

CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA GOVERNORS' LETTER FOUR 1997-1998



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@chesscanada.org

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@chesscanada.org if interested.

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is April 19th, 1998

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In this message I will begin by addressing the CFC - FQE question. First I will inform the Assembly that FQE has chosen not to ratify 97-10. The second development is the "Future of Chess in Canada" document that the FQE has circulated to the members of the Assembly. It is first important to clarify the current policy of both the CFC and FIDE with respect to the central proposal of this report namely the concept of a separate FQE as a federation in FIDE while Quebec is a province in Canada. The official position of the CFC is clear from reading the Letters Patent of the CFC (page 2-1) of the CFC handbook. The answer to this document has to be NO. Any changes to this policy require as a minimum the amendment of the Letters Patent of the CFC and many other sections of the Constitution. I do not recommend any such changes. The position of FIDE is also clear from reading both the comments in this letter and the FIDE report in EP #147 (December 1997) of Mr. Haley. I will repeat them here for further clarification: "It should be noted that to be accepted as a FIDE member one of the following criteria must be met...(a) be a member previously recognized by FIDE; (b) be a member of the International Olympic Association or (c) be a member state of the United Nations". Since Quebec does not meet any of the above criteria the answer from FIDE has to be NO. It goes without saying that if Quebec were to become an independent nation state separate from Canada then the answer in both cases would be YES. The question that now arises is where do we go from here? The answer is really quite simple. As far as the FQE is concerned the only logical course of action is to agree to disagree. As far as policy towards Quebec is concerned the best course of action is to follow our constitutional mandate while being open to cooperation with the FQE. We must recognize that there is large potential for the CFC in Quebec without competing with the FQE! The Championnat Ouvert de L'Outaouais rated both CFC and FQE in all sections is a perfect example. If this tournament were only to be CFC or FQE rated it would have a fraction of its current attendance. There are many services that the CFC provides in which the FQE has no interest and vice versa. There is no need to spend endless time and energy on never-ending negotiations or in attempts to extract funds from Quebec chessplayers as has been tried for nearly a quarter of a century with little or no success. This time and energy is better spent on promoting chess in ALL the provinces and territories of Canada.

I will now address some common misconceptions regarding the AEM. First it is by no means the only Scholastic Chess Organization in Canada. There are parts of Canada where scholastic tournaments are CFC rated and have been for years. There is actually no justification for a separate rating system for children. This is a needless duplication of resources that only causes confusion among young chessplayers. We must also keep in mind that there are other areas where major scholastic tournaments are run that are neither CFC nor AEM rated. London Ontario is a perfect example. Over 1600 players in one tournament. Secondly this is an organization that says one thing and then does something entirely different. For example: Anyone who reads *Échec plus* numbers 118 (number 118 is the most recent issue referred to in the Business Office report) and

114 must wonder why an organization that is supposedly dedicated to scholastic chess takes over the Ligue d'Échecs de Montréal. This is an adult league that accounts for approximately 50 % of the FQE's membership. The business side of this organization has been well covered in the business office report but there is a lot more to the AEM that meets the eye. It is very important that we get the answers to many questions first before engaging in any serious negotiations with the AEM. My final comment on this subject is that I would welcome any comments position papers etc from the AEM for distribution to the Assembly since this might provide some answers to many questions.

The next item is the Woman's Team. The executive has passed a motion that we will not be sending a Woman's Team to the upcoming Chess Olympiad in Russia. This is due to financial considerations under section 1202 of the handbook. I must emphasize that it is my strong recommendation that the Assembly make a clear policy regarding the Woman's team for subsequent Olympiads.

My final comment in this message is that I will not be running for a third term as President. This is due to my personal time commitments.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

I must advise the members of the Assembly that Mr. Phil Haley has recently been seriously ill. He has had multiple heart bypass surgery. The good news is that he seems to be recovering well now. I am sure the members of the Assembly will join me in wishing Phil a speedy and complete recovery.

ANSWERS TO MEMBERS

I will address Mr. Thomson's allegations. What I find most disturbing is that he offers no proof and yet is quite prepared to call me a liar. The reality is that his allegations are entirely without foundation. If he simply takes the time to actually read the report he wrote when he was an employee of the CFC, compare that report with the wording in motion 97-10 and then compare, both with his comments in both GL #3 and GL #4 he will find the following. That wording in 97-10 regarding the FQE's commitments are faithfully represents the wording in his report. That what he said the FQE agreed to in GL#3 regarding these commitments is quite different from his original report. Finally the most bizarre fact of all is that what he said the FQE agreed to GL#4 differs from both what he said they agreed to in GL#3 and his original report. Unlike Mr. Thomson I am prepared to offer proof of my statements. The proof will consist of quoting all the relevant passages. First I offer the reader the excerpt from Mr. Thomson's report on the FQE - CFC meeting. This is from GL #4 1996 -97. This is from what Mr. Thomson calls the "draft agreement"

"4) The FQE agrees to rate the Top section of all events which are FQE organized, and to recommend to its clubs, affiliates and organizers that they follow a similar policy in their events."

Rate above refers to CFC rating this was never disputed. I now include the relevant excerpt from 97-10. This is also from GL#4 As the reader can see this reflects faithfully the provisions of the draft agreement.

“2308 The provisions of 2305, 2306, and 2307 shall remain in force only if the FQE agrees to rate CFC the Top section of all events which are FQE organized, and to recommend to its clubs, affiliates and organizers that they follow a similar policy in their events.”

We now enter into the land of the bizarre. According to Mr. Thomson in GL# 3 1997-98 the FQE agreed to something quite different.

“Shortly after the meeting in which the initial agreement was worked out, I received a call from Mr. Bérubé. He stated that the agreement, as described in the minutes of the meeting that I kept, was in error. During discussions, the FQE agreed to do their utmost to encourage all Quebec organizers to have all of their events rated CFC. This was documented by Tom O'Donnell at the meeting, and was read by the FQE representatives before the meeting was adjourned. When Mr. Bérubé called he stated emphatically that this had not been part of the agreement”

It is quite obvious that “recommend” and “do their utmost” have very different meanings in this context. Furthermore the FQE never agreed to rate CFC all the sections of their events as Mr. Thomson implies, only the top sections. In this governor's letter Mr. Thomson provides a yet different wording as follows:

“Secondly, the draft agreement had a clause in it which did not appear in the motion, or in the explanation of it, that being the initial stipulation on the part of the FQE that they would encourage all of their organizers to rate all of their events CFC”

I can only conclude that Mr. Thomson imagined that the FQE said something very different from what they actually said at the meeting and has then proceeded to make wild accusations of dishonesty when the facts turned out to be different from his imagination. It goes without saying that there is nothing in his unfounded accusations that would justify me making any apologies or taking any other such action.

With respect to Mr. Bowerman's comments I must state that it is not justified at all for him to resign over his lack of attendance at the 1997 AGM. It is Mr. Thomson who has acted very inappropriately in calling for his resignation without even having the decency in this case to mention Mr. Bowerman's name.

STRAW VOTES

I respectfully remind the members that 98-2, 98-3, and 98-4 are straw vote topics. As such I urge the members to consider the general principles as opposed to very specific wording issues when considering your votes. If the response to one or more of these topics is favorable then a formal

motion or motions for inclusion in the handbook can be presented.

BUSINESS OFFICE REPORT

In this report from the business office, I will address the recent problems with Chess'n Math, or more importantly the existing misconceptions. Firstly, let me make one point clear, there is NO PRICE WAR with Chess'n Math from the vantage point of the business office. The 1998 CFC Catalogue had many reduced prices. This was nothing more than passing onto our members the benefits of efficiencies in our operations. Better supplier deals and other cost saving measures were being passed along to our membership. Our prices have historically been equal to and for the most part lower than that of Chess'n Math. Why would the CFC (as many people seem to think) lower our prices to compete with a company whose prices were already higher than ours? There is no logic in this perception. CFC prices are based solely on internal factors such as the cost to us, recommended retail price and inventory carrying costs. In short, if Chess'n Math were to disappear from the chess scene tomorrow, our prices would not change.

From the Chess'n Math side of the fence, there appears to be a very large movement in effect to either destroy or hurt the Chess Federation of Canada. They have released a catalogue specifically to CFC members with some prices reduced to the point that they are likely below costs, after taking into account operating expenses. Why have they done this? Simply to punish the CFC for entering into what Chess'n Math deems as their territory (the school market). Even though the CFC's program doesn't employ teachers like Chess'n Math does or advertise directly to Chess'n Math customers, we are considered to be “competing” with them. If anything, the CFC's program opens up an entirely new market to Chess'n Maths instructors. The CFC is initiating the process with the basic training manual. As students progress beyond the manual they may well look for more advanced teachings. Even when armed with this information the Chess'n Math organization still prefers to adopt a heavy-handed approach for its perceived view of the CFC's encroachment into what they consider their sovereign market.

Historically, we see a very different picture of reactions from the Chess Federation of Canada to Chess'n Math. When Chess'n Math started carrying books such as *Mastering the French* or *The Giuoco Piano*, books that are clearly aimed towards stronger tournament players, the CFC did not react. When Chess'n Math, an organization that proclaims its market is junior chess, starts selling at CFC rated events that are primarily adult tournaments the CFC did not react. Some people might think that no reaction to these occurrences was a mistake and they may right, but it was our belief that if someone was promoting chess in Canada without severely undermining the CFC then it was good for chess.

Larry Bevand commented in the most recent issue of *Échec Plus* that his price strategy is no different than when a gas station sells at one price in a city to combat a competitor, while others in the same chain sell higher throughout the rest of the country. This is Larry's philosophy, but I can be sure that any member of the CFC

would object to paying \$69.95 for a chess clock, while the CFC is selling the same item for \$42.50 in Montreal so we can battle another organization. It would mean that we were gouging our members to fund putting a competitor out of business. Most governors would agree that this is a very distasteful and unacceptable practice and it gets worse. If someone walks into the Toronto Chess Shop to buy the above-mentioned clock, it'll cost them \$69.95 unless the specifically mention the CFC, then it will cost them \$42.50, so it isn't even consistent from the same location! I think this proves that if the CFC were to stop selling books and equipment, Chess'n Math would instantly increase their prices.

The preceding information clearly indicates that the commonly held belief that there is a price war is simply a myth. The CFC is doing business as usual and doing everything in its power to fulfill its mandate, while Chess'n Math has clearly launched an attack on this organization. Our hope is that our members will remain affiliated with an organization that offers a complete gamut of services to everyone on an equal basis, regardless of what part of the country you live in.

You may be aware, the Ontario Chess Association recently permitted the Chess'n Math catalogue to be mailed out to CFC members within the province of Ontario. The ramifications of these actions on the CFC resulted in overall decreased sales in the province of Ontario of over 12% since the beginning of December. I find it very disturbing that one of the CFC's own affiliated organizations has led directly to the loss of revenue and I am wondering if the governors are of the same opinion.

As always, I am available to answer any questions you may have.

Troy Vail
Executive Director

VOTE ON MOTION 98-1

98-1 Moved (Taylor/Burgess) that Section 10 of By-Law #2 of the CFC be amended by replacing "Past President" with "Immediate Past President".

