

# **CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA**

## **GOVERNORS' LETTER THREE**

### **2000-2001**



Responses may be mailed, faxed or E-mailed to the Chess Federation of Canada, E-1 2212 Gladwin Crescent, Ottawa, ON, K1B 5N1, fax: 613-733-5209, E-Mail: [info@chess.ca](mailto:info@chess.ca)

**ATTENTION ALL GOVERNORS:** Anyone with an E-Mail address can have their Governors' Letter sent to them via E-Mail and save the CFC paper and postage costs. Please E-Mail [info@chess.ca](mailto:info@chess.ca) if interested.

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is January 15, 2001

## **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

This will be a brief President's Message as there are my comments and other comments on news in other parts of this G.L.

First of all, congratulations go out to our National Olympic Team for their outstanding achievement in the Olympiad. A tie for 25th place out of 128 Countries is truly remarkable especially when you consider that many of the teams we faced were among the strongest in the world. Individually, Kevin Spraggett won the silver medal for board two, another great achievement by a Canadian. Congratulations Kevin, you did us proud! Our Women's Team had a tough time playing some very strong teams, but all of our team had wins and put in a great effort.

In other news, we have signed an agreement with the Internet Chess Club {ICC} which should be beneficial to both organizations. Arrangements are being made to have exclusive CFC tournaments on the internet. Our Vice President Halldor Palsson has more details elsewhere in this G.L.

In what could be a very significant move, the CFC has formally applied for membership in the Canadian Olympic Association. If approved, this could have positive bearing on possible Government funding in the future. It will also make chess more credible as a sport in the minds of many critics. A decision should be forthcoming sometime in March.

We now have a TD Certificate Committee who are Lyle Craver, Serge Archambault and Raymond Stonkus. They will have some creative work ahead of them to devise the proper test to meet today's standards in the chess world. I thank them for their initiative and wish them well to reestablish a program that should help more people become interested in becoming Tournament Directors.

From all of the above, you can see that the CFC is moving forward and adapting to the changing world of chess. We must continue to adapt and take advantage of new technology and situations

as they arise.

Now, as the holiday season is upon us, let us pause for a while and say thank you for all the positive things we have encountered in our chess world and outside as well. To all our Governors and CFC Members I wish a sincere MERRY CHRISTMAS and HAPPY NEW YEAR. Have a safe holiday.

Maurice Smith  
President  
Chess Federation Of Canada

## **KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED**

David Cohen was appointed Women's Co-ordinator.

Lyle Craver was appointed Treasurer.

Maurice Smith  
President  
Chess Federation Of Canada

## **VICE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

The CFC and the Internet Chess Club (ICC) signed an agreement in November of 2000. The financial terms of the agreement are confidential at the request of the ICC. The agreement is non-exclusive and can be terminated by either party by giving 90 days notice. Under the agreement the ICC pays the CFC an annual fee for promoting the ICC in addition to a fee for each member that signs up through the CFC. The ICC will also promote membership in the CFC.

The CFC Executive appointed Dan DeCastro CFC ICC Coordinator. Dan DeCastro will run the ICC on-line program offered by the CFC.

The CFC will offer monthly tournaments that will be rated active. Further details about these tournaments will be announced on the CFC website and on the ICC in the near future.

The text of the joint news release is:

Chessclub.com, the global leader in Internet chess gaming, today announced the signing of a cross-promotional deal with the Chess Federation of Canada (C.F.C.), the national organization for chess in the country of Canada.

Under the agreement, C.F.C. and Chessclub.com will collaborate on a broad cross-promotional campaign which will involve advertising in C.F.C.'s Award-Winning Magazine, En Passant, advertising on the C.F.C. and Chessclub.com websites, as well as the creation of the first ever prize tournament series rated by the C.F.C., to be held on Chessclub.com on a monthly basis. Also in the agreement is a revenue sharing plan to benefit both companies financially.

Maurice Smith, President of the Chess Federation of Canada said: "The C.F.C. welcomes this historic agreement with Chessclub.com which brings together the solid traditions of the governing body of chess in Canada with the dynamics of innovative technological online chess. This partnership should bring new members to both organizations and bring the best of both worlds to all chess players."

Daniel Sleator, PhD, President and CEO of Chessclub.com said: "This is a wonderful day for our company and for chess in Canada. Signing this contract with the Chess Federation of Canada allows us to greatly enhance our global community. We're now able to reach thousands more chess enthusiasts, and create what will undoubtedly be a very successful advertising campaign and tournament series for all of chess."

