

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE OF SIMON  
FRASER UNIVERSITY HELD MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1969,  
FACULTY LOUNGE, 7:30 P.M.

---

SPECIAL MEETING - OPEN SESSION

PRESENT: Strand, K.T. Chairman

Baird, D.A.  
Boland, L.A.  
Burstein, K.R.  
Cole, R.E.  
Collins, M.  
Conway, J.  
D'Aoust, B.  
Funt, B.L.  
Haering, R.R.  
Harper, R.J.  
Hutchinson, J.  
Korbin, D.  
Lachlan, A.H.  
MacKinnon, A.R.  
Okuda, K.  
Prock, Mrs.L.  
Rieckhoff, K.E.  
Shrum, G.M.  
Sperling, G.B.  
Stratton, S.  
Sullivan, D.  
Tuck, D.G.  
Vidaver, W.  
Williams, W.E.  
Wong, S.

Evans, H.M. Secretary  
Meyers, D.A.  
Barboza, J. Recording Secretary  
Collins, E. Recording Secretary

ABSENT: Branca, A.E.  
Dampier, J.L.  
Ellis, A.J.  
Hamilton, W.M.  
Hean, A.F.C.  
Koerner, Mrs.O.  
Lett, Mrs.S.  
McLean, C.H.  
Perry, G.N.  
Walkley, J.

Audio-visual coverage of the meeting was provided to the Student Cafeteria through the use of two cameras in the Senate Room.

1. STATEMENT BY THE ACTING PRESIDENT

K.Strand, Chairman, spoke generally as follows.

Purpose of the Meeting

- i. To hear a statement by myself and the Acting Academic Vice-President on the problems of Senate.
- ii. To hear from members of Senate their views - as long as they are relevant and I intend to be the judge of how long the views of individual senators are relevant - no motions will be in order.
- iii. To act on an urgent matter - the Search Procedures for an Academic Vice-President.

He spoke further as follows.

Problem

The immediate problem of Senate can be stated quickly.

- i. A number of decisions of a university-wide nature must be made soon.
- ii. These are the responsibilities of Senate.
- iii. However, Senate, to date, seemingly is unwilling to come to grips with these issues.

Evidence

- i. Referral of a number of items to faculties.
- ii. Endless procedural debates.
- iii. Adjournment while substantive issues require attention.

Possible Reasons

- i. The presence of observers - this is no longer the case so it is no longer relevant.
- ii. The permissive attitude by the Chairman - this has been the case in the past, primarily because I have not wanted to cut off relevant debate. I have now heard so much irrelevant debate, that I have concluded that I shall be less permissive in the future.
- iii. The non-representative nature of Senate - the charge is that Senate is non-representative and on questions before Senate an attempt is made to prevent action rather than to meet issues. This issue is not going to be resolved immediately and I do not regard it as an excuse for inaction.
- iv. Rejection of Senate as a policy-making body in favour of Joint Faculty - the charge is that Senate should take no action on matters

of university-wide significance until "JointFaculty" has acted. I wish to make one point - the Faculty voted that Senate, not the faculties in joint meeting, should make policy on matters of university-wide significance.

- v. Inadequate delineation of how divergent views of individual faculties on matters of university-wide significance can be resolved - my point is that they are not resolved by referral back to faculties - but need to be resolved by Senate.

There may be other possible reasons and, after the statement by the Academic Vice-President, I shall be pleased to hear them. At this juncture, I wish to state that it is my intention to have this Senate as it is structured, and the next Senate as it will be structured, become more effective. In the discussion that will follow I ask you to address yourself to these questions.

## 2. STATEMENT BY THE ACTING ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENT

R.Haering, Acting Academic Vice-President, read a prepared statement. He indicated that the statement would be available for distribution to the Press at the close of the meeting, if desired (this statement is attached as Appendix A to the main Minutes).

## 3. DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT AND THE ROLE OF SENATE

The Chairman indicated he would recognize comments on the immediate problems of Senate.

