

FOURTH CANADIAN SYMPOSIUM ON THEORETICAL CHEMISTRY

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August 11 - 17, 1971

Minutes of Meeting

of

Canadian Theoretical Chemists

Held Monday, August 16, 1971

University of British Columbia

Chemistry Building, Room 225

6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Co-Chairmen: G. Malli, Simon Fraser University
R.F. Snider, University of British Columbia

A.R. Allnatt (Western Ontario), W. Brostow (McGill),
A.A. Cantú (Research Council of Alberta), J.A.R. Coope (U.B.C.),
I.G. Csizmadia (Toronto), W. Forst (Laval), S. Fraga (Alberta),
J.L. Ginsburg (Saint Mary's), F. Grein (New Brunswick),
B.R. Henry (Manitoba), W. G. Laidlaw (Calgary), C.S. Lin,
(Windsor), W.J. Meath (Western Ontario), K.A.R. Mitchell (U.B.C.),
J. Paldus (Waterloo), R. Paul (Calgary), R. Rauk (Calgary),
S.M. Rothstein (Brock), B. Shizgal (U.B.C.), W. Siebrand,
(National Research Council of Canada), V. Smith (Queen's),
N.S. Snider (Queen's), R. Truax (Calgary)

Secretary: Miss P. Timms, Dept. of Chemistry,
Simon Fraser University

- AGENDA:
1. Location of 1973 meeting and by whom
 2. CIC
 3. Critique and future
 4. Other business

Dr. Malli chaired the first part of the business meeting and Dr. R. F. Snider chaired the second part.

Dr. Malli called the meeting to order and proposed the question of where the Fifth Canadian Symposium should be held. Dr. Siebrand informed the meeting that it has been suggested that David Bishop from the University of Ottawa and Vedene Smith from Queen's University co-chair the next Symposium to be held in Ottawa if everyone agreed.

Dr. Csizmadia agreed that it would be appropriate to hold the next Symposium in Ottawa.

Dr. Malli agreed on this point that the Symposium should be held in Ottawa, and asked if there were any further suggestions.

There was general agreement stated by the members of the meeting and it was expressed by Dr. Malli that David Bishop and Vedene Smith should co-chair the Fifth Canadian Symposium to be held in Ottawa.

Moved by Dr. Meath and Seconded by Dr. Csizmadia to close item (1); and all were in favor of the choice of David Bishop and Vedene Smith as co-chairmen.

(2) CIC - Chemical Institute of Canada

The question raised by Dr. Malli was, would it be feasible to open a branch of Theoretical Chemistry in CIC? It was stated that CIC has been generous in the past with financial support for the Symposia.

Dr. Csizmadia related that last year there was some discussion about opening a separate division within the Physical Chemistry Division.

A question was asked of those attending how many belonged to CIC and how many belonged to CAP (Canadian Association of Physicists). The results are:

CIC - 8

CAP - 2

Dr. Malli then asked for a straw vote on the subject and a member of the meeting asked if it was necessary for a vote.

The question was raised as to whether CIC would bail a Symposium out if it went into the red?

Dr. Malli expressed the feeling of the general meeting of the problem whether the Symposium would lose its independence, such as, will the CIC choose when the conferences will be held.

For this Symposium, CIC had contributed approximately \$750.

The question was asked what is the total operating budget of the Symposium? Both Dr. Malli and Dr. Snider agreed that there is no set amount but most Symposia operated on \$10,000 to \$14,000, but this depended on the contributions and expenses.

Dr. Snider stated that the point in question was one of economics, of backing to the Symposia and if there was a deficit that one person would not be responsible.

Dr. Csizmadia related that he had a conversation with some of the people from the Physical Chemistry Division and they were of the opinion that if we decided to approach them about a sort of active working group within the division, the only requirement would be that we have a representative, such as a president or treasurer, who would also be a member of their executive.

Dr. Siebrand expressed the feeling that the decision should be left up to Dr. Bishop and Dr. Smith. Dr. Snider felt that someone should be appointed to bring a concrete proposal in detail to the next meeting for debate.

Dr. Malli suggested that an ad hoc committee of three men should be set up but the consensus from the meeting was that there should only be one man. Upon this decision, Dr. Malli suggested the name of Dr. Smith, the newly elected co-chairman who was present at the meeting. But Dr. Smith said he was not a member of CIC and suggested Dr. Bader's name. Dr. Malli suggested the name of Dr. Birss. After a discussion it was suggested by Dr. Snider that both Dr. Bader and Dr. Birss between them together or singly be asked to bring a concrete proposal to the next meeting for debate.

(3) Critique and Future

Dr. Snider began by asking people to comment on the Symposium.

Dr. Csizmadia stated that he liked the weekend break. Therefore, he felt that if the others agreed, it would be a good thing to follow. His criticism was that he missed the list of participants and would like to see a complete list of those attending the Symposium.