Yes: Ron Langill, Terry Fleming, Alex Knox, Herb Langer, Brad Thomson, Glenn Charlton, Hugh Brodie, Jacques Blanchette, Phil Haley, Miles Obradovich, Roger Langen, Richard Martin, Gordon Taylor, Ford Wong, Jonathan Berry, Francisco Cabanas, Lyle Craver, David Kenney, Denis Allen, Deen Hergott, Dan Majstorovic, Maurice Smith, David Ottosen, John Puusa, Vojin Vujosevic.

No: Peter Stockhausen

Abstain: J.Ken MacDonald, Walter Watson
Motion fails due to lack of quorum.

Denis Allen: The result of having sometimes a 6 person executive is not satisfactory if it results in possibly deadlocked positions. It is not sufficient to say that a motion fails on a tie vote. I.E. if there is a question of which of two players may qualify for something, a decision must be reached. Should the success of a "motion" depend on how it is expressed, i.e. in a positive or negative way? So this aspect should be considered further. I suggest two possibilities. One is that when there is a six person

executive, some other officer, perhaps the junior co-ordinator casts a decisive vote. My preference would be that on a tie vote, the vote of the president is decisive.

Bob Bowerman: This seems useful in terms of maintaining continuity.

John Puusa: I see no reason not to support this motion. A good housekeeping measure by Governors Taylor and Burgess.

Walter Watson: I'm more concerned about the practice of giving former Presidents a lifetime position as governor. Many of the former Presidents contribute largely to CFC business but some don't, and those that do contribute should be chosen yearly the same as everyone else. Apart from leaving some deadwood in as governors, the current practice produces provincial inequities. Some provinces have fewer governors in total than other provinces have sitting as former Presidents.

2ND DISCUSSION OF STRAW VOTE 98-2

98-2 (Brad Thomson) Moved, that the following section be added to the CFC Handbook:

817. Dress Code

All participants, the Tournament Director, persons assigned to demo-boards and any other individuals visibly associated with the competition during the playing of games shall dress in a proper manner. Running shoes, jeans, shorts, T-shirts and any tattered or unclean clothing are not proper. Suits are preferable, while neat, clean casual wear is the minimum acceptable standard.

The Tournament Director shall ensure that proper dress standards are upheld. If a player is improperly attired, he or she will be asked to change. The rules in place for dealing with a player who arrives late shall be in effect for a player told to leave and return only when properly attired.

Brad Thomson: The President has suggested a revision of the motion which I generally consider to be better, since it represents a clear improvement based upon the legitimate points that he and others have raised. But I would like to offer one further amendment. The motion might now run as follows:

817 Dress Code

All participants, the Tournament Director, persons assigned to demo-boards and any other individuals visibly associated with the competition during the playing of games shall dress in a proper, businesslike manner. A proper businesslike manner shall refer to the typical dress standards for the employees in an office environment of the sponsor(s) or potential sponsor(s) of the event. Or, if the sponsor(s) or potential sponsor(s) should so choose, it shall refer to the requirements for dress mandated by the sponsor(s) or potential sponsor(s) of the event.

The Tournament Director shall ensure that proper dress standards are upheld. If a player is improperly attired, he or she will be asked to change. The rules in place for dealing with a player who arrives late shall be in effect for a player told to leave and return only when properly attired

I will now turn my attention to some of the specific comments. The President is correct when he suggests that it

is impossible to legislate style. And he is correct to resist a specific list of what is and what is not to be allowed, and to suggest that there could be discrepancies between the letter of the law and the spirit of the law if things aren't worded carefully. I applaud his use of the term, *businesslike*, and his definition of it. But I have chosen to add another sentence, which would give sponsors the right to decide what they want the players to wear, if such does not coincide with what their employees wear when they show up to work. Concerning Deen Hergott's comments, all ironies aside, "the more basic issues of tournament site, playing conditions, accommodation, prize fund, etc." are not at all likely to come about without corporate sponsorships existing in the first place, and the motion is designed to better avail ourselves of the opportunity. Lyle Craver and Alex Knox express concern that the code not be made too harsh. I believe that the new wording now addresses that concern adequately. Finally, I thank all governors for their valuable comments.

Denis Allen: Potential sponsors should be protected from seeing open tournaments, where the general state of dress is appalling. I agree that for the Closed, some dress code is desirable. Perhaps the motion should permit the bidder for the Closed to include a dress code, worded in a way they think is enforceable, in the bid.

Jonathan Berry: No. I would consider a motion which would allow the organizers of a Canadian Closed to specify the attire of the players, providing the organizers provided or paid for the clothes, or provided each player with an appropriate appearance fee.

Jacques Blanchette: I agree if this is limited to the Canadian Closed, but would strongly disagree if it would include all CFC events as it would surely result in players not showing up for tournaments.

Bob Bowerman: I am not sure if this would have the desired effect of increasing corporate sponsorship or not. Sponsors are attracted to high profile events -- the Canadian Chess Championship is regrettably not of general interest to the public at large who are generally unable to appreciate chess at this level. This is why golf tournaments attract all kinds of sponsors and chess tournaments do not.

There are many golfers who can appreciate and enjoy watching a golf tourney in person or on T.V. but there are not so many tournament chess players who can do the same. It would be a different matter if there were 100,000 or even 50,000 tournament players. If one really wants to attract corporate sponsors then you need to increase CFC membership. This being said it is true that a bunch of scruffy looking chess players is certainly a turnoff to the suits that tend to run corporate Canada. I would welcome the opinions of our elite players who are after all those most effected by such a code -- is it worth the trouble? I would tend to abide by the consensus among those most effected.

Hugh Brodie: I agree with what Miles Obradovich said in the last GL. He said "I think it somewhat askance to ask the players to abide by certain standards but not impose similar conditions concerning the tournament hall, playing

conditions, organization of publicity, the welfare of the players during the tournament etc."

Definitely we cannot apply a "double standard" here. Maybe the players would voluntarily agree to some sort of dress code if the event were held in appropriate surroundings.

Lyle Craver: No - no comments to add beyond what I said last time.

David Kenney: If this motion applies only to the Canadian Closed Championship, then I would be inclined to give my support for the establishment of some form of a dress code. However, if a formal dress code was proposed for local tournaments then I would have serious concerns about this issue. The actual wording of this motion may have to be changed somewhat in order to provide flexibility in changing dress standards.

Alex Knox: Moderation is acceptable for dress code. Too high standards discourage. Organizer/TD discretion on scene can prevail in this matter.

Phil Haley: Although the intent of this motion is clearly good and should be supported in general terms I would suggest that any motion going to vote on this subject should provide for only a warning the first time a person arrives improperly attired rather than telling the player to leave and return only when suitably dressed. Asking the player to leave and return only when properly attired should only be done if the same player arrived for a subsequent round improperly attired after having received a warning in the previous round. Note that at the World Championship knockout event in Groningen, all of the players were neatly clothed but this did not mean that they were wearing a suit or even a tie.

Roger Langen: I concur with remarks made by Alex Knox and Miles Obradovich: that a dress code be the responsibility of the tournament organizers and/or bidders. I therefore oppose the Motion.

Herb Langer: Abstain. It is wrong to discriminate on the basis of dress -- however, the right to impose a clearly defined minimum standard is not only allowable, it is expected. The CFC should set a standard and allow TD/Org the right to impose it. The CFC should also provide the means to procure a minimum standard of dress by selling the products that are acceptable... is this the direction we want to go in? (I like Mr. Cabanas suggestion)

Dan Majstorovic: Yes, if the mover will agree to the friendly amendment which would state the proviso that only the most important tournaments would be considered. I would leave it to the Assembly to decide which these are. I would add that for a long time now I have been a very strong supporter of this idea, as chess indeed needs to earn a much more favourable image in the eyes of the public, and more importantly, in those of the potential sponsors.

I wish to warmly thank the governor for keeping this in mind while recognizing a delicate nature of this matter. The best way, as usual, is to lead with our own

examples and influences that start in our clubs with people we know. A change of attitude takes sometimes a long time to occur.

Richard Martin: In major tournaments where corporate funding is present, I think it would be most appropriate for a standardized dress code: but you cannot leave this to the determination of the participants or the subsequent interpretation by tournament officials. For an example, look at the PGA Golf Tournaments: do players decide how they should be dressed? Of course not – sponsors provide clothing, which is deemed appropriate, and the players are obligated to wear it. Tiger Woods, for example, receives millions of dollars to wear Nike adorned apparel and thus his dress code is already determined – he can choose which one of the hundreds of sweaters made available he would like to wear. Thus, his dress code is already set. Perhaps in the future, this could be a consideration when talking to corporate sponsors – if they are concerned about the appearance of players and how it might affect their corporate image then they (the sponsor) should consider providing suitable clothes, as mutually agreed upon by them and the tournament officials. It would be the responsibility of the tournament officials to ensure player compliance.

John Puusa: I commend Governor Thomson for his good intentions but feel that 98-2 is too harsh and authoritarian. I feel that common sense should prevail and that tournament directors/organizers should set out the dress code in their tournament advertising. The only exception, perhaps, might apply to the Canadian Closed and the Canadian Women's Championship since these are CFC-controlled national championships. Some organizations do have dress codes. The former North York Public Library in the new City of Toronto implemented a dress code as part of its Rules of Conduct requiring that "Shoes and shirts must be worn" in the library.

Peter Stockhausen: Yes.

Gordon Taylor: I don't think I can support this proposal. The intent is good, and since it would be added to Section 8 of the Handbook, it would only apply to National Championships, which I take to mean only the Men's and Women's Closed Championships and not the junior events. However, I think this matter is better left to the event organizers and the players. Even then it would be bad to give the organizers carte blanche. The way things are going we could have a Closed with a \$100 total prize fund but a formal dress requirement. The only participants would be local players who already owned a tux. On the other hand, if some sponsor can be found who guarantees \$50,000 in prizes and wants the players to dress well, and this is presented to the players as a pre-condition, then I believe the players can oblige. But to install this "question of good taste" in the Handbook seems to me to be rather heavy handed.

Vojin Vujosevic: Dress Code should be a guideline and left to the organizers to enforce.

Walter Watson: I'd like to know whether prospective Canadian Closed players feel that dress restrictions would be worth the prospect of attracting sponsors and increasing the prize fund. After all, they're mostly the ones affected. Also, it's possible that some impoverished Closed entrant might have trouble meeting a dress code. At the Alberta Closed level, this could certainly be a factor.

Ford Wong: I assume that this pertains only to the Canadian Closed and am in agreement if this is so.

2ND DISCUSSION OF STRAW VOTE 98-3

98-3 (Brad Thomson): Moved, that the CFC cease and desist from sexual discrimination, and that all distinctions between the sexes be removed from the Handbook.

Brad Thomson: I commend the President for having done considerable thinking on this issue. I would like to address the seven questions that he asks, since they are quite insightful and will help to clarify matters, but first shall quote rule 2230 as it *actually* reads, since it will provide assistance in the answering of his questions.

2230. *Support for Other International Events*

Where there are no rules in place for selection to a particular event, the President may approach the highest rated player eligible to participate and determine if that player wishes to take part at his/her own expense.