Moved by J.Conway, seconded by G.Sperling,

"that discussion be postponed until the next regular meeting."

The motion was ruled out of order and the Chairman indicated that at the outset of the meeting he did not propose to entertain motions on the first three items of the Agenda.

J.Conway expressed disappointment that the meeting had been called without senators being given a chance to see in advance the statements, with opportunity to discuss these before the meeting. He felt that the meeting had been called to allow the Acting President and the Acting Academic Vice-President to spank senators. Reference was made to the last meeting and his belief that discussions held had been significant as debate was needed on the issues then before Senate; and his belief that current statements indicated underrating of the significance of both students and Joint Faculty. He expressed the view that the philosophy of the University cannot be determined in the office of the Acting President or the Acting Academic Vice President but only in the university community at large. He expressed disappointment that an article in the week-end edition of "The Sun" had not led to appropriate response from the university.

K.Burstein expressed sympathy with many of the comments made by R.Haering but felt that there had been over-reaction. He concurred that Senate has

power to make decisions but that in discussions affecting faculty the advice of faculties should be sought in advance. With reference to the last meeting his vote for referral to faculties was based on the procedure involved rather than on the substance of the item then under review. He concurred that Senate has power but that it needs minimum essential information before making adequate decision and expressed opposition to a method of trial-and-error behaviour. He was opposed to the procedure of referring items back to faculty but felt that items of the type noted should only come to Senate by being channelled up through faculties. He expressed concern that Senate often votes on things about which it has little data.

R. Haering noted that Paper S.215 had been referred to the faculties without comment having been made by the Acting President at the last meeting.

G.Sperling stated that the Acting President's statement should have been available before the meeting in order that senators could consider it to determine support or opposition. He did not accept the view that because we have an unrepresentative body in Senate that it must be lived with, and enquired as to what might be done. He further enquired as to why copies of the statement by R.Haering would be provided to the Press when copies had not been provided to Senate, and felt that the reference to Fotheringham was inappropriate. He referred to scoffing remarks in the Vancouver newspapers and felt that these had been in part cause for the calling of a special meeting with over-reaction.

Comment was made on remarks by the Acting Academic Vice-President with respect to Robert's Rules of Order, participatory democracy, Strand's rules, representative democracy and other items. He did not consider the President's statement philosophical but believed that Senate had been called to discuss inter-disciplinary boundaries which was a very serious and difficult question, and enquired as to why discussion had not first been generated in faculties. He believed the administrators to be frustrated and that the view was being undertaken that Senate was powerful and that this would provide, in the eyes of the administrators, the answer but that Senate had its own way of handling these items. He expressed concern about the emphasis on efficiency and presented the view that Senate was not there to be efficient or get the business done, but to adequately develop curriculum and deal with related matters.

D.Korbin referred to the university administration as the civil service and that they had assembled Senate to lecture the senators. He expressed concern at the response to the Press statements and stated that Senate looked foolish on the argument that observers prevented decisions, in view of the fact that there were none last week and decisions were not made, and noted that other blames were now being made. He referred to complaints of students concerning the structure of Senate and argued that Senate was unwilling to act with such structure, and felt that discussion should be on Senate structure, not on other items. He noted that administrators held eight seats on Senate with votes, that they were appointed to implement policy, but noted that they were not elected or representative. He referred to gross under-representation of students and argued that there, therefore, was not representative democracy. Reference was made to comments by the Acting Academic Vice-President pertaining to the situation in 1965 where there was apparently totalitarianism, to the present situation where there was claim of participatory democracy, and argued that until there are further student representatives there could not be

representative democracy. He was opposed to increasing the powers of the President, was opposed to giving the administration more power with the Chair deciding on the relevancy of issues and found the philosophy of the Acting President and the Acting Academic Vice-President unacceptable.