Dr. Laidlaw expressed the opinion that it was a nice idea but the attendance had dropped. Those who had already given their talks used Saturday to look around and left for home on the Sunday. Dr. Siebrand commented that the future of the weekend should be left to the decision of the future co-chairmen.

Dr. Snider explained that this has usually been the policy in the past, not to pass any resolutions about action for the future co-chairmen, but to give them some indication of the feeling of the participants.

A straw vote was taken about the weekend break.

Those in favor of a weekend break - 8
Those against a weekend break - 9

The next question that Dr. Snider recognized was the mailing list comment. He said that he would pass on the lists of names to the next co-chairmen and would see that a list of the participants be put together for the conference as there had been a lot of interest in this. Also, the books of the Symposium would be open to the new co-chairmen.

Dr. Ginsberg commented that the program was very heavy and that there had hardly been any time for discussion except in the rare cases when people finished before their time was up.

Dr. Malli explained that the reason why this happened is that some people would only come if they could contribute a paper.

Dr. Snider commented that we had to turn down a few people who wanted to contribute a paper and some people who asked to contribute a paper did not attend. It was suggested that a private room be available for small discussions.

Dr. Lin took the floor and pointed out that the First International Congress would be held in July 1973, therefore something must be arranged. His second point was that he had heard some people mention that they were not informed that they would give a talk until after registration.

Dr. Snider replied that there had been the odd person whom we had turned down because we had a filled program but we managed to squeeze him in. Those people who made a contribution or were invited to speak were informed before the conference started. There is a file in which can be found a copy of a letter which had been sent to each of these people.

Dr. Lin brought up the point of grouping the talks and papers in certain sessions and commented that it had been well organized and felt that it should be handled the same way at the next Symposium. Dr. Rothstein felt that one possible way around the problem of discussion time was to arrange a more lengthy discussion period for invited papers.

Dr. Rothstein thought an attempt could be made to have invited discussion on invited papers and that certain people participate in discussions on controversial topics. Dr. Ginsberg felt that invited papers do not always invite discussion and tend to be rather uncontroversial. But sometimes buried in the

contributed papers you'll find a 10 minute paper that could evoke a lot more discussion, though he was not in favor of more 10 minute papers at the loss of invited papers.

Dr. Contú wanted to know if the co-chairmen had had any help in choosing the papers or did they make the choices on their own. Dr. Snider replied that they had been 'strong minded' and done their own choosing. Both Dr. Snider and Dr. Malli agreed that the decision on whether to obtain help or not should be left in the hands of the future co-chairmen.

Dr. Allnatt felt the number of contributed papers was just fine but felt in his opinion that he would have liked to receive a program.

Dr. Snider explained that the program had only been printed the Thursday before the Symposium started and therefore it was impossible to send a completed program to everyone at that late date. Also by not sending the program it ensured that people would come for most of the conference and become acquainted with a variety of topics in theoretical chemistry.

A question from the floor was, did the co-chairmen consider running parallel sessions? Dr. Snider's answer was no, because in his personal view that one should attempt to get people acquainted with a variety of subjects.

Dr. Ginsberg felt that 45 minutes for introducing oneself to a new area was not a long enough period for discussion. He also felt that it was contrary to 'scientific spirit' not to have the full information beforehand so a person could choose what he would like to attend.

Dr. Malli commented that a preliminary announcement was sent giving a partial list of the invited speakers. But it is almost impossible to know more than a week or so in advance whether a person is coming or not. Dr. Csizmadia backed up this statement by saying that only a tentative program is possible which, of course, is not binding at all and any resemblances between that and the final copy is merely coincidental.

Dr. Siebrand pointed out that theory embraces everything in chemistry so that it should not be expected that a Symposium covering a wide variety of fields to have a lively discussion on all papers. Dr. Fraga stated that it must be decided what type of meeting everyone wanted. Some want the kind of meeting that we've had and others want one like the Gordon Conference. He also pointed out that the Symposium was not trying to compete with the Gordon Conference.

Dr. Snider stated that the point in question seemed to be whether a broad Symposium was preferred over a narrow one. He asked for a vote

Those in favor of a broad Symposium - 23
Those in favor of a narrow Symposium - 2

Dr. Coope raised the question of why the Symposium had to be held in August and he wanted to know if it could be held at any other time.

Dr. Malli felt that there would have to be a questionnaire on this point. Dr. Csizmadia commented that a lot depends on the local situation such as summer classes, housing, and other important considerations.

Dr. Meath proposed a vote of thanks for Drs. Malli and Snider for their arranging the Fourth Canadian Symposium and everyone was in agreement.

Dr. Meath moved that the meeting be adjourned and it was seconded by Dr. Csizmadia.