a structure in place to which the question of Star Wars research could be forwarded. The President said that there was no policy regarding research for defense purposes but there is a policy regarding participation in research in which there is a limit on publication. He will consider the question further and report back to Senate.

Ms. Czapalay queried, on behalf of Ms. Blewett, whether a student representative would serve on any university committee charged with reacting to the MacDonald Commission report. She was assured by the Chairperson that DSU input was welcomed.

85:109.

Awarding of Degrees

On the recommendation of the Deans of the following faculties, degrees, diplomas and certificates were awarded upon motion to the individuals named in lists provided to the Secretary:

Faculty of Law (Christie/MacKay)

Bachelor of Laws        3

Faculty of Arts and Science (Betts/vanFeggelen)

Bachelor of Arts        82

(Distinction 2, Honours 7)

Bachelor of Arts Honours Certificate 6

(Honours 5, First Class Honours 1)

Bachelor of Education        9

Bachelor of Science 4  
(Distinction 4, Honours 7)  
Bachelor of Science Honours Certificate  
(Honours 1)

Diploma in Engineering 41  
TOTAL 223

Faculty of Graduate Studies (Leffek/McAulay)

Doctor of Philosophy 22  
Master of Arts 34  
Master of Business Administration 9  
Master of Development Economics 2  
Master of Education 18  
Master of Environmental Studies 2  
Master of Laws 3  
Master of Nursing 9  
Master of Public Administration  
Master of Science 34  
Master of Social Work 9  
Master of Arts in Teaching French (M.A.T.) 2  
TOTAL 145

Faculty of Management Studies (Horrocks/Zinck)

Bachelor of Commerce 36  
(Honours 3)  
Diploma in Public Administration 2  
TOTAL 38

Faculty of Health Professions (Tonks/Wien)

Bachelor of Nursing 9  
(Distinction 2)  
Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy 2  
Bachelor of Physical Education 6  
Bachelor of Recreation  
Bachelor of Science (Health Education) 4  
Bachelor of Social Work 12  
(Distinction 3)  
Diploma in Outpost Community Health Nursing 4  
TOTAL 38

It was agreed upon motion (Betts/Tonks)

**that the Registrar, in consultation with the appropriate Dean, should be empowered to correct any errors made by an agent of the University.**

85:110.

**Reports and Recommendations -- Committees of Senate**

A. Steering Committee

On behalf of the Steering Committee. Mr. Horrocks moved seconded by Mr. McAulay

**the nomination of Sandra McFarlane (Microbiology) to replace T.D. White (Pharmacology) as the Faculty of Medicine representative on the Committee on Committees.**

Following three calls for further nominations from the Chair, Ms. McFarlane was declared elected.

B. Committee on Committees

The following individuals, nominated by the Committee on Committees (Boyd/Zinck) were declared elected to the committees specified, following the requisite three calls for further nominations

D.A. Thompson (Law) - Senate Academic Appeals Committee

E. Gold (Law) - University Budget Advisory Committee

Y. Sankar (Business Administration) - Senate Library Committee

The Committee Chairperson, Mr. R. Boyd, noted for the information of Senators, that D. Gordon (Economics) had been appointed to the Senate Computer Advisory Committee (January - June 1986) and E. Spence (German) had been appointed to the Physical Planning Committee (July to December 1985).

C. Academic Planning Committee

I. Proposal - "The Future of Continuing Education at Dalhousie"  
(precirculated)

On behalf of the APC, Mr. Wien moved

**1. That the Senior Academic Unit authorized by Senate on May 14, 1984 be named by the Henson College of Public Affairs and Continuing Education.**

**2. That Henson College of Public Affairs and Continuing Education be headed by a Dean. to be appointed by the procedures established by**

**Senate** for the appointment of Presidents. **Vice-Presidents, Deans and Associate or Assistant Deans. such appointment to take effect on July 1. 1986.**

3. **That Henson College of Public Affairs and Continuing Education** incorporate the Institute of **Public Affairs. the Office of Part-Time Studies** and Extension and the Credit Studies Unit.

4. **That Henson College of Public Affairs and Continuing Education have the customary responsibilities. duties and authority of a senior academic unit in Dalhousie University including the power to organize its own affairs in accordance with policies established by Senate, except that the College shall not have the power to recommend to Senate candidates for academic degrees.**

Mr. Cross reminded members of Senate's authorized creation of a senior academic unit, headed by a Dean, in the Spring of 1984, which had been implemented in October 1984. Over the past year, the unit had initiated/facilitated some support services for adult students, new projects in the non-credit area, a significant increase in the number of evening classes and some smaller projects including cooperative efforts with the Music Department. He maintained that the time had come to confirm that commitment to continuing education is ongoing. Mr. Cross briefly reviewed the rationale for the four motions as outlined in the report. Mr. Betts asked that the motions be dealt with one at a time. Mr. Wood spoke of the positive attitude of those in IPA toward the "renewal" proposed in this amalgamation.