W.Vidaver noted his observations of recent weeks which he had found painful and which caused him some fear. He referred to the struggle which Simon Fraser University was having to come into existence, that the fight was not yet won, and feared that it might not be won. He expressed the opinion that in order to achieve success, some way must be found of managing the affairs of the university and that this had not yet been achieved. He felt that there was some anarchy, in a non-political sense, in departments and various groups in the university. He expressed the view that none of these groups can, or should, have power to make decisions of the type under discussion, but that integration must be achieved. He stated that some way must be found of establishing a representative body to formulate goals, policies and other important items, and that individual anarchistic tendencies would have to be overcome to achieve this.

D.Sullivan considered the remarks of G.Sperling and D.Korbin irrelevant. He claimed that the major problem of Senate is that of jurisdictional areas and noted that there are few guidelines and procedures established. He expressed the view that Senate must decide what is proper for it and what is proper to be sent elsewhere. He noted that there must be an appropriate merging of academic and budgetary considerations and agreed with the presentations of the Acting President and the Acting Academic Vice-President. He stated that serious problems faced Senate and felt that the Senate Committee on Procedures should have a hard look at jurisdictional areas, and that until that problem is resolved there would be a morass.

R.Harper referred to the definition of participatory democracy as defined by R.Haering as it applies at the university and made reference to the arguments presented by minority groups. He referred to K.Burstein's opposition to trial and error but argued that all organisms find necessity of use of this mechanism until they have appropriate data to do otherwise. He stated that someone or some group must decide on first-order approximation priorities, and concurred with the analysis presented by R.Haering. He expressed regret at R.Haering's decision to resign, expressed respect for him, stated that he had brought distinction to the office of Academic Vice-President, believed that it would be most regrettable if he were to resign and hoped that he would reconsider.

L.Boland indicated that he would refer to specific problems and noted that on a number of occasions he had refused to enter debate on items until he had understanding of such items - even such points as calendar items. He noted further that Senate has been willing to make decisions without criteria but that he had on a number of occasions argued the need for criteria, particularly when decision is being made to establish committees. He felt that without establishment of appropriate criteria, critical issues arose. Under such circumstances, he felt that Robert's Rules were necessary for protection but that if Senate were serious they would not be required. He expressed the need for a flow-procedural system. He believed the role of committees to be important but that they were not properly used, and argued that the full Senate cannot hope to do jobs requiring detailed consideration but that Senate must rely on its committees to carry out such detailed tasks. He stated that

Senate filtered off problems without serious consideration by establishing committees, that politics arise in the consideration of memberships on committees and that this problem needs to be overcome. He expressed appreciation for such procedures as have been developed up to the present time with reference, as an example, to the Senate Agenda Committee. He believed that the calendar items should first be reviewed by a committee before presentation to Senate. He suggested that policy proposals should be considered by Senate on a two-readings approach. He supported the Chairman's comments that the Chairman had been too lax and permissive.

S.Wong made reference to the specific comments of the Acting President. He referred to debate on the P.S.A. issue stating that faculty members would not debate the issue, that he had done so and had been jumped upon by Senate. He referred to the last meeting of Senate and two items which it had been requested be placed on the Agenda, noted that he did not support the items but that he did indeed support putting the items on the Agenda. He stated that Senate was held in contempt by students for a variety of reasons and that it often deals with trivial motions when other more important items urgently require consideration, and made reference to adjournment at midnight. He commented on the provision for lay members on Senate, indicated that he supported the idea but that he did not support current lay members as they vote but do not debate. He noted that in discussion on the P.S.A. issue, he had suggested that the lay members sit on committees, but that they state they are not qualified, but nevertheless they vote on issues. He noted the comments of the Acting Academic Vice-President to the effect that the Chairman did not have a chance to speak at the last meeting on Paper S.215, but that the Chairman did have opportunity but chose not to speak. He referred to the Ellis Report which he supported in principle but that he also supported sending it back to faculties for further discussion as he did not believe that un-democratic procedures should be used on issues requiring democratic procedures. He stated that on many occasions he had supported the view that faculties should have full chance to put comments forth before Senate decision. He made reference to Robert's Rules of Order, Page 5, and stated that the rules were to provide a deliberative body with protection from itself. He stated that when first elected to Senate, he had been told to learn Robert's Rules and the Rules of Senate, but that the previous Chairman had often avoided rules and had refused to put items on the Agenda. He argued that rules are valuable but that recently they had been violated, and made reference to the seating of R.Cole on Senate which had called for a suspension of the rules and not a challenge which was the procedure which had been followed. He made reference also to frequent interruption of his speeches and his request that order be called, but without response.