Halldor Palsson, Vice President of the Chess Federation of Canada said: "I am really pleased to sign this agreement on behalf of the C.F.C. The agreement expands our presence on the Internet and allows the C.F.C. to offer new services to our members."

Halldor Palsson  
Vice-President  
Chess Federation of Canada

## BIDS FOR 2001 ZONAL

The CFC Executive would welcome bids for the next Canadian Closed and Zonal Tournament. This event must be held before next year's World Championship, therefore a prompt response from organizers is necessary to allow adequate time for all the necessary arrangements. Please send all bids to the CFC Business Office.

Maurice Smith  
President  
Chess Federation Of Canada

## MOTIONS

**Editor's Note:** The mover of motion 01-1 has agreed to break this motion into two parts. To best avoid confusion with previous comments, I have simply renumbered them 01-1a and 01-1b

**Motion 01-1a:** (Roger Langen-Robert Webb): Whereas titles assist chess players to advertise competence for chess teaching and otherwise to enjoy the recognition of their peers for an achieved level of play;

be it resolved that the CFC adopt a title system for players rated above 1999 such that:

- 1) A player who attains a rating of 2000 be awarded the title of Expert, provided that this rating level is maintained for 24 consecutive games, exclusive of privately arranged matches or private tournaments not previously approved by the CFC;
- 2) A player who attains the rating of 2200 be awarded the title of Candidate Master, provided that this level is maintained for 24 consecutive games, exclusive of privately arranged matches or private tournaments not previously approved by the CFC;
- 3) A player who attains a rating of 2300 be automatically awarded the title of National Master;
- 4) A player who attains the rating of 2400 be automatically awarded the title of Senior Master, with attendant rights and/or privileges for national or international play as may be decided

by the CFC;

**Motion 01-1b:** (Roger Langen-Robert Webb): Whereas titles assist chess players to advertise competence for chess teaching and otherwise to enjoy the recognition of their peers for an achieved level of play;

be it resolved that the CFC adopt a certificate system for class players such that:

- 1) A player who attains a rating of 1900 be certified an A-class player;
- 2) A player who attains a rating of 1700 be certified a B-class player;
- 3) A player who attains a rating of 1500 be certified a C-class player;
- 4) A player who attains a rating of 1200 be certified a D-class player.

**Roger Langen & Robert Webb:** Questions related to the execution of the Motion(s) if passed may be treated separately. Certificates, for example, may be signified by an annotation on the membership card with updates reflected on the electronic rating list; that is, they need not be designed as paper products for members (although it may be useful to reward Junior players with a certificate proper). Title designations may be annotated as follows: Candidate Master (cm), National Master (NM), Senior Master (SM). If three Master titles seems too many, then I suggest dropping the Senior Master title for the time being. The other two titles affect more players.

A mid-range rating is not suggested for the D-class certificate as that rating range is a novice attainment; as, furthermore, first entry into a Class category should be recognized at the point of contact (to encourage younger players and reward participation in CFC events); and as distinction for prize purposes is not usually made among players rated below 1400, so that a concern to establish a D-class standard is not pertinent.

A qualification period is not suggested for the titles of National Master or Senior Master, as the attainment of the ratings 2300 and 2400 under the current system is already a remarkable

achievement.

Players active over the last three years (or more, as the CFC may determine) should receive titles or certificates immediately as per the criteria above. Exceptions might be made in some cases for the period prior to the rating change, e.g. ratings of 2300 attained by the 16+ formula but not maintained. For players not active in the last three years, a committee of the CFC may decide the manner of assigning titles and certificates.

The movers of these Motion, Governors Roger Langen and Robert Webb, recommend these Motion to our fellow Governors and to the CFC Executive. We believe it will encourage greater interest and participation in CFC events at all rating levels. We invite discussion.

**Motion 01-2:** (Martin Jaeger/ Wilf Ferner) That after the words "highest rated chosen" in 1203a) the words "from among participants in the most recent Closed and Zonal" be inserted.

**Martin Jaeger:** At the AGM, particularly as part of the masters' rep report, the question of strengthening participation in the Closed was addressed. The above motion would provide for an added incentive for increased participation by strong players.

This motion would make participation in the Closed a necessary condition for being chosen a selection rating list member of the team. Hence the strong players would have a stronger incentive to participate. Accordingly other registrants would have an enhanced opportunity to meet strong players over the board, and thereby earn selection rating list rating points. The event would be stronger and the Closed would serve partially as a qualifier event. The increase in the strength of the tournament would provide an increased incentive for organizers to step forward.