The President first asks, with respect to international events, do we wish to deny only funding or do we wish also to deny participation? As 2230 indicates, we deny only funding. If our top-rated female wants to play internationally then that's fine. But we aren't paying. If our top four women all want to pay their own way to the Olympiad, then that's fine too. But again, we aren't paying. And if our top female under the age of twelve wants to play in the World Youth Chess Championships, then the same reasoning applies.

The President then asks the same question with respect to national events. The answer is simple. If the CFC ceases and desists from discrimination based solely upon sex, then it no longer sanctions events that are open only to women. Of course, if any organizer wants to hold an event and invite only women to play, then we'll still rate it and treat it in the usual manner. But we will not recognize it as any sort of national championship.

The third question asks if we are prepared to provide a structure for qualification to international events? I submit that 2230 does just that, in clear and unequivocal language.

Fourth, the President asks if the CFC shall provide any minimal assistance to individuals wanting to participate in women's events worldwide, specifically, for example, issuing tax receipts for donation to a women's fund? This is a more difficult question to answer. 2230 demonstrates some minimal assistance, and of course, pursuant to this, the business office would do the paperwork involved in entering these persons into the international events. The CFC should not, however, pay the entry fee, or anything else. This would amount to condoning sexism. One might argue here that the offering of any minimal assistance at all is sexist, but I would disagree. If one of our players wants to pay their own expenses to compete in an international event, then the

mandate of the CFC is to help them. Organizers in Canada, and all over the world are free to run women's only events. Our goal is to avoid being sexist ourselves, but we cannot legislate for others. With respect to the notion of tax receipts for a hypothetical women's fund, why not?

The fifth question has already been answered. Yes, we will rate gender based events. But we will never fund them, nor sanction them as any kind of national championship.

The sixth question asks if we are to be prepared to apply to FIDE for gender based titles? Of course, but we don't pay, the player does. Again, we cannot legislate sexism out of chess internationally, nor out of the minds of some of our players nationally. But we shall not sanction and condone such activity by spending money on it.

Finally, the President asks about a bid from Canada for a FIDE event that is gender based? This question has already been answered. Organizers can do what they want to, and FIDE can do what it wants to. But the CFC offers no financial support, because it will not condone sexism.

The President concludes with valuable comments, though he states that he has no strong feelings on the issue. But he makes it clear, and I agree, that we should either fully support or fully reject a women's program, rather than leave it in a state of half hearted limbo. But the fact remains that the entire notion of men being better at chess than women is absurd. Hence to discriminate is sexist. And sexism should be abolished.

(There is also the secondary argument that we cannot afford to have a fully supported women's program. We have less than one hundred female members and the scant revenues generated from them is not sufficient to run the current programs, let alone what we would deem to be full ones. This means that some of the funding comes from the men's side of the equation. So now the men are being discriminated against simply and only because there are not enough female players to support a female program on the revenues obtained from females. While tenable, these sorts of arguments neglect to treat the higher issue, which is simply the proposition that discrimination based upon sex is wrong. Plain and simple.)

I will now address some of the other members' comments. Lyle Craver expresses the concern that we will tie the hands of organizers who may wish to hold gender based events. These concerns have been addressed. Deen Hergott suggest we consider addressing FIDE and other federations on the issue. No. We can only legislate ourselves, and we ought to take the high road irrespective of whether or not anyone else does. Herb Langer wonders if we might cause problems to our relationship with FIDE if we were to abolish sexism? Not given the considerations outlined above. FIDE does not and cannot legislate ourselves. Whether or not to have a women's program is up to us. Ron Langill voiced concern that the abolishment of sexism would prevent any women from representing Canada internationally. But we have learned that this would not be the case.

To conclude, I again commend the President for his work with respect to this motion. It has provided me with the opportunity to better understand what I was suggesting, to address the issues carefully, and to clarify them. I look

forward to the next round of commentary. All governors who took the time to comment are to be thanked.

Denis Allen: This motion is ill conceived since the C.F.C. does not practice "sexual discrimination." "Affirmative action" programs can be discriminatory if they displace persons who would otherwise qualify. For example, a rule which said that one or more places in the Closed must be given to female players would be discriminatory. That is similar to the former rule about one place on the Olympic team being for a young player. Such rules can sometimes be justified, but on the surface they are discriminatory. A completely separate program does not operate in this way. I recall someone at the 1995 AGM stating that since he could not play on the womens team, he was the subject of discrimination, but let's not waste time on nonsensical arguments like that.

Brad's own commentary to his motion, re inherent capability, is very much to the point. In 1983 Nava wrote an article for *En Passant* which cited an exhaustive study by John Hopkins of 35,000 children which showed that there is a clear difference between the sexes in brain functioning. Males are stronger in functions controlled by the right side of the brain and females are stronger in functions controlled by the left side, in particular verbal skills. The purpose of Nava's article was to explain why women's programs should be supported. The same issue arose at the 1995 AGM and I provided copies of the article to all present. Since 1993 I have seen the results of further studies. One three part program on CBC TV confirmed the John Hopkins results. It demonstrated examples where males and females performed the same task, but using opposite sides of the brain to do so. Another interesting facet is that it demonstrated that the brain functioning of male homosexuals was similar to that of women. That reminded me of Rueben Fine's *Psychology of a Chess Player*, written decades ago, where he explained the apparent lack of female chess ability in Freudian terms, and went on to comment that there was only one example of a homosexual chess master. Of course he also explained that in Freudian terms. Now of course many of Freud's ideas are properly discredited, but his observation of the lack of homosexual chessplayers is interesting, and I would say holds true today. I have also over the years discussed with knowledgeable casual acquaintances the idea of right-left brain differences and if appears not to be the subject of dispute. That does not mean that women cannot play chess, and certainly does not mean that men can play chess! But it does mean that strong female players will not be common. And that accords with observable facts. Anyone who teaches chess to children quickly finds that girls more quickly lose their initial interest, and that those who continue rarely progress as quickly as the boys. At the highest level Judit Polgar is the only woman to ever reach even the top 100 in the world. Compare that to the performance of women in backgammon or contract bridge, both in numbers and in results; the difference to chess is remarkable. So please don't tell me that it is a question of societal attitudes or some such rubbish.

Look at Georgia, where women chess players are really encouraged, have dominated internationally for decades, but still don't compare to Georgian men. Judit is a remarkable talent, raised in practically laboratory conditions;

her success is likely to remain isolated. Compare her two sisters, and Pia Cramling, where early promise, and full-time chess careers, have provided reasonable success, but nothing comparable to their male colleagues.

Having explained once again what most member seem unable or unwilling to understand or accept, the question remains, should we subsidize womens chess? The number of women members will never support the expense, although we must do what we can to improve the numbers. The reason we should support womens chess in my view is that the appearance of women in chess events provides both the appearance and fact of a more normal, civilized activity. The general appearance of chess tournaments in North America is not attractive. The standard of dress is bad and contributes to the inference that chess players are largely social misfits. Our now rapidly growing number of juniors helps, particularly as they are often accompanied by parents. Anyone who has been to a chess olympiad, where women appear in almost equal numbers to men, appreciates the more civilized atmosphere. The same observation applies to the World Youth Championships.

I therefore support a middle approach. We should support what we can, with a womens closed and Olympic team being the minimum. Other events require a realistic weighing of the financial implications.

And to women chess players, I would say this: before you complain that not enough is done to support womens chess, be prepared to say what you personally have done to encourage other women. I believe that our women players, particularly the top ones, must compete regularly, if they expect the subsidies to continue.

Jonathan Berry: No. Vive la difference! I would support a motion which replaced all our current women's programs with an annual investment of \$x,000 in an interest-bearing trust fund which would go to the first woman citizen(s) (whose CFC strength was not higher than 1800 when entering the country) who achieved a CFC established rating of 2450 or higher.

Jacques Blanchette: I agree.

Bob Bowerman: I am not sure that "sexism" is really the issue. As pointed out by another governor the CFC already 'discriminates' in favour of young players in order to encourage greater participation. In principle I see nothing wrong with doing the same for women. The real issue for me is the appropriate allocation of a scarce resource ie. money. If funding is not having the desired effect of increasing female membership then perhaps it is time to stop or to look at more effective ways of spending our limited funds.

Lyle Craver: No - no comments to add beyond what I said last time.

Phil Haley: I am opposed to this motion. I believe we should continue to support all women's chess activities in the same manner that we have in the past. I know of no other FIDE member that is considering taking such action. Not only in chess but also in bridge and curling neither of which require physical strength, women's championships are well

recognized and popular events. It should be noted that IOC President Juan Antonio Samaranch recently stated that only sports that include women's events will be eligible for the Olympics. As you know, FIDE president Kirsan Iljumzhinov is actively working to have chess accepted as an Olympic sport. I believe that we should make every effort to continue to support women's chess events including sending a women's team to the Chess Olympiads.

David Kenney: I would support the general thrust of this motion. However, if there is a legitimate reason for making a distinction between the sexes in the Handbook (FIDE conventions), then we may not be able to remove, nor would we want to remove, the distinction from every section.

Alex Knox: If anyone on planet earth has proof positive that any sex (female or male) is mentally superior, come forward please and produce it. The laws of nature do not discriminate! Correct.

Roger Langen: It does not require a Motion that the CFC not discriminate, as discrimination is against the law; the CFC enjoys no particular privilege with respect to this law. It may be an issue whether the CFC Handbook does indeed discriminate, and a Review Committee (or lawyer) might well look into it. Such review might start with the question whether distinguishing between the sexes alone constitutes grounds for a discrimination complaint. If so, I am individually guilty, as I have, in the past, restricted my marriage possibilities to women and women only.

Herb Langer: Abstain – still.

Dan Majstorovic: No, because of the wording. I do, however, agree with the basic idea. We also have our hands tied so long as FIDE remains on the same path.

John Puusa : I commend the eloquence of President Cabanas on the issue of the women's chess program. President Cabanas and Governor Hergott correctly place the blame for any "sexism" at the door of FIDE. President Cabanas raises some serious questions that merit serious responses. Some may see supporting women's tournaments as "special status" or "special treatment". Yes, some of the results associated with women's events have been disheartening, as Governor Ottosen has said but do we simply throw in the towel and say, "Enough is enough! Let's play to our strengths!" I think that it is time to see the big picture that women make up over half of Canada's population and maybe, just maybe, some of them might be inclined to play tournament chess if it were to be promoted properly. No, I don't know have all the answers. Yes, it is fair to say that all women would be inclined to give chess a try but the same could also be said for the male side of the species. Personally, I don't see women's events as sexual discrimination but as a way to encourage women to play. Granted, this hasn't worked well in the past but instead of playing with semantics, let's find some solutions collectively. If women chess players were to say that the current practice constituted sexual discrimination, then I would say fine, let's change it! How many female players have said that to any of you? Opposed.

Peter Stockhausen: No.

Vojin Vujosevic: Must we be the only country in the World doing this? Must chess be the only "sport" in this country and anywhere eradicating all distinctions between sexes?

Walter Watson: I would not favour eliminating women's events unless I were convinced that they could not fulfil their purpose of attracting women players. So far I'm not convinced.

Ford Wong: Financially, it is hard to justify the support. Cutting back on funding may be better. However, I agree with Herb Langers and Grant Brown's comments.

1ST DISCUSSION OF STRAW VOTE 98-4

98-4 (Gordon Taylor) Moved that with each new Governors' Letter, the CFC Executive be required to report to the Board of Governors on all motions passed by the Executive.