G.Shrum noted that frequent reference had been made in the discussion to the ex-Acting Academic Vice-President and indicated he did not think this correct in view of the fact that the resignation had not yet been accepted.

B.Funt expressed the view that Senate is gripped by a paralysis unique in Canadian universities and that it is proper to see if there are mechanisms to correct this difficulty. He believed Senate was neglecting responsibilities if it did not act when it had power and knowledge. He believed academic programmes and standards are suffering because of Senate's preoccupation with debate and procedural wrangles. He considered also that there had been a gradual erosion in Senate and noted that earlier lay senators and deans had participated in the debate much more frequently. He referred to the possi-

bility of the utilization of a University Court as it exists in other institutions for the possibility of debate if required. He believed that Senate should devote its prime attention to academic matters. He indicated no apology for suggesting adjournment at midnight as extension of meetings beyond that time significantly impaired efficiency and impeded on-going academic progress.

K.Rieckhoff stated that he was not speaking only as an individual senator but that he had a mandate from the Faculty of Science which had considered the paper on academic planning that day. He expressed sympathy with the statements of the Acting President and with the Acting Academic Vice-President except for R.Haering's intention to resign. He expressed objection to the statement of G.Sperling that Senate is not here to be efficient and to get business done. He referred to the comments of S.Wong with reference to lay members of Senate and the fact that they did not participate in debate. He argued that it is not necessary that all members of Senate debate on items if adequate expressions of pros and cons have been given and there are not new points to be stated. He felt that extension of debate in such fashion merely prolonged the agony and that if an individual has done his job in advance with careful thought, entry into the debate is not necessary if discussion has been adequately covered. He referred to Paper S.215 dealing with academic planning and indicated that it had been considered at the Faculty of Science meeting that day with very few comments and that the Faculty of Science had unanimously endorsed the paper. He stated that he had voted against referral of the paper back to the Faculty of Science as he had done his job and knew that the faculty would render support. He claimed that this was but one example of many similar issues on which there had been intensive debate in Senate for referral of items to faculties. He stated that if lines of communication are kept adequately open, that Senate could indeed make decisions. He was of the opinion that often there is no permanent or full solution but that decisions are essential for day to day operations. He expressed full support for the Acting President and for the Acting Academic Vice-President.

A.MacKinnon indicated that he was disturbed by the comments of those who suggest havoc and ruin, as much has been achieved at Simon Fraser University. He noted that many similar questions were facing other institutions. He concurred that Senate needs criteria to guide its actions and that there is great need for establishment of priority of problems. He was of the view that too much time was spent on procedures and not sufficient on policies. He concurred with the need for as much information as possible commensurate with the time available to deal with urgent items. He noted the necessity of getting committees working to do their jobs and the need for Senate to enunciate problems clearly, to provide appropriate data in order that committees could get to work. He referred to Robert's Rules of Order and noted that it included statements indicating that the purpose of the rules was to assist the assembly and argued that they were not provided to dominate the assembly.

B.D'Aoust stated that he was again seeing Senate acting as usual with nice speeches and some ideas, and enquired as to why a paper could not be prepared for submission dealing in depth with the topic as he felt that merely speaking did not accomplish much. He expressed agreement with the statements of the Acting President and the Acting Academic Vice-President and concurred that

some of the criticisms made had validity. He considered it essential that Senate address itself to policy priorities.