**Editor's Note:** The President has ruled that Motion 01-3 is actually an amendment of 01-1a. While the numbering can remain the same for reference purposes, the amendment will have to be voted on first when the time comes.

**Editor's Note:** I have made cosmetic adjustments 01-3 to take into account the change to former motion 01-1

**Motion 01-3:** (Richard Bowes / Ken Craft) That in Motion 01-1a, the clause "exclusive of privately arranged matches or private tournaments not previously approved by the CFC" under articles 1 & 2 be eliminated.

**Richard Bowes:** This is impractical and implies an undefined criteria to apply to the 24 consecutive games in order that they qualify.

**Motion 01-4:** (Richard Bowes / Ken Craft) Whereas the rules for the selection of the Olympic Team were not followed when choosing replacements for the resignations of Yan Teplitsky and Ron Livshits from the Canadian Olympic Team; and Whereas the President of the CFC has a clear and direct responsibility to ensure that the rules are correctly applied for the selection of players. The New Brunswick Governors request the resignation of Maurice Smith as President of the Chess Federation of Canada.

**Richard Bowes:** The New Brunswick Governors wish to express their great displeasure with the manner in which the CFC handled the selection of replacement members for the Olympic team. The CFC President acted without authority, in contravention of the CFC Constitution, in personally appointing Jack Yoos & David Cummings to the Olympic team instead of following the procedures set out in the CFC By-Laws. If Yan Teplitsky's & Ron Livshits' quitting the team created an issue as described under Article 11 of By-Law 2 then, if there was no time for a Governor's vote, the President had a duty to refer to the Board for a decision as to how to proceed. If this situation cannot be characterized as an issue under Article 11 because the procedures are clear regarding selection, then the President had a duty to refer directly to the selection rating list and to contact eligible players in their order of listing. In the latter event we would note the following:

The CFC procedures for selecting the Olympic team ensure that an objective test will be applied

in selecting players for the team. These procedures exist with the approval of the Assembly of Governors. The Governors are the representatives of the CFC members and work to ensure that the interests of the members are protected and respected by the governing body. In this instance the governing body (in the person of the President) has acted in such a manner as to ignore the proper procedures and to trample on the rights of certain members by not following the rules under the CFC Constitution. It is noted that the President has asserted that he acted within his authority inasmuch as the situation was one of great urgency. Presumably he considers that this event constituted an "issue" under By-Law 2, Article 11. However, assuming this to be the case, this claim of urgency has not been substantiated by facts. It has been noted that the President had several days after receiving notice of Teplitsky's & Livshits' quitting in which to, at the very least, contact the Board and to have them decide the course of action as stipulated under By-Law 2, Article 11. The President first learned of the pullout on Friday, October 20th and failed to even try to contact the members of the Board for the next 2 days. In fact it was certain Board members who contacted him eventually and when they gave their decision as to how to proceed (via the selection list) the President ignored their decision. Furthermore, there has been no evidence presented to indicate that Jack Yoos and David Cummings were contacted by the President any earlier than the following Monday, illustrating that there was plenty of time to telephone everyone on the selection list.

Note: Under the CFC rule titled "Conflict of Interest" the President must declare a conflict and abstain from involvement/voting/discussion in this proposal. Therefore we demand that the Vice President be the one to make the ruling on this submission with respect to its inclusion in the GL.

**Editor's Note:** A responding statement by CFC President, Maurice Smith is included in the following section: Motions Under Discussion.

**Straw Vote Topic 01-1:** (Martin Jaeger) "That the Canadian zonal be held biennially and if a second world championship be held between zonals, Canada's representative to the second world championship be the winner of a match held between the first and second place finishers at the most recent zonal."

**Martin Jaeger:** The world championship is now tending to be an annual event but holding a zonal every year is beyond the financial capabilities of Canadian players and organisations. Accordingly the above straw vote motion is presented.

While we (players and organization) cannot afford to hold a zonal every year, we should be able to finance a biennial Closed and a biennial match. In my view the match would be an interesting event for our membership.

#### **MOTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION**

##### **Second Discussion of 01-1a & 01-1b**

Refer to previous discussion by A. Mendrinos, D. Gebhardt, D. Miriguay, A. Mayo, L.Craver, and J.Rutherford, pg 6-8, GL#2.

**Roger Langen:** I am agreeable to the motion being separated into two different motions: one on titles, the other on certificates for class players. However, I do not feel that we should disrespect the class player and his or her achievement (perhaps especially at the junior level). The class player is certainly as important to a healthy chess organization as the titled player.