Upon vote, **the first and second motions passed.**

Mr. Rodger, referring to Motion #3, asked whether IPA and the Advanced Management Seminars would continue. Mr. Cross responded in the affirmative and added that it seemed unwise to extinguish either name yet, although there would not be a definite unit in Henson Centre which was either IPA or the Office of Part-Time Studies and Extension. The Public Relations Committee of the Centre would look at the question of presenting the new name and the subunits of Henson Centre to the public. Ms. Sherwin wondered how the Credit Studies unit would differ from Part-time Studies and Extension. Mr. Cross stated that the unit would liaise with academic departments about new certificates and diploma programmes and evening classes. He explained that the Part-Time Studies and Extension would no longer exist as a separate functional unit, although the name would continue to exist for legal reasons. Mr. Myers stated that Part-Time Studies and Extension, now through the Credit Studies unit, would develop with departments, summer and after hour courses.

Mr. Betts suggested

**that the capital letters of the Credit Studies unit. implying official status. be**

**changed to lower case (,e. credit studies unit).**

This amendment was **agreeable** to the mover and seconder.  
Motion three then **carried**.

With respect to the fourth motion, Mr. Rodger believed that the intent of the credit studies unit to stimulate and encourage academic departments to offer courses at "accessible" times would be clearer if specified in an amendment. Mr. Betts noted that the last phrase "the College shall not have the power to recommend to Senate candidates for academic degrees", made no mention of diplomas and certificates. Mr. Cross saw this as a purely functional question in that recommendations regarding awards of diplomas and certificates would be done in cooperation with academic departments. Mr. Wien noted that the Advanced Management Seminars were non-credit, but Mr. Betts identified a "greyer area" in that certificates and diplomas could have some credit and some non-credit components. Ms. Sherwin queried the fact that there appeared to be no clear "voice" for faculty members, to which Mr. Cross replied that the Centre was different in that there were no academic faculty and it could not offer classes. However, issues for debate would go to the Executive Committee and advisory groups of academics would be created in the process of proposing new programmes.

It was moved and seconded (Tonks/D. Cameron)

**that the motion be amended to include the words certificates and diplomas following "degrees" in the last line of the motion.**

The amendment passed. A second amendment was moved by (Rodger/vanFeggelen)

**namely, that following the word "Senate", these words would appear "and including the responsibility of encouraging departments at Dalhousie University to offer some of their classes at times and places which are suitable for students seeking degrees on less than a full-time basis."**

This amendment was also accepted and the motion as amended twice **carried**.

## 2. Academic Planning Process

The Chairperson reported that questionnaires had been forwarded to departments and faculties to assist them in the preparation of their submissions to APC; that there would be a concerted attempt to adhere to the timetable; that separate Redistribution and Development Funds application forms would be sent to Deans shortly and that APC was pulling together a plan for the university and planned to meet with Deans and faculty academic planning committees. He anticipated that a university academic plan could be presented to Senate in the new year.

## 3. Ph.D. in French



Mr. Jones noted that the APC, following thoughtful discussion of the question of funding for library books, did not believe that it could precommit funds from the Development Fund. Accordingly, the following motion had been passed by APC on 16 September 1985s

**that start-up funds for library resources for the Ph.D. (French) programme not be pre-committed from the Development Fund.**

Mr. Bishop commented that the thinking of APC in this matter was well understood by members of the French Department. He added that the Department of French was proceeding with essential preparations for a Ph.D. programme in the hope that the programme could be initiated in September 1986 and would submit a request to the Development Fund at the appropriate time. Mr. Birdsall confirmed that the Ph.D. (French) requirements would be a first priority in the Library application to the Development Fund this year, as it had been for the past two years.

#### 4. French as a Second Language

Following introductory comments by the Chairperson, indicating that individual recommendations would return to Senate for implementation and that a recommendation to approve in principle meant that the APC supported the thrust of the report, Mr. Wien moved on behalf of the APC

**that the "Final Report of the Subcommittee of the Academic Planning Committee on the Use of the French Language at Dalhousie" dated 10 July 1985 be approved in principle.**

Mr. Pross referred to the original terms of reference for the committee which stated that

The Subcommittee is asked to consider the proposition that it befits a University of the regional and national stature of Dalhousie, to commit itself to the furthering of bilingualism in Canada. If this is found to be so, the Committee is expected to advise Senate and the President on:

- the form which Dalhousie's commitment to bilingualism should take (and, in particular, on the relative importance of measures to improve proficiency in French as a second language and of measures to enable those who are already proficient to study or teach in French.)