Jonathan Berry: I agree wholeheartedly with Gordon Taylor. I would add the name of the person (Secretary?, President?) responsible for putting in the Executive results, and perhaps specify that the exact vote be recorded.

A constitutional amendment a few years ago passed powers from the Governors to the Executive. I opposed the amendment, but the governors should have the right to know.

Jacques Blanchette: Strongly agree.

Bob Bowerman: Yes. All discussions/motions etc that are decided upon by the executive should be transparent and should be reported in a timely manner.

Hugh Brodie: I agree. The Governors should be aware of what's happening at the Executive level.

Grant Brown: When it comes to the authorization of the expenditure of CFC money by the Executive, there should be no question that the vote of the Executive is recorded and reported at the earliest opportunity. I would move to impeach any Executive member who opposed this practice, in fact. I strongly support this motion.

Francisco Cabanas: I find some aspects of this straw vote topic very troubling and if it were passed as a motion could well lead to less rather than more accountability in the CFC and Canadian Chess. It effectively prevents the executive from dealing with confidential material. The CFC has to live in the real world and this means that there is information that the executive and the office have access to that needs to be kept confidential. This can range from personal matters dealing with the staff to business and planning information of great value to a competitor, to legal requirements etc. The governors are just too large and diffuse a body to expect the level of confidentiality required in many cases. The danger here is obvious. Many of these matters would be handled by the President alone or the office and not go to the executive

resulting in much less accountability and control that is presently the case.

For non confidential matters; however a regular reporting to the Assembly is appropriate. This should be handled on a systematic basis by the Secretary. We must keep in mind however that we are dealing with volunteers and that the reason for the delays was that the Secretary was very busy. Furthermore the reporting was done with plenty of time for the governors to raise questions at the AGM.

This straw vote topic raises a broader issue. It is important that the Assembly trust the people that are elected to hold office. The answer here is to choose your officers and directors wisely not tie up their hands with endless bureaucratic procedures. The CFC governors have in the past in many cases responded to problems by creating or attempting to create endless regulations and procedures. The danger here is that you paralyze the CFC while at the same you allow other organizations with little or no accountability, but that are prepared to take action, to take control over National Programs. The result is little or no accountability over those national programs. In many cases it is better to make the "wrong" decision than to make no decision at all.

Lyle Craver: Yes - I'm all in favor of the Governors' being made privy to motions of the Executive subject to the usual caveats in areas touching on currently ongoing personnel and legal matters as well as incomplete negotiations with third parties. (Given the semi-public nature of the GL I can see real problems for the CFC if motions touching on our negotiating positions be made public to other parties in these cases.)

David Kenney: I believe the Governors should be advised of the motions passed by the Executive on a regular basis. Therefore, I would probably support this motion.

Alex Knox: Something is amiss here, (if what Gordon Taylor says is factually true), surely the CFC Executive has always been morally and constitutionally obligated to reveal all motions passed, to the Board of Governors, and if not, why not?

Roger Langen: I am prepared to see this Motion discussed.

Herb Langer: I will second Mr. Taylor's motion, if required.

Richard Martin: I am in agreement and would support it.

Dan Majstorovic: Yes, absolutely.

John Quiring: Accountability and confidentiality. A few governors, including in particular Brad Thomson and Gordon Taylor, have made comments on this topic. To address first Mr. Thomson's speculation about the 1996 Closed funding, I was contacted about increasing the CFC's expenditure to \$6500 and voted in favour of it. I do not know who else was contacted or what the final vote was.

Both Brad and Gordon have expressed the desire that "all Executive votes should be published". My view is that "almost all" votes should be

Maurice Smith: I am all for openness and good communications between the C.F.C. Executive and the Governors. Therefore, generally speaking I would be in favour of this motion. However, Executive motions sometimes deal with confidential matters. Salary of office staff immediately comes to mind. Is it either necessary or desirable that these kind of items be published to all the Governors, go on the Internet and then on to the world? I don't think so.

Therefore I can't support 98-4 with the phrase "all motions" without any restrictions. Perhaps a motion that ends with "all motions not considered confidential passed by the Executive" could be more acceptable. I know the main objection will be that the Executive still decides what is confidential. However, you have seven people on the Executive from various parts of the Country who have often served the C.F.C. for many years. If you can't trust their judgement on confidentiality who can you trust? So

the bottom line is to have the Executive report decisions wherever possible, but still have the right to decline when other persons privacy and confidentiality should be respected.

Peter Stockhausen: Qualified yes. Confidential matters to be excluded.

Brad Thomson: Yes, obviously.

Vojin Vujosevic: Yes, by all means let us know what is going on. Do publish all the CFC Executive motions passed between the GL's.

Ford Wong: I agree. Ideally, all motions passed by the Executive should be reported to the Governors. This would provide some accountability and enable others to be aware of the kinds of problems that the Executive deals with. However, there may be decisions of a sensitive nature and perhaps discretion could be made by the Executive as to whether it should be made public to the Assembly. Would it be possible to add an additional clause that "Decisions of a very sensitive nature can remain private at the discretion of the executive?"

GENERAL COMMENTS

Jonathan Berry: One-Section Canadian Open

Peter Stockhausen stated in GL # 3 that: "The 1997 Canadian Open did not produce a norm. Mr. Berry's explanation of this fact, in my opinion, is incomplete, misleading and dishonest." That means "fraudulent, knavish, insincere". Thank you.

He blames the lack of norms on his TD's failure to fiddle with pairings x and y in the third round. That can look good afterwards, but maybe the tournament would have turned out so that you should have fiddled pairing z instead. He says another problem was that there were only 3 IMs. He made a format that was unattractive to IMs, so they stayed away. Peter closes the paragraph with: "What is your point?? It is probably more likely to make a norm in a closed or restricted event than in an open event." Exactly. If the Canadian Open is held as a single section event, it is far less

likely to produce a norm than if it is a multi-section event. Far less likely. So Mr. Stockhausen agrees with me.

In the next paragraph Peter refrains from ad hominem attacks, but he does patronize. "Jon's next comment makes no sense. How can a clause in a contract between two parties constitute 'tantamount to false advertising'?" The term used in the contract is actually a correct legal description of what the organizers attempt to do. If the same term would be used in an advertising piece, it would actually be correct and legal as well. Jonathan, do your homework."

If you structure your event in such a way that norms are extremely unlikely (i.e., a one-section event), and you know that norms are unlikely (as Peter admits), then to say that you will make your best efforts to provide norm opportunities is--well--dishonest. And it's advertising because the agreement was published in the CFC Governors' letter, as Peter intended. Governors are not only consumers, they are also opinion leaders. You might as well have a clause in the contract that "every effort will be made to obtain the participation of Garry Kasparov", knowing that his fee would be far too high for the budget.

Part of the reason that CFC gave money to the 1994 and 1997 Canadian Opens was the chance of norm opportunities. I have pointed out repeatedly that these are remote. Instead of dealing with the issue, Peter has chosen to attack the messenger.

Norm opportunities are a "motherhood issue". It means that just about everybody is in favour of them. Other motherhood issues include "full employment" and "happiness and prosperity for all", "corporate sponsorship" and "bigger prizes". So by mentioning norms in advertising or contracts, Peter is tweaking the motherhood receptors in all chess players. When Jayson Gonzalez and Oleg Linskiy achieved IM norms in North Bay, the chess players who were capable of understanding that were pretty excited for them, no matter what their ratings. Does Peter Stockhausen not believe it "good" for Canadian chess that Kevin Spraggett and Alexandre Lesiege have the grandmaster titles? Would Alexandre have been interviewed for 20 minutes on national CBC radio if he had been "obviously" of GM strength, but had played an unrated opponent in the third round, so, too bad, wait for Bermuda 1999?

Peter continues: "The CFC is here to promote chess. 98% of its current and future members will never come close to a "Norm". The CFC should use 98% of its [sic] resources, fiscal and human, to the segment rated below 2200." Nonsense. Following that advice could be the excuse for all sorts of knavery. Let's see, 10 of the 11 GMs at Winnipeg 1997 were foreigners, not CFC members in a contributory sense. According to Peter's nonsensical precept, he should rather have paid Canadians of any rating to show up. Maybe he'll claim that the GMs were paid for by non-CFC sponsorship money. But it's all one big pot.

In the question at hand, offering norm chances doesn't cost extra. Nor does running the tournament in such a way that most of a player's opponents are within 200 points.

Brad Thomson in his comments, and Peter Stockhausen in a phone call to me, both indicated that it is a great attraction to the 1800-2000 players in the Canadian Open to be able to play against a Grandmaster. Yet these

same players stay away in droves when a Grandmaster gives a simul. When GM Tony Miles came to Ottawa years ago, he gave a simul to a group that, in his words, was smaller than would turn out at a small English hamlet.

When the 1800-players actually do play a GM at the Canadian Open, they like to have a photo of it. This should not be surprising, they're making the best of the situation. Asking "Father, take this bitterness from my tongue" of the TD wouldn't help, especially when the TD so obviously could never be anybody's father.

Please forgive the hyperbole.

Peter then brings up the red herring of finances. It doesn't make any difference to finances whether the tournament is held in one section or several. The business plan for a multi-section event is better, because it will be more newsworthy, have more publishable games. And since he offered, yes, Peter, I'd like to see the balance sheets of the 1994, 1997 and 1999 [sic] Canadian Opens. Please submit them to the Governors' Letter so that we can all benefit.

"Again, I am left wondering why anybody would think that the CFC is entitled to benefit from an event that in their mind, the CFC should not support?" Peter Stockhausen has it backwards. CFC support for an event should not exceed the extent that the event furthers the goals of the CFC.

Brad Thomson asked "Is there any way to overcome the yo-yo effect, and yet still maintain the one-section philosophy that allows all of us a chance to get a game with a grandmaster?" The one section of the Canadian Open comes down to us from the days when not a lot of people entered, when the accuracy of ratings was in doubt, and before the age of norms. It allows anybody who enters the tournament to win, which I think is admirable, or at least it was then. I think the game-with-a-grandmaster idea is a crock.

It was an answer to questions like Brad's that I was trying to get from Peter Stockhausen with my remarks in GL #2. We saw in GL #3 that his answer was not yet ready.

In general, you can warp pairing systems so that they fulfill goals other than the primary one (to find a fitting winner for the tournament), but you risk unforeseen circumstances that force you to improvise or see the tournament wrecked (e.g. the hyper-acceleration system of the 1976 Canadian Open).

Ray Kerr, an Expert and tournament director in BC, came up with some useful innovations in the early 70s, but his spearheading of Vancouver 1975 (6 sections, 320 players) showed his conclusion about the best system for large events. Whether some variation of Kerr pairings could help with norms, I don't know. That would take work: modelling and simulation. FIDE might also reject your event if they don't like the pairings, but I'm not sure they have ever done so.

To summarize: I have nothing against a one-section Canadian Open. The organizer has the right to choose the form of competition. But I do object to pretending that norms are a realistic possibility. When the CFC spends all its national promotion money for a year on a one-section Canadian Open, the governors should not kid themselves.