**Tony Ficzere:** I doubt very much that sending a certificate to a player in the lower classes will have a positive impact on chess in this country. I would be willing to bet dollars to donuts that the majority of these certificates will end up in the trash. To me, this is just a waste of time, resources, paper, and money. I believe that recognition of our players achievements should take place at the higher levels, that is expert, candidate master, master, and so on. These are major accomplishments, and recognizing these

achievements would give the lower classes something to strive for, as well as giving recognition to our stronger players. I would not object to awarding certificates to lower class \*junior\* players, as it is this demographic that would be more receptive to a program like this. It would also be nice to see these achievements listed in EP beside the names of the players so that these accomplishments can be seen. How difficult would it be to add an E, CM, NM, IM, GM to a players name field. When I read the magazine, or view a rating list provided by the CFC now, I have to rely on my poor memory of who is a titled player. Just my 2 cents.

**Gordon Taylor:** I do not think I will support this Motion for two reasons:

(1) I am not convinced by the reasons presented by the Movers. Strong players do have titles -- FIDE Master, IM or GM. Players who have only a high rating are never at a loss to present documentary proof when called upon. If someone now calls himself a "national master" I will ask what his rating is and make my own judgement. If the Motion passes then we could quickly have people who possess a title, but whose real strength is far below what that title suggests. In any case "caveat emptor" must be the guiding principal.

(2) The Motion proposes that the "CFC adopt a certificate program" but provides no details as to who would administer said program or how the costs would be funded. I seem to recall Yves Farges proposing a certificate program some years ago and it never got off the ground. The Business Office did not want to administer the program and the costs were prohibitive.

**David Cohen:** I am in favour of certificates. I prefer a certificate upon achievement of 2000 (Candidate Master), 2200 (National Master), 2400 (Senior Master). Certificates for lower levels are good as well, using achievement of the Class minimum (1200, 1400, 1600, 1800), but for juniors only. I think the CFC Business Office could send out the ones for FIDE rated players and for juniors once per year automatically. If the process can be computerized, then the others could also be done automatically, once per year.

**Francisco Cabanas:** Vote: No. This motion has two components. The awarding of titles and the production of certificates. I will first deal with the awarding of titles.

Traditionally players have been ranked as follows

2200+ Master (National master) or  
2200-2399 Master (national master), 2400+ (Senior Master)  
2000-2199 Expert or Candidate Master  
1800-1999 A or Category I  
1600-1799 B or Category II  
1400-1599 C or Category III  
1200-1399 D or Category IV  
1000-1199 E or Category V  
etc

Without life titles a player who drops below 2200 is no longer considered a master and is now an expert or candidate master. What this motion is trying to do actually makes sense namely create life titles. But it fails in the implementation. First it creates a very confusing title of "candidate master" for players over 2200! And then it creates a complicated set of rules to determine the title. Namely the 24 game rule excluding the undefined "private tournament". These rules cost money to implement. Why because we have to pay the staff to figure all of this out. And for what to call certain masters "candidate masters".

For this reason alone we should vote No. Now we come to the question of certificates, the mover and seconder are prepared to separate the motion; however that is not how the motion reads. So again vote NO.

My recommendation is that the Assembly defeat this motion and the amendment. As a final note I would support a title system that granted the title when the player reached the mid range of the class senior master or Canadian Master at 2500 master or national master at 2300 expert or candidate master at 2100 etc. down to class E or Category V at 1000.

Such a system has the advantage that it is fair and much harder to abuse than the 24 game rule,

furthermore it would cost nothing to implement since we already track peak ratings. In short by keeping it simple you get the benefits with no cost. As for certificates this should be a separate motion and discussed taking the cost of implementation and potential revenue into consideration.

**Lyle Craver:** Vote NO. I have strong reservations about this motion. I see nothing at all in this GL addressing my concerns in the areas of:

(a) "exclusive of privately arranged matches or private tournaments not previously approved by the CFC". Is the Executive or the Business Office now to get into the business of pre-certifying events to be held? If so, what is the proposed criteria for allowing a tournament to be held?

(b) I've checked with a number of masters (both over and under 2300) and the title they all apply to themselves is MASTER. The term 'Candidate Master' is nearly universally considered to be synonymous with Expert which everyone understands to mean 2000-2199.