K.Okuda stated that a number of the problems currently facing Senate had faced departments of the university earlier including such things as non-clear terms of reference, the treatment of committee reports cavalierly, the introduction of frivolous or stalling motions. He suggested that it might be in order to have a rule that no committee report could be amended on the floor of Senate but that the report would be returned to committees where necessary. He noted also that in some instances committee members who supported certain discussions within committee and in the preparation of the report then opposed such items when they reached the floor of Senate. He considered it unfortunate that Senate seemed unwilling to accept reports from its committees.

D.Tuck commented that the current meeting showed a sincerity of debate which had often been lacking. He did not consider it necessary for everyone to debate particularly if entry into the discussion would merely repeat expression of points already made. He considered that efficiency at a university is not measured in budgetary or similar terms but rather in learning, teaching, research and scholarship. He could see no necessity of having every issue a public debate.

S.Stratton noted that often an individual senator's method of presentation could be inhibiting a discussion and referred to such items as sarcasm, taking items out of context, red herrings and misleading statements. He believed that all should speak to the real issue at hand and should totally avoid insincerity.

A.Lachlan supported R.Haering's statement and believed that Senate could proceed faster if the Chairman were given more discretion to guide debates. He suggested that Robert's Rules of Order be abandoned and that the Chairman's rulings should pertain.

K.Strand commented on a number of the points which had been made. He believed that the comments on giving committees tasks without adequate criteria were well taken. He concurred that the statements on jurisdictional matters were pointed. He appreciated the idea of using first and second reading on policy items. He noted that he had left the Chair at the last meeting to talk to Paper S.215, that he had decided against talking as there were procedural issues, and believed that he probably should have done so. He expressed the view that a number of the points raised were of value and considered the discussion helpful.

L.Boland indicated that he wished to speak further and was reluctant to cease the debate as he considered that further discussion could be of value to Senate. He expressed the view that representative democracy alone is not sufficient but that there must be effective use of the committee structure on the premise that if the committees do their job adequately, giving pro and con arguments, then Senate can make adequate decisions; but that if these are not given in the paper provided by the committee, voting likely would be political. He expressed irritation at a number of the attitudes shown on Senate and stated that he had no wish to be on a political body.



4. SEARCH PROCEDURES FOR AN ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENT - PAPER S.219,  
219a (D.Tuck)

S.Wong rose on a point of order and noted that at the last meeting a motion had been passed to table the item for the next regular meeting and that if Robert's Rules of Order were followed, the item should not be dealt with at this time.

Moved by D.Tuck, seconded by L.Boland,

"that the motion to postpone discussion on Paper S.219,  
219a to the next regular meeting be rescinded."

MOTION PASSED  
18 in favour  
3 opposed  
2 abstained

D.Tuck, Chairman of the committee which presented the report, commented thereon.

Moved by D.Tuck, seconded by K.Rieckhoff,

"that Senate adopt the recommendations of the Senate Committee on the Methods of Appointments, Responsibilities and Tenure of Heads and Deans for the general method of appointment of an Academic Vice-President and that this policy be recommended to the Board of Governors."

L.Boland noted that there were errors in fact in the references to Interim Council Report and Joint Faculty voting.

Amendment was moved by S.Wong, seconded by G.Sperling,

"that Senate accept in principle the participation of students on the Selection Committee in all future selections of an Academic Vice-President, including this one."

Debate was undertaken and S.Wong spoke in favour of the amendment noting that students participate on the Presidential Search Committee and that students are affected by the position of Academic Vice-President.

G.Sperling spoke in favour of the amendment referring to inclusion of students on the Presidential Search Committee and that similar conditions should pertain to the two committees.

D.Tuck made reference to the Student Implementation Committee Report, indicating the committee had considered the report and drew attention to Page 10, Paragraph 420, in which the Student Implementation Report recommended that the position of Academic Vice-President be abolished before being created.

M.Collins expressed the view that Senate was again entering into a long debate, that a committee had brought in its report, that an amendment had been proposed, and that if this were considered necessary the report should be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

D. Korbin stated that use of the argument by D.Tuck based on the Student Implementation Committee Report was inappropriate and that under no circumstances should students be left off the Search Committee as they are effective.