When I moved to Ottawa in 1975, I was put off by smoking at tournaments. I told organizers that I would not play in tournaments where smoking was allowed. The

organizers responded that they, too, were annoyed by the level of smoking, but they hadn't considered that somebody would stay away because of it. They banned smoking, and within a few years, like it or not, you couldn't smoke at any CFC-rated tournament. I've been staying away from one-section Canadian Opens. It hasn't made a difference yet. But I think that I am not the only one who stays away because of the pairing system.

Bob Bowerman: : As one of the governors who did not attend the CFC meeting I have to say I have no regrets. I play chess because I like it but I am a governor only because no other Yukon member wanted to do it. Placed in the same situation I would make the same decision -- I would not want a CFC meeting to hinder either my vacation or my enjoyment of the Canadian Open which is the only over the board 'slow' tournament I play in all year. If this is a problem I would be happy to tender my resignation.

Grant Brown: Francisco Cabanas raises a lot of interesting questions about the internal workings of the AEM and the FQE, about the relationships between the CFC and the AEM and FQE, and about the relationship between the AEM and the FQE, but most of these questions are completely beside the point. The fundamental point is that the AEM and the FQE exist and indeed have flourished in the past 10 or 20 years because they have filled various niches for Canadian chessplayers which the CFC has always serviced poorly. What should concern us as Governors of the CFC is only that which is within our control. Specifically, we need to decide whether we are able and willing to recover these niches by doing a better job of chess promotion within them than the other organizations are currently doing.

While I don't know much about the FQE, it would seem that the only service it provides chessplayers in Quebec which the CFC doesn't provide (better) is a French-language chess magazine specializing in Canadian, and especially Quebec, news. It seems to me we have two options here:

The first option is, for a start, to produce a dual-edition magazine which satisfies the average francophone chessplayer in Quebec as well as the current publication serves the average anglophone chessplayer in Canada. This would involve, at a minimum, hiring someone to produce a translation of the current English edition, and probably to add Quebec content as well. This alone might make the CFC only equally attractive to the average Quebec chessplayer as the FQE, and so something more would doubtless have to be done to fully recapture this niche. What that "something more" might be is not clear to me, but it would probably have to involve some form of re-affiliation of the FQE to bring Quebec players into the CFC rating system, or barring that, the systematic infiltration in Quebec of CFC event organizers. Frankly, I think that the option of fighting head-to-head with the FQE to recapture the francophone niche in Quebec is beyond the financial and organizational abilities of the CFC at this time, and so we should settle for the second option.

The second option is to make our peace with the FQE, cede the francophone niche to them, and work diligently at improving our relations with them in areas where cooperation could be helpful to us both (e.g.

merchandising) and where it is necessary (e.g. representation at national and international events, and the funding thereof). Given that the FQE exists and therefore has a bureaucracy with a self-interest to protect, relations will always be unhappily political to some extent. I am therefore not optimistic that the CFC will be able to achieve those objectives which would be to the advantage of all chessplayers in Canada - harmonizing the rating system and securing adequate and fair funding for Quebec players to national and international events - but we should look at the arsenal of carrots and sticks available to us to see if we can't make progress on that front. The current situation is unsatisfactory to all concerned.

The special niche of the AEM, on the other hand, is junior chess promotion, in both French and English. The CFC has ceded this niche to the AEM for the past 15 years or so, and the AEM has done us a service by doing what we were not willing or able to do. Before I could endorse going head-to-head with them to recapture that niche, I would again have to be satisfied that we could do a better job of it. If we can't or aren't prepared to do a better job of organizing junior events and championships, publishing a junior chess magazine, and establishing a network of coaches for juniors throughout Canada, then we should not mess things up by sticking our noses into that area. Again, the sensible option would be to find areas in which we might have common cause and could profitably work together (e.g. promoting chess in schools; developing a chess magazine for juniors), and agree to go our separate ways in other endeavors (e.g. hiring organizers and coaches; merchandising).

The AEM and the FQE are both competitors and cooperators in the promotion of chess in Canada. If we take the attitude that our mission is to crush them out of existence, we will undoubtedly fail and probably lose much of their specific expertise in the niches they have been servicing well these many years. We need to find an efficiency-enhancing division of labour between the various chess organizations in Canada, rather than arrogantly or stupidly bring about a destructive duplication of efforts. We must recognize that all organizations have self-interests at stake, and at least in the near term, we must try to promote our own interests in such a way as to leave the interests of these other organizations intact. Rather than ask the CFC Board of Governors a host of questions which none of us has answers to, why doesn't Mr. Cabanas initiate executive-to-executive meetings with M. Bevand and M. Beaudoin, with the objective of trying to establish a mutually favourable division of turf, and report back to us what the other organizations want and can offer in exchange?

P.S.: With regard to the school program initiated last year by the CFC, and further to the suggestion made by J. Berry to establish a Chess Futures Committee, I would like to offer the following proposal. We could be much more effective in the long run reaching teachers and grade-school students with a chess program if we were to attack the problem at the source. I suggest that we send a copy of O'Donnell's new teaching manual to the Dean of every education faculty in Canada. (I can probably obtain a list fairly easily.) A covering letter would make the following points: outline the scholastic benefits of chess as an extra-curricular activity; note that aspiring teachers these days need to have a special skill that they can promote as an

extra-curricular activity to enhance their chances of being hired; give permission for the Dean to copy and distribute the teaching manual to any of the faculty's students who might be interested in promoting chess in school after they graduate.

2. I don't think we need a hard and fast rule about whether the CFC should support Canadian Open bids financially, although I am personally opposed to the practice. I don't think we need a hard and fast rule about whether the Canadian Open should be one section of more than one, although I personally much prefer a multi-section tournament (and positively avoid Canadian Opens in part for this reason). Can we not leave these decisions up to those who will be organizing future events and those who will be voting on future bids, and move on to more pressing matters faced by the CFC?

Lyle Craver: By now most of us governors have received the missive from the FQE which decisively rejects any notion of a revived 97-10. In my view it takes the FQE's previous position and takes their demands to a previously unknown extreme. And THIS is what we're supposed to concede BEFORE negotiations are opened! Certainly there is no evidence in the FQE's letter that there is any FQE motion currently on the table that we as Governors need to respond to. I suggest we treat their letter with the silence it deserves while remaining open to serious discussions rather than the blustering one-sided demands we've received so far.

In any case for a BC governor, the AEM/CnM is certainly a more relevant matter for concern than the latest extreme demands from an FQE executive that is clearly out of touch with national realities outside Quebec. Mr Cabanas fairly represents the position of the BCCF Executive at the February 1997 meeting with Mr Bevand (I took the minutes at the meeting in question). Judging by Mr Bevand's reaction to our proposal that all his BC events should be CFC-rated (he in fact made no reaction at all and never even responded to our proposal) one must wonder if his intention was to obtain the secession of the BCCF along the lines of the situation in 1968-75. (In light of the FQE missives it's worth pointing out that the BCCF's case for FIDE membership is every bit as strong as the FQE's) In any case, at the 1997 meeting he was asked for ** and promised to deliver to the BCCF president ** AEM/CnM financial statements. This promise has not so far been kept.

[I'm quite surprised at the mailing done with the cooperation of the OCA - some three years ago one of our people made our provincial membership list available to the Washington State Chess Federation without permission and caused quite a tempest.]

At present I'd say the best CFC policy is to concentrate on providing the best service in Canada to chess players from coast to coast. That has always been our mandate and despite Mr Bevand and the FQE remains our mandate. The USCF has survived Chess Digest and others - I see no reason why we cannot do likewise.

In any case, the President is in error when he says the CFC has recently started a school program - while I understand what he's referring to, it's only fair to point out that similar programs have been ongoing in BC for nearly 30 years and were in fact what brought me into the game.

Phil Haley: Letter from Stephane Beaudoin, FQE president.
...discussion

It should be noted that to be accepted as a FIDE member one of the following criteria must be met...(a) be a member previously recognized by FIDE; (b) be a member of the International Olympic Association or (c) be a member state of the United Nations.

Note that at the 1997 FIDE Congress in Kishinev, Moldova, the Isle of Man Chess Association submitted their application for FIDE Membership. The minutes state " Mr. E. Omuku informed Central Committee that the Steering Committee had recommended not to include the Isle of Man application in the Agenda and that the FIDE Secretariat should forward only applications which comply with the Statutes. On recommendation of the Central Committee, General Assembly deleted this item from the Agenda."

I would suggest that if the FQE wants to become a member of FIDE that they should concentrate their efforts on becoming a member of the International Olympic Association.

Roger Langen: 97.12 There was much favorable discussion of my Motion, seconded by Vojin Vujosevic, that the CFC introduce a title & certificate system to the rating classifications, primarily as an honorific device, but with some useful secondary purposes as well. As there is an element of complexity in the Motion as originally proposed, and some confusion, too, I think, about its meaning, I shall be re-presenting the Motion as a series of smaller motions for discussion and resolution in the not too distant future.

For the moment, let me say, as regards the President's concern that the Canadian rating system needs some downward adjustment, that a title & certificate system need not be correlated with such an adjustment.

That is, it may proceed before or after such adjustment, since 1) the proposed scheme does not intend to replace ratings with "norms", but simply adds "honors" or recognition based on sustained ratings values; and 2) insofar as ratings inflation is a concern, the proposed scheme, in effect, "corrects" it by introducing the Candidate Master category (2200-2299) as a buffer separating Expert from Master. In other words, it lessens the claim both of new entrants and stable residents alike in this class to be Masters, the latter being Candidate Masters, the former but norm-holders for this distinction. The designation of Master (or Canadian Master as I styled it) is thus "upgraded" to the 2300-plus group.

Part of the complexity of the Motion involves the question of how to define and manage the qualification criteria. So I take the President's advice and plan to make haste slowly.

RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

As President of the Greater Toronto Chess League, I have recently expressed to Maurice Smith, CFC Vice-President, my opposition to the CFC attitude to Chess & Math. Through concern over book sales, the CFC blinds itself to an outstanding opportunity for developing scholastic chess in Canada.

Chess & Math is a business. It has a right to sell books. It also has a demonstrated interest in developing scholastic chess in Canada. The CFC, on the other hand, is a

service organization with a mandate to promote chess in Canada. It serves a largely adult membership who are ratings conscious and want to be informed of events. The ground for a constructive collaboration can hardly be missed. What comes immediately to mind is a shared-income arrangement (on the business side, primarily books & equipment) in exchange for the cultivation of large numbers of young players for CFC membership.

Chess & Math is prepared to release its database for players who attain a certain rating and, I believe, for players who reach a certain age (or grade). Constructive means, including a rating conversion, could be found for making the transition to the CFC relatively easy for scholastic players. One-day actives might serve as a useful device for introducing such players to the CFC. The point is to get talking. Any potential business arrangement, as with the points above, would be subject to regular review, but it is clear that both parties stand to benefit tremendously.

Here is an example. The Greater Toronto Chess League will this year dispense 16 chess scholarships of \$50 apiece to students throughout Toronto. Next year we expect that number to double. The bulk of the funding, as well as the database management and telephone work with the schools, comes from Chess & Math. Adult players contribute through a \$1 levy at weekend tournaments. The GTCL decides on the recipients and writes the cheques. In this way, we are able to reach the community of schools with the message of chess in a way we could never hope to do without Chess & Math's considerable organization.