(c) Last year the CFC brought in revisions to the rating system that the Ratings Auditor says are intended to cause a deflation in CFC ratings designed to align CFC ratings more exactly to FIDE ratings. This means non-active players will on average be higher rated than active players, particularly in the over 2000 range. This motion makes NO PROVISION AT ALL for transitional issues.

(d) Why on earth do we need to certify lower rated players? Seems to me that the 'lifetime high rating' issue is already quite nicely shown on the CFC rating list.

In short I think this motion is poorly drafted, creates significant extra work and cost for the Business Office and is of uncertain benefit to players generally. As such we should defeat this motion and send it back for redrafting if Messrs Langen and Webb feel their proposition has merit.

In short I completely agree with my good friend Ari Mendrinos.

If despite my vote, this motion is approved I

disagree with David Miriguay that a fee should be involved particularly for juniors and first-time masters.

### **First Discussion of 01-2**

Refer to previous discussion by K. Spraggett, pg 8-9, GL#2.

**Tony Ficzere:** Forcing our players to play in events doesn't seem very democratic to me. We keep playing with the formula for the Olympic team, and the acrimony never decreases. As these players also have to make a living, playing in the Canadian Closed with it's almost non-existent prize fund may not be a priority.

A simpler(?) solution would be to seek corporate sponsorship. This avenue has not been investigated enough. Sponsors are out there, but they must be solicited first. They won't come banging on your door. Another idea would be to tax the membership via rating fees. For example, why not raise rating fees by 50 cents per player per event, and putting this money towards the Closed prize fund. I guarantee that if the prize fund for the Closed was over \$10,000 that you would have greater participation.

**Gordon Taylor:** Our guiding principal should be that the Olympic Team consist of Canada's best players. This Motion is counter productive. It might persuade more strong players to compete in the Zonal Swiss, but most of Canada's best players will stay way for purely pragmatic reasons. The Zonal Swiss can function well to determine Canada's best player (singular intended), and to create some more IM's, but it is poorly constituted for selecting our Olympic Team.

**Martin Jaeger:** In Mr. Spraggett's comments on motion 01-2, amidst the ad hominem, lies the thesis that the proposal is outlandish. This thesis is transparently false. We presently use the national championship as the trial to determine our representative at the World Championship, our representative to the World Women's Championship, our representative to the World Junior and World Youth Championships. The Canadian Bridge Federation uses trials to

determine Canada's representatives to world championships and far and away Canadians who go to world championships and the Olympics in the physical sports are chosen on the basis of national trials.

Given what we do in choosing our other representatives and what other sports do, labelling the use of the national championships as a mandatory trial as extortion is simply hyperbolic abuse of the English language.

It is the responsibility of the assembly of governors to provide for fair and meaningful competition for places on the team. If players can avoid the national trial they avoid giving other contenders for the team an opportunity to wrest away rating points. This is particularly true for players outside the Toronto area who presently have no guaranteed opportunity to confront strong players from Toronto. If the Closed became a required trial then non-Torontonians who came to the Closed would have the opportunity to "knock off" other contenders.

Two of the three players (Torontonians) initially chosen for this year's team did not play in the last Closed. The present system of allowing players to avoid a national trial is simply unfair and should be replaced. I urge governors to move to a system of required trial that by far predominates in other applications. I urge the governors to give players outside the central area fairer access to the team.

**David Cohen:** Opposed. I don't see the need to restrict ourselves in our choice of Team members. We should focus on publicizing the CFC and chess in Canada, with regular press releases, and with the goal of obtaining corporate sponsorship for the events we are publicizing.

**Francisco Cabanas:** Vote NO. There is little I can add to Mr Spraggett's excellent discussion on the subject, other than to say this is also a barrier for players from outside Ontario to qualify to the Olympic team.

**Lyle Craver:** Vote No. I've nothing to add -

Kevin Spraggett has done a superb job of making his case.

### **First Discussion of 01-3**

Refer to previous discussion by R. Langen, pg 9-10, GL#2.

**Roger Langen:** As for qualification criteria, the 24 game rule is modelled on FIDE's practice and seems reasonable. If the CFC does not wish to administer it, then of course we could retreat to a position whereby 2100 gets you the Expert title and 2250 gets you the Candidate Master title. In other words, we use a midpoint formula. Simple.

Rather too much is being made of the "privately arranged match" stipulation. Any "normal" CFC tournament or match would qualify for rating. What I had in mind was the situation where I call my friend and we arrange for a match result (so that I can confirm my title, etc.) and then send it in to the CFC. Perhaps it is easier if the CFC simply reserves the right to question or quarantine a particular result. But I see arguments on this model. Maybe the CFC can sort this one out.