G.Shrum spoke in favour of the amendment and interjected words of defence of lay members. He considered it disastrous that of six lay members of Senate only one had indicated willingness to serve again. He referred to the contributions made by a number of the lay senators. He considered that it would be helpful to have students serve on the Search Committee.

K.Rieckhoff noted that the mover indicated the recommendations were following those approved by Joint Faculty, that the report had received major consideration of the committee submitting it and that it was following the procedures of Joint Faculty which had passed by an overwhelming vote, and spoke against the amendment.

Moved by K.Rieckhoff, seconded by A.Lachlan,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION PASSED  
17 in favour  
1 abstained

Vote was then undertaken on the amendment by S.Wong, G.Sperling.

AMENDMENT PASSED  
11 in favour  
10 opposed  
3 abstained

Amendment was moved by R.Haering, seconded by K.Burstein,

"that the three student representatives on the Presidential Search Committee be placed on the Search Committee for the Academic Vice-President."

but as S.Wong had indicated he had a further amendment to propose if the first amendment passed, the Chairman ruled the Haering-Burstein item out of order.

Amendment was moved by S.Wong, seconded by D.Korbin,

"that Senate include five students on the Acting Vice-President Search Committee with power of veto on a majority vote among the student senators."

(Note that in the student group a vote of three out of the five could veto. S.Wong stated that the amendment was to apply to Item 2 of Paper S.219a).

K.Okuda spoke in opposition to the amendment noting that it stated both numbers of students and the procedures which the committee would follow.

G.Shrum suggested that the mover and seconder adopt the Haering motion, enquired why five students would be needed, and indicated disagreement with the proposal for veto.

S.Wong noted that the Presidential Search Committee provided for a power of veto and argued that students have a great institutional loyalty, and said that there need not be fear of misuse.

M.Collins indicated astonishment and stated that the main concern of the individual appointed would be with faculty not with students, but that the item was now being discussed as a political issue.

S.Stratton enquired as to whether the question could be separated with vote being undertaken on the numbers of students and then on the aspect of veto.

Moved by S.Stratton, seconded by G.Shrum,

"that the question be divided into two parts."

MOTION FAILED  
6 in favour  
13 opposed  
2 abstained

G.Sperling spoke in favour of the amendment and stated that the Academic Vice-President would indeed affect students as he dealt largely in matters dealing with curriculum. He noted that students serve on the Presidential Search Committee and considered that there should be consistency across the two committees.

D.Sullivan wished to give information on a point of fact and noted that students do not have a power of veto on the Presidential Search Committee, but that unanimous vote is required.

D.Tuck noted that Senate had before it a committee report and was again acting as at certain previous meetings. He deplored the nature of the debate and the tone of it.

W.Vidaver opposed the amendment and indicated that he would support the motion which had been proposed by Haering-Burstein.

Moved by W.Vidaver, seconded by K.Burstein,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION PASSED  
21 in favour

Vote was then undertaken on the amendment by Wong-Korbin.

MOTION FAILED  
3 in favour  
17 opposed  
3 abstained

Moved by R.Haering, seconded by G.Shrum,

"that the three student representatives on the Presidential Search Committee be placed on the Search Committee for the Academic Vice-President."

R.Haering stated that this would be for future selections and that it could fit into items No.1 or 2 or 3 and that he would now specify Item 3.

D.Korbin argued the motion out of order. D.Tuck enquired as to whether Senate was going to deal with the matter tonight or whether it was going to refer the matter back to committee. Discussion became involved and it was decided that the three items of Paper S.219a would be considered ad seriatim.

Moved by G.Sperling, seconded by K.Burstein,

"that the items of Paper S.219a be considered ad seriatim, 1, 2, 3."

MOTION CARRIED  
12 in favour  
6 abstained

Moved by K.Burstein, seconded by G.Sperling,

"that Item No.1 be tabled."

MOTION FAILED  
2 in favour  
10 opposed  
2 abstained

L.Boland referred to error in Item 1 in that Interim Council had made a recommendation to Joint Faculty and that Joint Faculty had passed the recommendation.