- the time frame in which the measures which are proposed should be implemented, taking into account the possibility of funds being available for this purpose, both within the University and from external sources.

That Dalhousie should commit itself to fostering bilingualism in Canada, and that it should do so, over the next decade, by allocating resources to the attainment of the

following:

First, Dalhousie should expand current opportunities to study French language and literature by increasing the number of French **language classes, by developing second** language classes oriented towards particular professional and academic fields, and by instituting a certificate of bilingualism.

Second, Dalhousie should develop plans for teaching in the French language in disciplines other than French, and should seek the resources to do this by initiating faculty exchanges with francophone universities, by establishing postdoctoral fellowships for francophone scholars to study and teach at Dalhousie, and by seeking funding from external sources such as the Secretary of State.

Third, primary responsibility for implementing these goals should lie with the Department of French and the Second Language Coordinator, part of whose position should be located in the Department of French.

Fourth, in view of the financial constraints facing the University, Dalhousie must seek new funding to accomplish these goals.

Mr. Pross explained the belief of the committee that the university could expect an influx of students from French immersion programmes who would go to Dalhousie if there was an opportunity to maintain their competency. Dalhousie should offer incentives to attract the best students from these programmes. Further, the committee considered it evident that Canada is becoming increasingly bilingual.

Mr. Andrews suggested that the preamble to the recommendations might be considered arrogant in that it implied that no one else was doing this. He inquired about the degree of urgency which would be attached to the consequences of the motion, about the costs of implementing the motion and when senators might expect to receive recommendations regarding implementation strategies and resources. The Chairperson anticipated that FPC would look at the costs with other groups involved and believed that a motion in principle did not bind Senate to resources. He added that the first step would be to develop a timetable if the desire to make this a "priority" area was indicated by Senate.

An amendment was moved and seconded (Rodger/vanFeggelen)

**that the preamble in the first three pages of the report be approved in principle.**

Ms. Sherwin claimed that she could not support the motion until a timetable ordering the recommendations according to priority and **specification of** the phrase "allocating resources"

were received. Mr. Andrews expressed some sympathy with Ms. Sherwin's views. Mr. Betts then sought clarification regarding whether Senate, by approving the motion in principle, could be interpreted as approving the appointment of a Second Language Coordinator. Mr. Jones confirmed that this was not the case.

Mr. Cross supported Mr. Rodger's amendment and reiterated Mr. Andrews' concern regarding the urgent need to debate specifics and settle on a timetable.

The amendment was **approved** and the motion as amended **carried**.

85:111.

Matter of Information

1. Weldon Law Building Fire

President MacKay's memorandum of 28 August 1985 entitled "A Fire in the Weldon Building, August 16, 1985", had been precirculated for information. Further, a letter - "The Weldon Law School Fire/Revisited" from Bill Jeffery (DSU), was distributed at the meeting. The President advised Senate that a review of safety considerations had been initiated. Mr. McAulay sought clarification of whether the adequacy of the centralized electrical system would be investigated. Mr. Rodger wished to have the President inform Senate of the results of the investigation. Mr. Shaw and the President took both requests as notice of questions to be responded to at a future meeting of Senate. Mr. Shaw supported many of the points in the Jeffery document. Mr. Andrews wished to have the President or Vice President give a full report in future to Senate regarding mechanisms to be put in place to prevent similar disasters. Ms. Ritchie noted that this issue was currently on the PPC agenda. Mr. Pross raised a question of storing valuable papers in the university library, to which Mr. Birdsall replied that this would have to be considered at a later date.

2. A copy of the "Dalhousie University Diving Regulations" (July 1984) will be retained in the Senate Office for viewing by interested Senators. The President expressed his gratitude to Mr. McNulty and other members of the ad hoc committee.

3. A document entitled "Student Information Guide on Academic Appeal Procedures at Dalhousie University" dated September 28, 1985, had been written by students for students in consultation with the Chairperson of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee and the Secretary of Senate. The Chairperson noted that this would be forwarded to Deans, DSU and others directly involved with such matters. As the document summarized academic appeal procedures at the unit/faculty and university level, he thought it should prove to be a useful document for Senate.

4. A revised schedule of meetings (25/9/85) indicates that the meeting scheduled for the fourth Monday of each month would only be held if the agenda for the preceding Senate meeting on

the second **Monday was not** completed or if there was urgent business.