**David Cohen:** Opposed.

**Lyle Craver:** Vote Yes. I'd strongly urge 01-1 be defeated but if not then 01-3 makes some effort to defang the more objectionable portions of this motion.

### **Discussion of new motion 01-4**

**Maurice Smith:** The following are my comments on the motion. The inference in the motion is that because of last minute withdrawals from the Olympic team, the President should have made selections from the rating list which he did not do, therefore he should resign. However, there are factors here that the movers of the motion are either unaware of or choose to ignore.

This was the situation. The team was due to fly out {all tickets had been bought} on Thursday, October 27th. On Friday, October 21st just six days before, I received word from the employer

of Ron Livshits and Yan Teplitsky that those two players would not be participating because of fears of travelling due to the Israeli/Palestine conflict. I was hoping that on Monday, October 24th, a phone call to the CEO of that Company explaining that this was a U.S. based advisory would result in both players being allowed to go. The call was made, and I was dismayed to hear that there would be no change and that Ron and Yan would absolutely not be going. That was final. Meanwhile, earlier Jack Yoos had called and said that he would be available if necessary. On Sunday, I learned that the next three on the rating list did not appear to be available. One for medical reasons, one was out of the Country and one had said that he would not go even if he were asked. However, David Cummings said that he would be available. Therefore, on Monday with only three days to go, the question was, what to do? Trying to contact people was out of the question. I had to have an immediate answer. The type of situations you run into when you have to call people to go away in three days would make the chances of getting a team together in time quite remote. I have had to send out invitations and call people for closed tournaments in the past and there are always the usual and actually quite reasonable replies and situations such as: you can't get through or leave a message. "I need a couple of days to see if I can make arrangements at home and at work." "You calling me now? I need more time than that." and so on. It would seem reasonable that anyone would have to call back and could not make arrangements right away. That was no good, I needed to know immediately. The Office had to make final travel arrangements and the Turkish organizing Committee had to be notified. Therefore on Monday, I advised our Business Office to contact Mr. Yoos and Mr. Cummings right away and formally invite them to participate in the Olympiad. They accepted as I knew they would. We had a full team after all, and a team that had one of the best results ever in the Olympiad. The movers of the motion may say that this is irrelevant, but it is not irrelevant. Under the circumstances I faced, I had to put a top team together with three days notice after the withdrawal of our third and fourth boards. That we had such a great result is entirely relevant.

There is a precedent for the above action. Two years ago, another two players withdrew with little notice although there certainly was more than a week to go. At that time, we then decided to go with just five players. I approached Lawrence Day who I felt could go with little preparation. I can recall almost word for word Lawrence's reply. "Yes, I am in the unusual position where I can pack up and go on very short notice. Most people aren't like that". So Lawrence was added to the team, and I heard little more about it.

For the Constitutionally minded, I refer them to Bylaw 3 and the duties of the President. There is one other point that I wish to make. It has been suggested that there was something personal in the selections. This is entirely untrue. I had only met Mr. Yoos once before and that was for a short time at the Canadian Open in Edmonton. Not only had I never met Mr. Cummings before, I had never even spoken to him and did not even know what he looked like. I understand that Tom O'Donnell has complained that he was not selected because we have had some disagreements on policy in the past. Well, we have had some disagreements, although the only one that immediately comes to mind is Women's chess. However, it is entirely untrue that this had any bearing on the situation. As I have stated, I felt that there was no time to go through with the usual process, and I needed to get immediately whoever I knew to be available.

If Mr. O'Donnell had called me on the Sunday and said "I am willing to go and I am ready to go." then he would have been on the team. The bottom line here is that it was an emergency situation and if any of the critics had been in my place they would have realized this. Appropriate action was taken, which resulted in a strong team being sent in spite of all the problems, and the end result was one of the best Olympiads ever.

Therefore the motion asking for the resignation of the President is inappropriate and shows a lack of understanding of the entire situation.

**Note:** The following statement was submitted prior to 01-4, and is therefore not exactly

addressing the motion, itself, but nonetheless this seemed like the best place to actually place this statement.

**Roger Langen:** A motion by Langen/Jaeger (offered to this issue of the GL) has been ruled out of order by the president of the CFC. The motion was that the president of the CFC should resign for failing to observe the rules for selecting players to the Canadian Olympic Team. Can a Motion be ruled out of order before it is actually moved?