Another benefit of having a dedicated scholastic tournament provider is that school league players can also obtain ratings, from kindergarten to grade 12. Until now, schools with homegrown chess traditions were generally unrated and therefore unattached to opportunities for play outside the leagues. This is an important population since it exists within school culture, whereas the majority of students attending Chess & Math's monthly tournaments have so far had to rely on their parents.

The GTCL, which is interested in promoting CFC play and membership in its area clubs, works closely with the Toronto school leagues. One result will be the rating of all scholastic play, once again through Chess & Math. Clearly, it is easier for a chess-interested young person to join a rated tournament (outside his school context) if he already has a rating in tow.

So it is inconceivable to me - and I ask the Governors who may not be very familiar with the CFC-Chess & Math problem to follow my line - that a friend of chess, with a decided power to organize and develop interest in the grade 1-8 population, should offend our national organization.

When Alexandre Lesiege obtained his final GM norm, Chess & Math made him a travel gift of \$2000. Over the last ten years, Chess & Math has subsidized the travel of children to CFC-sanctioned and other international events to the tune of \$45,000. Had that been IBM, would the CFC not have been generous in its praise?

Let's focus, folks. A destructive price war is under way between two organizations which have everything to gain through a little cooperation and good will. I recommend we get a committee together and begin working out the

framework for a comprehensive deal for shared management of the current chess opportunity.

Dan Majstorovic: As usual, the presidents message has given everyone a lot of food for thought so here are a few reflections on my part.

Historically speaking the CFC has not become involved in scholastic chess until the 1993 Canadian Open that took place in London with a modest group of 40 students in all. I will gladly stand corrected on this as my knowledge in this area is somewhat scant.

It seems to me that ultimately it is not important what the situation is with or within the AEM. Rather, I have always felt that it was up to the CFC to assume the leadership role it has inherently had since day one of its existence. This not only in the eyes of our players and the public, but also with regards to its international status. My comments have never been directed AGAINST the AEM but rather toward the CFC actually following its mandate. I'm afraid that we have fallen far behind the AEM in this respect and it won't take a just a year or two to get caught up. I am eagerly waiting to see what is being planned. After all, what, if anything, were the benefits for the CFC coming from the AEM? Our membership has not increased in any significant way as a result of its initiatives.

On the other hand, I would like to salute the presidents wise financial decisions to which I was privy during my "term in office", as it were.

Despite its non-profit status, my impression of the AEM is that it is much more stringently ran as a business rather than an organization (association)

Having said this, it is (maybe not so widely) known that the AEM did A SECOND mailing using the information on the OCA membership without ANY knowledge or consent from the OCA. We are still asking the question: "How was this possible since they did NOT get the information from the OCA?" I urge the president to do a little investigating on this important matter.

As far as the concern of having been taken advantage of by the AEM, I would like to turn the question in a different direction and comment that if we truly were in the leadership role I mentioned above, our question would have been: "How can we more efficiently use outside resources at minimal, if any cost, in order to promote and further advertise our cause?" Once again, wherever the AEM got its information for the SECOND mailing, it did not get it from the OCA.

On a similar note, I think that it is credit to our integrity to have done away with all the discriminatory items re FQE. Now, if anything is to happen, let's let the FQE take the next steps. In the meantime, let's also do what we have to do for better chess in Canada and not worry about things out of our control.

John Quiring: CFC vs. Association Echecs et Maths (AEM)

There is increasing tension between these two organizations, a seemingly inexorable movement toward outright warfare. Is it inevitable? If the CFC does its job, the answer is probably "yes". After all, the CFC's mission statement is to "promote and encourage" chess, which includes chess for kids. This is an area which AEM

apparently has bequeathed to itself, exploiting the CFC's appalling lack of initiative. But, led by our intrepid office staff and their excellent Scholastic Program, we are now belying up to the table. No doubt AEM sees this as encroachment into their territory, but it certainly falls entirely within the CFC's sphere of responsibility. Is competition good? Yes, usually it is; and in this case it will definitely be good for kids' chess (as long as we don't wear out our volunteers).

Canadian Open in Sections?

Never. An A-class player getting a chance to play a GM is dismissed by Grant Brown as a "cheap thrill", but I have to wonder how an Albertan can be so poorly informed. I'm an A-class Albertan who played 500 rated games before getting a crack at an IM a year ago, and here's a news flash-it was a thrill, nothing cheap about it. (Teplitsky got lucky; that's my story and I'm sticking to it). Should I ever get a chance at a GM, that will be an even bigger thrill, and that chance is an integral part of the too-long, too-expensive, beloved dinosaur tournament, the Canadian Open.

Peter Stockhausen: Comments Re Canadian Open - Norm Opportunities - Financial Support, and other such matters. Jonathan was kind enough to supply me via e-mail his answers to my comments from GL 3.

1, " He blames the lack of norms on his Td's..." Re-read my comment. I did not blame anybody. I raised the issue that " we may have missed maximizing pairing opportunities" . Note that I used the word "we". I cited some examples. I asked for input and advise to make future events better. You know full well that pairings are routinely adjusted in tournaments to preserve norm possibilities. You are experienced in these matters. I asked for constructive input. Please provide it.

2, "...that there were only three IMs". Obviously!! If there would have been a dozen IMs, chances would have been better. Even you may understand this.

3, "...a format that was unattractive to IMs, so they stayed away." Did these IMs tell you this We actually thought that we offered the Canadian IMs quite an interesting "format". a, Free Entry b, hotel accommodation c, some travel subsidy d, the opportunity to make some money via lectures or simulms e, an almost ideal playing site. But rather than speculate I will canvass our IMs well before the 1999 Open and hear what they have to say.

4, "...far less likely" etc. It is probable that chances for norms are higher in restricted events. But we speculate. We have no substantial hard data to support this. But at least a comparison with the North Bay results point in that direction. My agreement with this is not the issue. What is at issue is that norm possibilities are in existence in an open event. These possibilities can be increased if the organizers work at it and make "best efforts". The analysis of comparable likelihood's was never at issue. Many clauses of the bids for 1997 and 1999 were hotly debated. That one did not get debated. Of course if the

majority of governors had asked to delete this clause, we might have done so. It would save the organizing committee a tremendous amount of work.

Interesting that you raise Kasparov's name. Quite a debate took place in the organizing committee as to what key players we might invite for 1997. One member of our committee was particularly keen on investigating Kasparov. So he did. It turned out that with months of efforts he could not even get his phone calls returned. So we then tried Karpov. Much faster reply.

Unfortunately he only had about 48 hours for Winnipeg as he was sandwiched between two events, Dortmund and Biel if memory serves right. The fee and the travel expense was high, but not totally out of reach. But it was relatively late in "the game" and one major sponsor had made his contribution "purpose specific" so those funds were not available for a Karpov or Kasparov. So we abandoned the idea. But it was closer than you think and I might just make you eat your words yet:).

But of course playing against either would be of no interest to you since the rating differential between you and either of them is above your desired 200 point margin.

5, "...attack the messenger". And all along I thought I was defending myself against the accusation of practicing "false advertising".

6, Thank you for explaining "motherhood" issues. I am in favor of the ones you mention. How "good" is it for Canadian Chess that Kevin and Alexander are GMs, I have no idea. How many Canadians are interested and play chess because these two are GMs, again I would not have a clue. Unfortunately I have not met Alexander yet. I have however known Kevin for almost 20 years now. As such I had the opportunity to observe him under various circumstances, in various tournaments and matches, from Candidate tournament and matches to church basements in the far reaches of rural Quebec. Never have I heard him commenting on the desirability or undesirability of opponents in terms of rating. He seems willing to play anybody, anywhere. He seems to give his time freely for analysis and post mortems regardless of the opponents' strength.

Matter of fact, I have observed that he is rather far more generous in post mortems and analysis with the lower rated opponent, particularly in case of juniors. Somehow like giving a free lesson gladly and graciously. The conduct does not vary, win, lose or draw. Maybe it is this kind of ambassadorship that promotes chess more than the actual title. His lectures are strictly SRO and his simulms are packed.

7, "...98%..." I was actually quite serious. We might want to simply abandon this "subsidy" business and conduct the Canadian Open on an equal basis. No privileges for anybody, GM IM or FM. You come, you pay your way, and if you win, good for you. Simple as that.

Same for our overall business strategy. What if we spent our efforts strictly according to good business practices. Who knows, doing this consistently for a number of years might put chess further ahead than we think.

8, Thank you for telling me why 1800 rated players wish to have their picture taken when playing a GM. This was news to me. How many 1800 players expressed those views to you, I wonder.

9, "...red herring of finances." Why red herring. It is just finances. You collect money from various sources and you expend it on various activities.

Hopefully one does not go broke doing this. I am happy to hear that you have comparable business plans for us to review. Please do share them with us. I have observed that few chess things in Canada are newsworthy. Most have to do with "contrast" i.e. youngster (preferably female and blond) playing older, much older male player, and preferably beating him. It helps if the older chap is champion or ex champion of something or other. Also computers playing humans is still newsworthy. Chess for and with children can get some coverage. If Kevin or another Canadian got to the world championship final, that would definitely make the news. Please explain what publishable games contribute to the business plan.

10, "...since he offered, yes, Peter, I like to see the balance sheets...."

Re-read my paragraph. I offered no such thing. I never mentioned the term "balance sheet". The budgets for the 1997 and 1999 events are part of the respective GLs. You can look them up. To make things a bit more interesting I will publish 1994 Actual vs. Budget, 1997 Actual vs. Budget and the 1999 Budget side by side in the next GL. (It is already Feb 28 as I am writing this and I have to retrieve 1994 and 1997 from Winnipeg) I will also provide a bit of commentary to them and I look forward to receiving meaningful input from any governor. Any Accounting "101" type book will enlighten you as to the differences between a "budget" and a "balance sheet".

11, "...has it backwards." Backwards, forwards makes little difference to me.

I agree with Jonathan, the CFC should not support a Canadian Open that does not benefit the CFC.

12, "...yo-yo effect and...playing a Grandmaster". Sorry I did not answer this. The simple fact is that I am not competent in this matter. While I have a reasonable understanding about the swiss system, my understanding is insufficient to even take a guess at that one. Jonathan and Phil come to mind who might have an answer to this.

On the other hand I do not feel that there is anything particularly wrong with participating in a tournament where one gets opponents which have a variety of strengths. I always thought that variety is fun.

Brad Thomson: With respect to the *President's Message*, there can be no question that it is in the best interests of Canadian chess to have a cordial relationship in place between the CFC and Larry Bevand. But it takes two to tango.

Concerning the matter of the approval of the 1996 Closed and Zonal, we have not heard from Mr. Farges, who was President at the time. I ask that Mr. Cabañas now live

up to his commitment and relate to us what he knows about the incident, now that Mr. Farges has been availed of his opportunity. Mr. Cabañas, did you participate in an executive vote with respect to whether or not to hold the 1996 Closed and Zonal? I would also like to readdress the same question to Mr. Quiring. Previously, I took the liberty of speculating that Mr. Farges, having secured the votes of Mr. Cabañas and Mr. Quiring, did not bother to consult the remaining members of the executive. But I now suspect that the President consulted no one and simply stated to the business office that it was to go ahead with its part in the running of the event, based upon the absolute lie that an executive vote had taken place. This interpretation might well explain the silence of the above mentioned individuals, and the fact that a request from a governor at that time to have the vote made public was not granted. As a result, I would like to ask Mr. Farges, did you lie to the business office when you told it that a vote had taken place? Or, did you only consult with some members of the executive? Why was then-governor O'Donnell's request for the vote to be made public denied? Finally, if you used the presidential power that you are fully entitled to use to mandate the event, then why didn't you just tell the business office and the assembly that this is what you had chosen to do in the first place?