85:112.

University Campaign Committee

The President indicated that there was nothing further to report and that he hoped that a report could be made at the next regular meeting of Senate.

85:113

Presidential Search Committee

Mr. Jones stated that the committee was still collecting and sorting source material on candidates and added, in response to Mr. Rodger's inquiry, that the list was somewhat shorter now.

85:114.

Report of the President

President MacKay expressed regrets over the passing of Professor A. Ross (Computer Centre) and Professor A. G. Riley (Oceanography).

He reported that the AUCC had met with the four granting councils - IDRC, SSHRC, MRC & NSREC and expected a higher level of commitment to funding of research. He was disappointed that few members of the Dalhousie community had taken advantage of the Conference on Research. Finally he noted the following upcoming events: Killam Lecture Series, Panel discussion for Centenary of first women graduates, Convocation honoring four women, sixtieth anniversary of MSVU and National Universities Week.

**85:115.**

Other Business

1. The Chairperson pointed out that the motion passed at the 1/10/85 meeting of the Senate Advisory Committee on Computing, attached to Mr. Rodger's letter of 4/10/85, was at the end of the table for the information of Senators. This had also gone to the Vice-President (Finance) and the University Campaign Committee. Mr. D. Cameron thought that the motion had, in effect, been implemented already. The President qualified this statement by noting that there was agreement to make the recommended purchase but the question of allocation from specific funds had not yet been resolved.

2. Items 10 and 11 will be discussed at the 28 October 1985 meeting of Senate as indicated on the agenda.

**85:116.**

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

**DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY**

**MINUTES**

**OF**

**SENATE MEETING**

Senate met in regular session in the Board and Senate Room on Monday, 28 October 1985 at 4:00 P.M.

Present with Ms. Judith Ritchie in the chair were the following members:

Andrews, Angelopoulos, Betts, Binkley, Birdsall, Blum, Bradfield, Cameron D.M., Cameron T.S., Chaytor, Cromwell, Czapalay, Ferguson, Forgay, Fraser P., Friedenberg, Hennen, Jeffery, Jones D.W., Leffek, MacAulay, MacIntosh, Maloney, Manning, MacDonald M.D., McNulty, Misick, O'Shea, Ozier, Pedersen, Pooley, Ritchie, Rodger, Ruf, Russell, Segelberg, Sinclair, Stewart, Stone, Stuttard, Swaminathan, Thiessen, Varma, Young, Zinck, Christie (invitee).

Regrets: Belzer, Caty, Cohen A.D., Fulton, Gratwick, Horrocks, Konok, Nicola, Stern, Tan M.H., W.E. Jones.

85:117.

Revised Regulations Concerning Appointments, Tenure and Promotion  
(Senate Minute Nos. 84:56, 84 42, 84:37)

A document entitled "Proposed Regulations Governing Appointments, Tenure and Promotions - 1985" had been precirculated.

Mr. McNulty as Chair of the original subcommittee of Messrs. Stuttard, Axworthy and McNulty (who had been designated by Senate to work with Messrs. Rodger and Crocker on recommended revisions) reviewed the historical evolution of the document which was now before Senate. He indicated that the most recent subcommittee had met on several occasions; had encountered great difficulty with the assigned task; had attempted to reach the "best" compromise; and now considered that its work was done. Their work had to be postponed initially until the new collective agreement had been completed.

Ms. Ozier questioned the meaning of clause 6.3.1, which she predicted might penalize faculty unfairly. Mr. McNulty considered that there might be additional expectations regarding teaching when being promoted to higher levels in certain Faculties. Mr. Rodger believed that the clause could be deleted and that it had been included as an oversight. Mr. McNulty reminded members of the document circulated earlier dated 19 March 1984 which contrasted present regulations to recommended changes.

It was moved and seconded (Ozier/Rodger):

that clause 6.3.1 be deleted as it was open to misinterpretation.

Mr. Crocker then reflected Mr. McNulty's disappointment in the subcommittee's discussions and wondered if it might be dangerous to support some of the revised regulations, although new sections such as 6. Academic Promotion should be considered. He was concerned that two sets of regulations would emerge from the discussions - a new set for non-DFA members and an old set for DFA members. If the intent was to make the regulations consistent with the Collective Agreement, then discussions with the DFA would need to occur. If the recommended changes were approved by Senate, amendments to the Collective Agreement would be necessitated. However, Senate had no role in negotiations. He added that if 14.1.1 was passed, this would represent an abrogation of Senate's responsibility. It might be more appropriate to have a standing Senate committee deal with tenure and promotion regulations in an expeditious manner. Mr. Andrews stated that the Collective Agreement does provide for additions to Regulations by Faculties, Schools and Departments, but not by Senate. Messrs. Andrews and Rodger supported Ms. Ozier's motion. Mr. Rodger recommended that Senate discuss the recommended revisions section by section. Mr. D. Cameron wondered what would be gained by a clause by clause discussion if the whole exercise was untimely, as suggested by Mr. Crocker. He claimed that the finished document had come before Senate with little warning and reviewed three reasons why the exercise had been started in the past:

(1) Senate should have its own regulations;

(2) Senate regulations would apply to all faculty unlike the Collective Agreement which would not apply to some faculty at the university; and

(3) There was a general belief that having two sets of conditions governing employment was not a good idea. He would be surprised if the proposed regulations would find favour among those not covered by the Collective Agreement.

It was agreed upon motion (D. Cameron/D. Jones):

that the matter be tabled until the standing committee suggested by Mr. Crocker brought forward procedural recommendations.

Further to the Chairperson's request for clarification of the intent of the motion, Mr. D. Cameron suggested that such a committee might examine the implications of adoption of the (revised) regulations, do a comparative analysis and report back to Senate. Mr. McNulty commented that the original subcommittee had attempted to do exactly that; it had sent the proposed regulations to Faculties for feedback, had incorporated recommendations of Faculties, and had been instructed to make the regulations consistent with the Collective Agreement. Hence, the subcommittee did not believe there was a need to survey Faculties again, and wished to get off the "merry-go-round". In his view, Senate should decide, (a) if it wished to have its own regulations, (b) if it wished to simply adopt certain principles, or (c) if the Collective Agreement shall prevail. The Chairperson recommended that Senate respond to Mr. McNulty's questions by considering initially if it wanted or needed its own regulations. Mr. Russell stated that where the regulations were in conflict with the Collective Agreement, the Collective Agreement would automatically take precedence for members of the bargaining unit. Mr. Sinclair referred to an inevitable conundrum if the Senate regulations only included a statement "Refer to the Collective Agreement" and the Collective Agreement included a similar statement with respect to the Senate document. The problem, he contended, was that the Collective Agreement embodies the process of the old regulations. It may be that the two documents need to be "cut adrift" and that the Senate document would apply except where overruled by the Collective Agreement. Mr. Andrews recalled the lengthy discussions about the proposed revision of the regulations which occurred in the Faculty of Arts and Science three years ago. He didn't see any large or serious discrepancies between the two documents and considered that it was

curious how the discussion had evolved from one member pointing out one inconsistent item. He considered that it would have been more appropriate to discuss only the points at which inconsistencies were identified. Mr. Stuttard endorsed Mr. Andrews' comments and wondered if there might be a problem with clause 14.1.1. Mr. Rodger commented that the people who had stimulated the original document had been the DFA and added that the Board of Governors had passed a motion which confirmed that faculty and librarians not covered by the Collective Agreement should be treated no less fairly than faculty so covered. He suggested that Senate might wish to consider a similar course of action with respect to the revised regulations. Mr. D. Cameron stated that the more basic problem was not that there might be inconsistencies but that Senate must consider whether it wished to be the body through which the terms of the Collective Agreement were extended to those not covered by the Collective Agreement.

It was agreed upon motion (Ozier/D. Cameron):

that the question of the process by which the Revised Regulations Concerning Appointments, Tenure and Promotion will be dealt with should be referred to the Steering Committee which should return to Senate with recommendations.

85:118.

#### Faculty Academic Appeals Procedures (84:46.B.I.b)

A document dated 22 October 1985 from Mr. Evans, Chair of the Senate Academic Appeals Committee entitled "Academic Appeal Rules and Procedures at the Faculty level" was distributed at the meeting. Members were asked to direct their comments to Messrs. Evans or W. Jones. The Secretary noted the two recommendations incorporated on page 6 of the document for consideration by Senators. Mr. Rodger thought that the process outlined in the second recommendation should be reconsidered. He maintained that Senate would never "get all the Faculties in line" and thought that Senate should discuss whether it really wants to see and approve Faculty academic appeal procedures.

85:119.

#### Other Business

In response to Mr. Jeffery's request for an answer to his correspondence distributed at the 11 October 1985 meeting of Senate, the Chairperson clarified that Mr. Shaw had intended to give his response during Question Period, but had to leave the meeting for another commitment. Mr. Shaw had been informed that Question Period was routinely omitted from Senate meetings held on the fourth Monday of the month and assumed discussion could be continued during Question Period on the 8 November 1985 meeting.

85:120.

#### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.