If the Handbook allows the president discretionary Olympic selection powers under cover of "emergency procedures", then there is certainly ample room for mischief. Jack Yoos and David Cummings were identified early on as viable candidates for the Olympic team; yet they were well down the list. What does this tell us? Tom O'Donnell, on the other hand, a higher-rated, full-time professional, was ready, willing, and able to step in if needed. Tom is also a vocal critic of the CFC. He was never considered.

## STRAW VOTE DISCUSSION

### First Discussion of SV:01-1

**Ari Mendrinos:** To Be or not to Be a good idea for Canadian Zonal every other year.

**David Cohen:** Opposed. I think all of our championship events should be held every year. Instead of bemoaning the lack of resources, we should go out and raise the funds to make this possible.

**Lyle Craver:** Vote No.

## RESPONSES to GOVERNORS' QUERIES

**a) Kalev Pugi Fund Use.** (From GL#2, pg 13, Alvah Mayo)

**Joshua Keshet:** As far as Pugi money for the Olympiad for this year:

(a) Among the boys - one player in question was already too old for considerations and the other was already granted support out of the dwindling available junior funds. Among the girls, the CFC provided direct support to the junior player.

(b) No request was presented to the committee anyway.

(c) The National Olympic team was supported anyway by a sponsor.

(d) I personally do not think that the small amount of available Pugi Fund should apply to this event for which plenty of other CFC funds are provided.

(e) The committee is limited in the allowable funds per player per year (\$400) so even if players were supported from the fund, we would have to go elsewhere for further support.

**b) Rating of Active Junior Events as Regular**  
(From GL#2, pg 13, Alvah Mayo)

**Francisco Cabanas:** I refer the Assembly to GL 2 from last year  
<http://www.chess.ca/Gls/99-00GL2.pdf> Where I deal with this issue and the executive motion that allows the rating of junior game/30 events as regular provided that 50% of the players are rated under 1500.

**Joshua Keshet:** Rating of some ACTIVE Junior events as REGULAR is done according to the CFC rules which include the provisions of rating an event regular when certain criteria met. Please refer to the handbook for the exact rules. Specific alleged violations should be addressed directly to the Rating Auditor.

**c) Annual FIDE Fees** (From GL#2, pg 13, Martin Jaeger)

**Phil Haley:** In response to Martin Jaeger's comments on annual FIDE rating fees...please note that as our results are now submitted electronically, the fee is only 2.5 Swiss francs for each FIDE rated player beyond 100 as opposed to the 5.0 charge when results were sent in manually.

Also it should be observed that we are charged for active players only...we are not charged for inactive players on the list.

It is interesting to note that plans have been initiated to reduce the lower limit for FIDE ratings from the present 2,000 to 1,000 with probably an intermediate stage where the level will be 1600. Even though substantially more players will be rated, it is not intended that the rating fee be increased over what it would be for those rated at 2000 and higher. Details of this plan are still under development.

**d) CFC Funding Issues** (From GL#2, pg 10, 12, David Gebhardt)

**Maurice Smith:** David mentioned that when he was in England he noticed that the British Chess Federation {BCF} did not sell books and equipment. David suggested that since they can operate financially without these sales, why can't the CFC just cut its expenses and not rely so much on the sale of chess supplies. Well first of all David did not have all the facts. While in Istanbul I talked to an Executive of the BCF. He said that the Government sponsors the BCF to a tune of 50,000 pounds a year. Also, for every player in a tournament, the BCF receives 29 pence. He said that although this may seem like a pittance it adds up to roughly another 50,000 pounds a year. At today's rate of exchange this is a total of about \$220,000. The CFC would love to have this type of revenue. Furthermore, I was told that this is not enough, and now the BCF is considering going the Canadian way of selling chess supplies. One other thing, during the last three years, we have been cutting expenses wherever possible and are constantly looking at the financial picture to avoid unnecessary expense. There is not much more we can do that way, we just have to concentrate on increasing our revenue. The sale of chess supplies is VITAL to the financial structure of our organization. The other key is membership fees. We must find ways to increase our membership.

David and I have had several enjoyable games together, so we know each other fairly well. That being the case I know that David is enthusiastic and trying to be helpful. So David,

here is how you can help. First buy yourself a nice Christmas present from the CFC store. Then put your thinking cap on and see if there are any new ideas to increase our membership. I encourage all our Governors to try and help in this manner. I look forward to seeing creative comments from David in the future.

**e) Advertising Clubs** (From GL#2, pg 14, Fred McKim)

**Fred McKim:** For clarification: the CFC publishes information on all Canadian chess clubs in the July issue. The CFC web site [http://www.chess.ca/chess\\_clubs.htm](http://www.chess.ca/chess_clubs.htm) has information on clubs and is updated as new information is sent in.

