

published in 1980 and a new electron microprobe analysis of a specimen of killinite (Table I) from

TABLE I. *Electron probe analysis of killinite from Killiney Bay calculated on an anhydrous basis of 22 oxygens**

SiO ₂	50.35	Si	6.90
Al ₂ O ₃	28.14	Al	4.55
Cr ₂ O ₃	0.01	Fe	0.21
FeO	1.79	Mg	0.28
MgO	1.39	Mn	0.02
MnO	0.17	Ca	0.01
CaO	0.07	Na	0.04
Na ₂ O	0.14	K	1.66
K ₂ O	9.48	[OH]	4.00
H ₂ O	[8.46]	[H ₂ O]	1.87
Total	100.00		

* Analyst-Vezzalini, Modena; 0.46 Li₂O subtracted for spodumene.

Killiney Bay, kindly made available for research by the National Museum of Ireland, Dublin (spec. No. NMI:G:647:1980). The X-ray powder diffraction pattern of this specimen was identical to that published in 1980 for another killinite from Killiney Bay. The data presented leaves little doubt that killinite is a dioctahedral hydromuscovite.

Acknowledgements. Miss Farley and Dr Oriordan of the National Museum of Ireland kindly loaned the specimen and Dr Vezzalini of Modena kindly performed the probe analysis. The late Dr M. H. Hey was largely instrumental in preparing the proposal and circulating it amongst the IMA delegates.

REFERENCES

- Taylor, T. (1818) *Trans. R. Irish Acad.* **13**, 3.
Nawaz, R. (1980) *Irish Naturalists J.* **20**, 120.

[Manuscript received 15 February 1984]

© Copyright the Mineralogical Society

Department of Geology, Ulster Museum, Belfast BT9 5AB, Northern Ireland

RAB NAWAZ

MINERALOGICAL MAGAZINE, DECEMBER 1984, VOL. 48, PP. 567-8

Rules of procedure of the Commission on New Minerals and Mineral Names, International Mineralogical Association

1. Proposals for new minerals, changes in mineralogical nomenclature, discrediting and/or redefinition of existing minerals and mineral names, or matters dealing with mineral groups should be brought to the attention of the Commission on New Minerals and Mineral Names, International Mineralogical Association (referred to hereafter as the Commission),

(a) through the appropriate National Committee where these exist, or

(b) directly to the Chairman of the Commission, if they are for new minerals, or

(c) to the Vice-Chairman of the Commission, with a copy to the Chairman, if they are for existing minerals, or

(d) to the Secretary of the Commission, with a copy to the Chairman, if they deal with mineral groups.

2. A proposal should include as much data as possible, so that the Commission can adequately

judge the validity of the proposal. The Chairman is authorized to write to the author asking for more data when he considers this desirable, or he may point out possible objections either to the mineral or to the name. If the author so desires, the Chairman is required to submit a proposal to the Commission whether or not he approves of it. The Chairman's abstract of a proposal is sent by air mail to each member of the Commission and approximately 60 days are allowed for receipt of voting papers. In cases where a new name is proposed to replace an old one, the proposer of the new name must write to the original namer, if alive, and obtain his comments on the re-naming. These comments must be supplied with the proposal. The Chairman may also choose to correspond with original namers.

3. Members of the Commission are urged not only to vote but to comment in detail. The Chairman is authorized to suspend voting if, in his

opinion, serious objections to a proposal are raised. He is then required to send the objections to the author of the proposal for a reply. After receiving the author's reply, the Chairman must send copies of the objections and the reply to the members of the Commission and voting must be re-opened. Any member of the Commission who objects to a proposal may ask the Chairman to use this procedure, but the decision to suspend voting rests with the Chairman.

4. Abstracts of proposals dealing with ore minerals are customarily sent to some members of the IMA's Commission on Ore Microscopy. Similarly, the Chairman may submit abstracts of any proposals to other specialists for advisory opinions. Such advisors do not vote, but their comments are considered by the Chairman. Serious objections raised by any advisors are to be treated by the Chairman as in paragraph 3.

5. Proposals dealing with minerals belonging to mineral groups for which subcommittees have been organized by the Commission may be sent to the appropriate subcommittee Chairman for circulation among the subcommittee members if the Commission Chairman thinks such action is advisable. Subcommittee members are invited to submit opinions and serious objections raised by them are to be treated by the Chairman as in paragraph 3.

6. If two or more proposals for the same new mineral are received by the Chairman, the proposal which arrived first in the Chairman's office will have priority.

7. A proposed new mineral will be considered approved if at least two-thirds (2/3) of the members who vote on the proposal vote yes. A proposed name will be considered approved if at least one-half (1/2) of the members who vote on the proposal vote yes. After voting on a proposal is completed, the Chairman sends the results to the Commission members and to the author of the proposal. He includes any comments of the voting members, but the votes of individual members are not disclosed. The Commission may publish the results of votes, but publishing non-approved names or the names of non-approved minerals is not permitted.

8. In the case of proposals handled by the Vice Chairman or Secretary (as defined in paragraphs 1c and 1d) the results of voting shall be sent to the Chairman who will then send the results to the Commission members and to the authors. Such votes require the same majorities of the members voting as given in paragraph 7 in order to receive approval.

9. Reconsideration of adverse votes can be requested by an author at any time if new data or new

interpretations are obtained. If a mineral is approved, but not the name, a new name should be requested by the Chairman when he notifies the author of the voting results. In cases of repeat voting, approvals of the mineral and the name require the same majorities as given in paragraph 7.

10. Authors of proposed new minerals must publish their descriptions within *two years* of being notified of the approval by the Chairman. If a mineral description is not published within that time, the mineral and name are no longer considered as approved. Any extensions of this deadline must be approved by the Chairman.

11. Priority reservations for authors of those countries which have a national committee for new minerals and mineral names shall be maintained for *one year only* if the priority reservation is requested by the chairman of the respective national committee. At that time a complete detailed abstract must be submitted to the Chairman of the Commission who will send copies (with the date of priority) to all members of the Commission for their information only. If the proposal is approved by the national committee, voting by the Commission shall proceed as soon as possible.

12. Authors who have described new minerals without names shall not have any priority rights on the subsequent naming of such minerals. Any such names will have to be approved by the Commission.

Toronto, Canada, 30 September 1983

The Commission on New Minerals and Mineral Names, IMA

Dr J. A. Mandarino, *Chairman*,
Department of Mineralogy and Geology,
Royal Ontario Museum,
100 Queen's Park,
Toronto, Ontario,
Canada M5S 2C6

Dr E. H. Nickel, *Vice Chairman*,
Division of Mineralogy,
CSIRO, Private Bag, PO,
Wembley, WA,
Australia, 6014

Dr F. Cesbron, *Secretary*,
Departement MGA
BRGM
BP 6009
45060 Orleans CEDEX
France

[Communication received 21 December 1983]