May I state that it is quite disconcerting that I have to keep asking these questions over and over again. It is even more troublesome when no responses are given by *any* of the parties involved. And apart from a very appropriate straw vote motion from Gordon Taylor, no other governor has expressed any opinion on all of this, either implicitly or explicitly. Does anyone other than Mr. Taylor and myself care? Is anyone else concerned with the shady and underhanded dealings that have taken place? Or shall we just sweep these things under the carpet? Please be advised that this is not a personal vendetta, nor a witch hunt. Our principle hope is to prevent these things from happening again in the future. Openness and accountability are paramount in the running of a democratic organization. Would the honourable members choose rather, a dictatorship? And further, one apparently bent upon the notion of bankrupting the organization through wild and inexplicable spendings?

I will now turn my attention to the various comments of the President. First, I shall deal with the matter of 97-10, that being the ratings deal with the FQE. The President begins his comments by agreeing that the motion would have to be fully reintroduced, and changes his view from the idea that we could simply vote on it again, without due process. This is proper and the President has made the correct decision. Next, the President reminds the member that the motion did *not* allow for Presidential discretion with respect to implementing only some portion of said motion. Again, the President is correct. There was no clause in the initial agreement for a line-item veto. But this is precisely my contention, and I thank the President for spelling it out so eloquently. Now, given the fact that there was no such discretionary power involved, why did the President then choose to exercise it anyway, by drawing up a motion which did not conform to the initial draft agreement, and follow through with it, after the Quebec representatives had verbally unilaterally rescinded a portion thereof, which

portion of course, was that which the President did not include in the actual motion itself? Without the line-item veto that the President points out did not exist, the entire deal ought to have been scrapped as soon as the FQE sought to change it one iota, indeed it *had* to be scrapped. Or, it had to go through as *initially* worded, without the verbally rescinded changes, which had not been gotten in writing. Indeed, as the President admits, had the changes been gotten in writing, the full deal would have been negated entirely. For the deal could not, according to the President, be altered, since there was no provision for such discretion in the first place. No line-item veto.

To continue with the President's comments, he next states that any questions will be answered by reading the motion itself. This is not correct. For the President only drew up the motion subsequent to the fact, sometime after the meeting and the initial draft agreement which resulted from it, had taken place. The initial agreement, which led to the drawing up of the motion, contained a distinct clause which was verbally unilaterally rescinded, and it is this document and its ramifications that is at issue here. The fact remains that the President himself admitted to me that he agreed that Quebec had verbally extracted a portion of the initial agreement. Maurice Smith, Tom O'Donnell and Troy Vail also concurred.

This renders astonishing the President's next statement, which is worthy of a full quote. He states, "I will also respectfully remind the member that the wording in 97-10 regarding the FQE's commitments was the wording I verified with the other CFC representatives present." This is disingenuous on two counts. First, the wording of 97-10 could not have been verified before it was even written in the first place. But secondly, and more importantly, the President is either suffering from a peculiar memory disorder which recalls events other than those which actually took place, or he is blatantly telling a lie. For indeed, the draft document (not the motion which hadn't been written yet) was verified by all CFC representatives present, but that which was unanimously verified contained a clause which was later verbally unilaterally rescinded. And all parties present, including the President, shared the same recollection regarding the existence of a verbal agreement to the clause that was later withdrawn, this apart from the fact that the clause was there in writing, and this writing was not only verified by all CFC representatives, but by the two FQE representatives as well.

Thus, even if it is argued that a language barrier caused the FQE to agree to something that they did not understand, the fact still remains that due to the lack of a line-item veto, as the President states, the agreement could not go through in a changed format. And yet the President *did* change it and went through with it anyway, doing so precisely to conform to what the agreement would have looked like if the verbally rescinded clause had not been included in the first place. And ironically, in doing so, he allowed the FQE as well as himself the very line-item veto powers that he correctly insists were not available.

By way of information, the clause itself was suggested by the FQE, and not the CFC. In other words, the FQE clearly understood what it was doing, bargained in bad faith and later changed its tune. Both Troy Vail and Tom O'Donnell will be able to verify this, as will or at least

should, Maurice Smith. And so the point remains that the President went ahead with the implementation of 97-10, based upon a draft document that had a portion of it verbally unilaterally rescinded, and did so while instructing one of the business office employees not to reveal this fact to the assembly unless it be gotten in writing, which it was not. This despite the fact, that as the President now admits, it was an all or nothing deal, since there was no line-item veto in effect for either side.

Now, this presents another flaw in the President's position, and it also exposes a scandalous bit of conduct. First, he has stated that the written version of 97-10 was that which was verified at the meeting. This has been demonstrated to be false. The draft agreement was included in the minutes of the meeting and sent to the President, and it is from this, or rather from a *portion* of this, that he worded the actual motion itself.

Secondly, the draft agreement had a clause in it which did not appear in the motion, or in the explanation of it, that being the initial stipulation on the part of the FQE that they would encourage all of their organizers to rate all of their events CFC. So the President *did* in fact utilize the line-item veto that he admits was not allowed, and I dare say he in all likelihood did so without notifying the FQE that he was violating the letter of the agreement. Again, as noted, this violation was performed so as to omit any mention of the clause that the FQE improperly withdrew. Further, the President chose to hide all of this from the assembly.

One might, and in fact must go so far as to conclude that the entire deal should have been dropped when the Quebec side sought to change it after the fact, this being the case because there was no line-item veto. Again, by the President's own admission, it was an all or nothing deal. But one must surely agree, also, that the President should not have restricted this fact from the attention of the members of the assembly, and he should not have gone ahead with an alleged agreement which had *not* been agreed to, or with an agreement that had been rendered null and void by the FQE side, at least verbally. If he was to go ahead at all, it had to be, by his own admission, with the *initial* agreement as documented, since only this agreement was not alleged, but actually agreed to.

Thirdly, by stating that he would only inform the assembly of the unilateral rescinding if it was gotten in writing, which writing would only have nullified the entire agreement, he is guilty of a grievous double standard when he prepares the exact wording of 97-10, and the explanation of it, while choosing to *exclude* a part of it that *did* in fact exist in writing. In other words, the President did not develop the motion and its explanation from the *entire* draft agreement, as by his own admission he was obliged to, but from *only* that part of it that was not verbally unilaterally rescinded. And yet, by his own contention, he should have drafted the motion and its explanation *with* the unilaterally rescinded clause, unless the revoking of it was gotten in writing, which it was not, and in which case the deal is dead anyway. Or, he should have gone ahead with it as *initially* worded.

To repeat, we have noted that the President's own position is that the deal should not have gone through in the first place due to the absence of a line-item veto, unless it was to go through as it appeared in its *original* form. The

absence of a line-item veto for either side demanded that the *entire* agreement be scrapped and that both parties would have to go back to the drawing board if further negotiations were to be decided upon. Or, if the President was intent upon continuing, he was obliged to go ahead with the *initial* agreement, verbally rescinded clause included, since the revoking of the clause was not gotten in writing, which writing, again, would have terminated the entire process, and which revoking he was not entitled to implement, again, by his own admission.

This would have produced the subsidiary benefit of exposing the FQE for what they are. But what the President in actuality did, instead, was to prepare the motion and its explanation as if the clause didn't exist, or as if it had been legitimately rescinded, neither of which was true, one of which was impossible, and thereby choose not to expose the FQE for what they are, but rather adopt in the process their own pattern of operating in bad faith, insofar as he altered a non-alterable agreement, just as they had illegitimately done. Again, the clause was there in writing, staring him in the face. The President deliberately withheld this information from the assembly and by his own admission went ahead unlawfully, by putting forth a perverted version of the agreement, rather than rejecting the agreement completely based upon the verbal rescinding of a portion thereof, or by putting forth the motion as it was *originally* outlined in the draft agreement, without perversion.

I shall not speculate as to the motivations of the President in this matter. The members, if interested, are more than capable of doing this for themselves. What is to the point is his conduct. Which conduct was a shameful disgrace.

All of these allegations can be easily demonstrated to be true by simply going to the files and pulling the appropriate documents, or by questioning the relevant persons. Unless, of course, respectively, they were to mysteriously go missing, and lose their memories. But I shall have little further concern with the matter, since it was brought forth initially only in an effort to induce the President to fully reintroduce motion 97-10 if it was to be given further consideration, which he has in fact now stated that he will do. I would, though, implore the assembly to consider the FQE's actions and those of the President, before voting. But I would like to make the following suggestion. The next time, if there is one, that a draft agreement is prepared with the FQE, put the entire agreement in the GL, and if subsequent to this, the FQE unilaterally rescinds a portion of it, put this fact in the GL too, and thereby allow the assembly to assess the merits of the motion in question with all of the facts of the case present to their capacities of reasoning, so that they can make the best choice for Canadian chess. In furtherance to this, I would suggest that the President attempt to be honest from this point forward, both with respect to his dealings in his capacity as President, and in his explanations to the assembly when questions relating to his conduct arise.

Finally, the President chastises me for calling for the resignations of governors who refused to attend the annual meeting, but who were present and able to do so. By way of rebuttal, I observe the fact that one of the governors in question took me up on my suggestion. I commend him. Given his blatant dishonesty and general disregard for the

assembly, as demonstrated by his attempt to put through an agreement with the FQE that they verbally reneged upon combined with his instructions to the business office that this fact not be revealed, and his subsequent inept and appalling efforts to obfuscate the matter, not to mention the fact that he has admitted that he had no justification to act in the manner that he did in the first place in the absence of a line-item veto, I now call for the resignation of the President. Or is this is not forthcoming, at the very least an apology is in order.

In his general comments, the President argues that six months is not enough time for our national champion to prepare for the world championship tournament. I would have to agree, but I must reiterate the point that we cannot afford to be lining people up to represent Canada internationally in an era when FIDE is in such disarray. There should have been no Zonal in 1996. Kevin Spraggett won the Zonal in 1994 and it was not until late 1997 that he finally played in the FIDE cycle. Having won in 1996, Spraggett became eligible to play in two cycles in a row, which was ridiculous. At the earliest, he will expend his second opportunity late this year. It would be nonsensical to hold another Zonal until after this opportunity has taken place. Indeed, if FIDE runs another world championship tournament in late 1998, then in 1999 we will require a Zonal, and the winner may only have six months to prepare if FIDE manages to hold a third consecutive yearly world championship tournament at the end of 1999. But so be it. Until and unless FIDE can be trusted to run this event yearly, something that only time will demonstrate, we cannot possibly consider lining people up in the hopes that they will only have to wait a year and a half for their opportunity. Spraggett had a wait of more than three years as a result of winning in 1994, and will wait, at the very least, more than two years as a result of having won in 1996. Now, should FIDE demonstrate that they can be reasonably expected to put on an event every year, then the merits of a six month wait, versus an eighteen month wait can be assessed. But let's not waste any more money lining people up! It would be nice, possibly, but it's simply a luxury we cannot afford.