## GENERAL REMARKS on CFC BUSINESS

**a) CFC Funding Issues**

**Lyle Craver:** Mr. Gebhardt makes a lot of good points concerning the British experience. Given that most of our international experience has been with the USCF (which I consider hugely dysfunctional as a casual reading of *rec.games.chess.politics* makes obvious), I found nearly everything he had to share about the BCF most worthwhile. I particularly appreciate his comments on CFC press releases. I hope he plays an active role this year.

**b) CFC Handbook**

**Lyle Craver:** It's good to see the CFC Handbook revision well under way. I gather from talking to Mr. Cabanas that the main point of the revision is to integrate the Handbook with the 1997 FIDE rules revision (which among other things regularizes the sudden play finish rules).

One request though: it would be greatly appreciated if an annual consolidated list of Executive and Governors motions be published each year in order of the Handbook paragraphs they revise. I know the CFC intends to keep the Handbook current in PDF (e.g. Adobe Acrobat) format, but rather than having to continually

reprint the Handbook on paper each year it would be easier just to have a list of all revisions since the previous Handbook revision (which may be four or five years worth of revisions). Some of us prefer to work from paper - especially those of us who are active TDs who take their copy of the Handbook to the tournaments they direct.

**Gordon Taylor:** I read that the Handbook is undergoing another revision. This is good but the process is bad. The Handbook should be viewed as a "dynamic" document, capable of change at any time, but any change subject to rigid protocols. Thus, if an obvious typo is discovered it can be fixed and an updated Handbook posted at the website. A committee should be constituted to incorporate new Motions into the Handbook and periodically review sections with an eye to refining the regulations. The committee could report annually with its suggested changes and these would be voted upon by the Board of Governors. The present system whereby the Handbook is revised every five years or so is simply unsatisfactory given modern technology.

**c) CD-ROM Initiative**

**Gordon Taylor:** It will only surprise a few of you to learn that you can now acquire all the issues of the "National Geographic" and "MAD Magazine" (to give but two examples) on CD's. The CFC should investigate doing the same for the CFC Bulletin / En Passant. It would be too demeaning a job for the Business Office but with all the job grants available, a summer student could probably complete the task. In a similar vein, we could do the same for the Governors' Letters, though it might not sell as well <grin>

**d) EP Membership Survey**

**Lyle Craver:** I'd welcome an EP membership survey - but even if it showed 100% of members had Internet access I'd favour EP in its present format. For most average members I've talked to EP is perceived to be their main benefit of membership. As a former subscriber to Inside Chess, I've got a nearly complete collection of

Mr. Seirawan's magazine though have only looked in to his website two or three times since he ceased paper publication. Meanwhile, I read The Week in Chess religiously - and think En Passant has a completely different role than TWIC as I discussed in the last GL.

**e) Rating Junior Active Events as Regular**

**Lyle Craver:** I completely agree with Mr. Mayo. Hopefully this simply requires the Executive Director to carry out existing policy

It should not require an Executive or Governors motion to stamp out this abuse.

**f) Annual FIDE Fees**

**Lyle Craver:** Wow - is Martin Jaeger really correct concerning FIDE rating fees concerning inactive players? This is really amazing and if Mr. Jaeger has his facts straight, I completely agree with him.

## **Motions for Final Discussion (will be voted on in next GL)**

- 01-1a Langen/Webb. Proposal for National Title Program (those 2000 and above)
- 01-1b Langen/Webb. Proposal for National Certificate Program (those under 2000)
- 01-2 Jaeger/Ferner. Modification to Qualification to National Olympic Team
- 01-3 Bowes/Craft. Amendment to 01-1a (removal of 24 game provision in clauses 1 & 2)

## **Motion for First Discussion**

01-4 Bowes/Craft. President asked to resign over selection of Olympic replacement players.

### **Straw votes for Final Discussion (will be voted on in next GL)**

01-1 Jaeger. Holding the Canadian Zonal every other year.

## Motions for Discussion

- 01-1 Langen/Webb. Proposal for National Title & Certificate Program
- 01-2 Jaeger/Ferner. Modification to Qualification to National Olympic Team
- 01-3 Bowes/Craft. Amendment to 01-1 (removal of proposed certificate system for class players and removal of restrictions on 24 games in clauses 1 & 2)

## Straw votes for Discussion

00-1 Jaeger. Holding the Canadian Zonal every other year.