Amendment to Item 1 was moved by L.Boland, seconded by W.Vidaver,

"to delete and change Section 1 to read 'that a Selection Committee as recommended to Senate by faculties in joint session be used in the selection of an Academic Vice-President. The composition of this committee shall be the (Acting) President, the three Deans of the Faculties, one representative elected by each faculty, and two faculty members elected at large.' "

AMENDMENT PASSED  
9 in favour  
7 opposed  
2 abstained

Moved by D.Sullivan, seconded by K.Rieckhoff,

"that all action taken on this Agenda, Item 4, Paper S.219a, at

this meeting up to this time be rescinded."

MOTION FAILED  
 9 in favour  
 8 opposed  
 4 abstained  
 (two-thirds  
 required)

Motion was made by R.Haering, seconded by K.Rieckhoff,

"that we rescind Robert's Rules for the remainder of this meeting and all future meetings until this body becomes convinced that we cannot operate more smoothly under the system which we advocated earlier."

but the motion was not accepted by the Chairman.

Amendment was moved to Item 1 by L.Boland, seconded by B.D'Aoust,

"that we accept three students elected by the Student Society on the committee."

D.Korbin moved an amendment to the amendment,

"that there be nine students."

but the Chairman ruled the amendment to the amendment out of order on the ground that if the amendment which would include three students were defeated, then D.Korbin could make amendment for nine students. The ruling of the Chairman was challenged by D.Korbin, seconded by J.Conway; vote on the ruling was undertaken with 17 in favour of the Chair, 4 opposed, and the ruling of the Chair was upheld.

D.Korbin then spoke to the amendment, in opposition, indicating opposition to tokenism, to the rules being used, and argued that representative democracy needs to be proportional representation.

Moved by B.D'Aoust, seconded by D.Tuck,

"that the previous question now be put."

MOTION CARRIED  
 16 in favour  
 1 opposed

Vote was undertaken on the Boland-D'Aoust amendment to include three students on the committee.

AMENDMENT FAILED  
 9 in favour  
 9 opposed  
 3 abstained

Amendment to Item 1 was moved by D.Korbin, seconded by G.Sperling,

"that there be added the words 'plus nine students elected by the Student Society'."

AMENDMENT FAILED  
4 in favour  
17 opposed  
1 abstained

Amendment to Item 1 was moved by K.Rieckhoff, seconded by A.Lachlan,

"that one student elected by the Student Society be accepted on the committee."

AMENDMENT FAILED  
6 in favour  
8 opposed  
8 abstained

Amendment to Item 1 was moved by D.Sullivan, seconded by A.Lachlan,

"that two students be accepted on the committee."

D.Sullivan gave notice of motion that if the above amendment passed that this would be implemented on all committees.

AMENDMENT FAILED  
4 in favour  
10 opposed  
8 abstained

Amendment to Item 1 was moved by K.Okuda, seconded by L.Boland,

"that three student representatives be added to the committee, one to be the President of the Student Council and two to be elected by the Student Society at large."

D.Korbin opposed the amendment stating that it was undemocratic and that students had the right to select who would represent them on committees.

AMENDMENT FAILED  
7 in favour  
10 opposed  
3 abstained

Amendment to Item 1 was moved by K.Rieckhoff, seconded by D.Sullivan,

"that there be three students, one the President of the Student Society and two students to be elected by the Student Society, to act in a consultative capacity to the Search Committee."

A priority motion was introduced by S.Wong.

Moved by S.Wong, seconded by D.Korbin,

"that the meeting now adjourn."

D.Tuck asked the Chairman what he would do if the meeting adjourned without solution to the problem and the Chairman stated that he would make recommendations to the Board of Governors and take responsibility therefor.

Vote was undertaken on the motion to adjourn.

MOTION PASSED  
11 in favour  
8 opposed  
1 abstained

The meeting adjourned at 12 midnight.

H. M. Evans,  
Secretary.