Peter Stockhausen is correct when he points out that I made a variety of opinionated statements concerning the funding of the Canadian Open, without really supporting the statements, and without offering alternative proposals. My principle argument was simply that the CFC cannot afford to be throwing money around generally speaking, and cannot afford a Canadian Open that costs it money. This is why I am opposed to grants, the waiving of ratings fees, and a concession on sales. I would allow, though, for the CFC to cover the costs of the sales rooms on site. This seems perfectly reasonable. I do not suggest that the CFC invest nothing in the Canadian Open, but I do emphatically hold that unless it gets a return on its investment, then the investment was illogical in the first place. The CFC must get back more than it puts in. And due to our precarious financial status, which is always the case, the returns must be viewed only in terms of immediate dollars gained. Arguments to the effect that there are other farther reaching potential returns, such as good will and publicity, are only valid when we have enough money to survive in the meantime. But we don't.

The reference to the term *showcase* event, was not my own. It was the contention of others. My view is that the so-called *showcase* event, if it is as such, ought to make us money. If our *showcase* event ends up costing us, we're in big trouble.

As for my ideas with respect to corporate advertizing and fundraising, these were amply expressed to both the current President and the current vice-president when I was a business office employee. They were also fully articulated to Mr. Thaler, and Mr. Majstorovic, who were on a fundraising committee at the time. All of my preparations and plans went unnoticed, or at least un-dealt with. If there is a sincere effort on the part of the CFC to reopen these discussions, I shall be happy to test my powers of recollection.

Finally, Mr. Stockhausen asks if I am of the opinion that a loss of \$2000 would be a poor investment on an otherwise utopian Canadian Open? Yes, a loss of \$2 would be. The money could be better invested in the bank, in an effort to ensure that we do not bankrupt ourselves. May I very respectfully state, that of all people, the treasurer should be aware of the precarious nature of our financial picture, and concerned about how truly vulnerable we are if the trend of liberal spending practices, which has been the policy of the current and previous administrations, is to continue unabated.

Ford Wong: Peter Stockhausens comments about financial support by CFC to 1999 Canadian Open.

This is a sore point with me, but since the last AGM agreed to it, I decided that I would leave the issue alone. However, Peters comments in the last GL have gotten me perturbed.

First the amount in question is \$4,000 and not \$2,000.

At the last AGM, I recall that the discussion of \$4,000 had nothing to do with a fee for giving the CFC a concession. Peter does mention that this is a small price to pay for the potential gross sales of \$10,000 and possible \$2,000 profit. Great, but I personally feel that it would be an honor to help the CFC out as much as possible and let them set up the concession for free. As far as I am concerned, this is just "seed" money for the organizers. If you look at the contract between the BCCF and the CFC, it explicitly states that "The BCCF undertakes to provide for an adequate room for the CFC store at no expense to the CFC". When really there is an expense stated further down in the contract (\$4,000). Of course, it looks good to potential sponsors that the National organization is prepared to throw in some financial support. Compared to the budget proposed (\$83,000) \$4,000 is quite trivial. At the AGM, Peter adamantly stated that the bid was a take it or leave it situation. It would be withdrawn if they did not get the \$4,000. When Troy mentioned that the CFC has a serious cash flow problem, the organizers of Canadian Open were willing to modify their original proposal so that the CFC could pay them the money in installments (they were willing to budge on this). I was also somewhat surprised in that, knowing the "tight" financial situation that the CFC was in, that the organizers would ask for this funding. It can be setting a dangerous precedent for other future Canadian Opens.

I feel that the organizers of the 1999 Canadian Open held the CFC AGM for ransom on this issue. Peter is a great organizer and I wish him the best in hosting the 1999 Canadian Open however I still disagree with providing \$4000.

Vojin Vujosevic: Comments re: President's Message:

What caught my eye were these lines: "The next issue of Echec Plus may prove to be quite interesting. My most significant concern here is that this will lead to conflict between the CFC and the OCA."

Well now, why should there be a conflict between the OCA and the CFC? We too are CFC, in fact its major part. Or is the intention of the CFC to start some sort of action leading to this conflict? If I did not know better I might think that the G. Taylor's letter to editor in the EP, that came out at about the same time, was somehow a shot at the OCA.

Here, an uniformed although perhaps well-intentioned player criticized the organizers and implicitly the OCA over the organization of the Ontario Closed. True, there are some problems with holding of any tournament and some of the criticism may be valid. We should and will improve this important event. The major point is that the OCA followed its own constitution. The player in question was asked and said no to participation. The regional league may have been late in contacting him but that was not the fault of the OCA. There are other things incorrect in the letter.

Did the editors contact the OCA to get the other side of the story? No. Did they check the facts? No. So now for at least two months there is an opinion in front of the entire CFC membership to see and judge but the OCA gets no opportunity to give the facts and its side of the story in the same issue.

Now, back to the Echec Plus. I read "the next issue" because the TIO 98 ad is on the back page of that issue. Quebecers let us have the space that the EP has denied us. We cannot ever buy the back page in the EP for a Toronto tournament it seems, either in this year or in the years to come.

Furthermore, the Echec Plus had the letter from a CFC Office employee to the readers regarding the price war between CFC and Chess'n Math. And right next to it C&M answer, something our magazine did not think of offering the OCA.

And finally who is the CFC? Is it just the executive? I don't think so. Is it the CFC Office. I guess not, they are the paid employees who should do their job and get paid and that's that. It appears the CFC is much more than the two categories I mentioned.

NEW STRAW VOTE TOPICS

98-5 (Brad Thomson): Moved, that substantial revisions be made to By-Law Two, section 17, of the Handbook, along with a slight revision of item 4 of By-Law Three. Comments: Let us begin by looking at By-Law Two, section 17, as it now stands. It reads:

17. REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT

When a President consistently fails to carry out the duties of his office, the Vice-President upon giving the President two weeks notice of his intention to do so, may present to the

Board of Directors, a written motion to replace the President by one of the other members of the Board of Directors. This motion will only become effective if the vote to replace the President is agreed to unanimously in writing by all of the Board members, except the President. Upon replacement the President shall remain a member of the Board of Directors unless he resigns or is removed by a vote of the assembly.

With respect to the first sentence, we observe that only the Vice-President is empowered to instigate impeachment proceedings against the President. This notion is seriously flawed. For if the Vice-President is himself without gumption, or if he is himself incompetent or inattentive, or if he is himself conspiring in some manner with the President, then there is no longer a mechanism in place to deal with a defective President. To rely solely upon the Vice-President who may be just as worthy of replacement as the President himself, then, is not in the best interests of the CFC. We have, therefore, a situation in need of change. This argument alone is sufficient to refute the tenability of section 17 as it now stands. The section needs to be re-written.

I propose the following:

At any time, a governor may put forth a seconded motion calling for a vote of non-confidence in the President. The motion, and any explanatory comments on its behalf, shall be sent to the Business Office and published in the next Governors' Letter, provided that it does not arrive after the deadline, in which case the subsequent Governors' Letter shall publish the material. The motion and any commentary shall also be sent to the President directly, by registered mail, and must be received by him at least seven days prior to the deadline of the next Governors' Letter, otherwise the matter shall be settled in the immediately following Governors' Letter. The President shall be permitted the opportunity to defend himself against the motion by offering his own response. In that same Governors' Letter in which the motion, any commentary and any response by the President are published, the assembly shall be asked to vote on the matter. The President, as well as the mover and seconder of the motion shall not be allowed to cast a vote. In order for the motion to pass, at least half of the governors must cast votes, and at least two thirds of the votes cast that are not abstentions must be in favour of the motion, for it to take effect. When a President is removed from office, the rules in effect for cases when he for any reason is no longer in office shall take effect, and shall do so on the day immediately following the date of the deadline of the Governors' Letter that contains the vote. The Business Office shall inform the President alone of the results of the vote, if the motion has been defeated, but shall inform both the President and the Vice-President if the motion carries. A deposed President shall no longer be a member of the Executive or of the Board of Directors, though he shall retain his status as a governor.

Let us now examine the proposed new wording. First and foremost, we will no longer be at the mercy of the Vice-President, as any governor who can find a seconder may instigate the impeachment proceedings. A sensible set of procedures for informing the President of such a motion and its publishing to the assembly is provided, along with a timely schedule for resolving the issue. The President,

naturally, is entitled to defend himself, something strangely absent from the wording of the regulation as it now stands. And to discourage frivolous attempts at impeachment, a two-thirds vote is required, apart from abstentions, with at least half of the assembly being required to cast a vote. Finally, what to do once the votes have been tabulated is explained.

We may now turn our attention to item 4 of By-Law Three. It reads in part:

The President shall have full power to take such action in the name of the Federation, as he may in his sole discretion decide.

We see that the President can do whatever he wants to. This means that he can reject or nullify the current mechanism in place for his own impeachment. In other words, he is currently unimpeachable. As a result, regardless of whether or not the regulations regarding the impeachment process are revised, we must, to ensure any possibility of impeachment as the rules currently stand, add the following sentence to item 4.

The one exception being any matters pursuant to By-Law Two, section 17, over which he shall have no authority.

98-6 (Martin Jaeger – Brad Thomson): Resolved that the Assembly of Governors regrets that the CFC-generated list of CFC-OCA members was made available for use in the mailing of the sales catalogues of a rival sales organization.

Martin Jaeger: In December 1997 the OCA made the use of the CFC-OCA membership list available to Chess and Mathematics for the mailing of the Chess and Mathematics catalogue. Material provided by the OCA and the Greater Toronto Chess League was also included in the mailing.

This use of the list has implications for the CFC finances. The OCA executive includes Messrs. Knox, Majstorovic and Vujosevic, who respectively have been CFC Vice President, Treasurer and Treasurer and are therefore in position to appreciate the effect of the mailing on CFC finance. Discussion of the resolution will provide an opportunity for them to present their views.

Governor support of the resolution would provide the CFC Executive a mandate for a policy change that would prevent a repetition. It would also provide a mandate for a change to the CFC bylaws and agreements with the provincial organizations aimed at preventing a repetition.

98-7 (Jonathan Berry): To restructure CFC finances so that:

1 -- a portion of each CFC membership is credited to the Provincial Association of the province in which the member resides;

2 -- CFC no longer pays for national championships or international expenses from general revenues, but from entry fees (to the Canadian Junior, Cadet, Closed, Women's Championship, Olympiad Teams, Interzonals etc)

3 -- That provincial associations be encouraged to pay for (2) with (1).

Discussion: The present system does not work because Provincial Associations did (BCCF) and do (FQE) profitably drop out of the CFC membership scheme.

This could lead to, say, a \$500 entry fee to the Canadian Junior, but it might (should) be entirely paid for by

the province out of revenues from (1). The provinces which have opted in might even band together to form an insurance partnership like Lloyd's: having a couple of players from PEI on the Olympiad team in Yerevan could have bankrupted them without it!

I introduced this straw vote topic a couple of years ago, but withdrew it to leave the field clear for a hoped-for reconciliation with Quebec. The current system is better if all the provinces opt in.

