

# **CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA**

## **GOVERNORS' LETTER FIVE**

### **1999-2000**



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

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

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is May 25, 2000

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

As we approach the end of the financial year, it appears that our financial picture will be somewhat brighter than anticipated. With increased spending for Juniors and similar expenses, I felt that it would be quite difficult to avoid a moderate deficit. However, although the final figures will not be known until May 1st, it does look like we will come close to breaking even this year. I believe that sound financial management and the efforts of our Office staff have contributed to this positive result. The upcoming year will be more of a challenge again as we must include the Olympics in the financial picture. Therefore, increasing revenues and decreasing expenses will remain priorities.

What kind of a Governors Letter do we want to have? Many Governors have said that they would like to see an end to the personal sniping that goes on. Also that the tone of the G.L. on occasion lacks integrity and dignity because of the kind of remarks that are made. It causes people to stop reading and bothering to comment. Therefore, I have introduced Motion 00-9 in this G.L. to improve this situation. The bottom line is if you wish to see either obscene, libelous or personal attacks in the G.L., then vote against the motion. Otherwise, I would ask you to support it.

On a somewhat brighter note, we are fast approaching the Canadian Open in Edmonton this July. It promises to be an outstanding event and the organizers are to be congratulated for bringing in all the GMs and IMs that have agreed to participate. Other events that are upcoming include several involving our Juniors. The Canadian Junior in Montreal next month has attracted many of our top young stars. Then we have the Canadian Youth Chess Championships in Edmonton. We are also for the first time inviting our top Juniors to play in the Pan Am Championships in Brazil. Then of course, we will be sending out invitations to play in the World Youth Championships later in the year. Our commitment to Scholastic and Junior chess is increasing each year. I ask all the Governors to show support for our Junior programs and for our Junior players as they give their best in National and International events throughout the year.

Maurice Smith  
President  
Chess Federation Of Canada

## SECRETARY'S MESSAGE

Sadly, D. A. Yanofsky passed away on March 5, 2000 after a prolonged battle with cancer and

congestive heart failure. Prior to his death he finished his autobiography "Chess the Hard Way". To honour the memory of Grandmaster Yanofsky the CFC is publishing his autobiography this month.

The book is a paperback of 254 pages, 6x9 inches. There are 11 photos and 129 games in the book. Part I, which was first published in England in 1953 under the same title, covers the years from 1939-52. Part II covers the years 1952-96. Grandmaster Yanofsky offers a selection of good instructive games and he is a wonderful raconteur. I strongly recommend this book to you.

Halldor Palsson  
Secretary  
Chess Federation of Canada

## KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED

Troy Vail resigned as Executive Director effective March 27th to pursue his computer programming career with an other employer in Ottawa. Troy served the C.F.C. for more than seven years, his major achievements being in the computerization of the Business Office. Many technological innovations were the result of Troy's programming expertise and our web page stands out as one of the best in the business. We wish Troy success in his future endeavours. David Miriguay takes control of the Office and we have hired a former part time employee Chris Collins to assist David full time in ensuring that all the Office functions are running smoothly. David and Chris will be working hard to not only keeping an efficient Office, but also giving quality friendly service to all our members. I ask all Governors to give David and Chris their full support.

## MOTIONS

**Motion 00-1 (Jaeger-Langen)** "That as a matter of policy the CFC should make available to affiliated provincial associations En Passant space for communication to association members. The aggregate of such space shall be decided annually by the CFC executive and its allocation among associations be proportionate to the square root of CFC provincial ordinary memberships equivalents. (Example: if Province A has 400 CFC ordinary members' equivalents it shall be entitled to twice the space of a province that has 100 membership equivalents). Where there is no affiliated provincial association the use of space shall be made available to an association in that province/territory from among associations applying for the use of the space".

<b>VOTES YES (6)</b>	<b>NO (5)</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
(1)		
Jaeger	Stockhausen	
Bunning		
Langen	Taylor	
Stringer	Craver	
Brodie	Cabanas	
Von Sarac	Palsson	
Deline		

### **MOTION PASSES.**

**Halldor Palsson:** 00-1. The vote by Toni Deline was received prior to the deadline for G.L. #4. The e-mail attachment containing his vote and comments was not forwarded to me by the office. This is now corrected.

**Motion 00-3 (Allan-Hartman)** "In any Canadian Championship tournament, including CYCC events, where one or more players will qualify for a FIDE event, the time control shall be the same as for the FIDE event.

**Denis Allan:** This issue arose at the Canadian Closed players' meeting and the majority reached the conclusion as in the motion. I am more immediately concerned with the 2000 CYCC event where it is proposed to use the normal time control for the U18 and U16 sections, but a faster time control for the other sections, presumably on the basis that the younger players usually play more quickly. No doubt this is generally so, especially since the Swiss format is intended to attract a high number of players, thereby reducing the average strength. In the World Youth Championship, most of our players needed their full time allotment. Even our two youngest girls, Alexandra Bengawan and Stacey Kazekevich, played most of their games close to four hours, and some into the second time control. Playing our national championship at a faster rate only encourages poor playing habits, and is no proper preparation for the World Championship. If some players do not want to use the full time available, so be it - that is no reason to penalize the more serious players. When Chess'n Math organized the CYCC, the only criticism I heard from the players was that the time control was too fast, the result of playing five rounds over a two day weekend. Now that three full days are available, and the intention is to use the normal time control for some age groups, it can and should be used for all sections.

**Motion 00-4 (Allan-Hartman)** "The 2000 CYCC shall have separate events in each group for girls. In each age group the format, including tie-break, shall be decided by a representative of the organizing committee in consultation with the Junior Coordinator and the Women's Coordinator. If they are unable to agree, the final decision shall be made

by the Junior Coordinator. This decision shall be made after the entry list has been finalized.

**Denis Allan:** Motion withdrawn by Dennis Allan.

**Motion 00-5 (Spraggett-Stockhausen)** "Olympic Team Member Selection - Replace Section 1203(a) and (b) with:

### 1203 Selection of the National and Women's Team

a) The National Team shall be comprised of 5 or 6 players. One shall be the winner of the most recent Canadian Closed and Zonal, two players shall be chosen by a Selection Committee and the remaining players to be the highest rated chosen from the selection rating list as outlined in 1204. If a player declines after selection, the replacement player shall be filled from the selection rating list.

b) The Women's Team shall be comprised of 3 or 4 female players. One shall be the winner of the most recent Canadian Women's Closed and Zonal, one female player shall be chosen by a Selection Committee with the remaining player(s) to be the highest rated female players from the selection rating list as outlined in 1204. If a player declines after selection, the replacement female player shall be filled from the selection rating list.

Replace Section 1204 with:

### 1204 Selection Rating List

(a) Eligible Ratings Only Established CFC Ratings will be considered in determining the Initial Ratings and the Selection Ratings.

(b) Rating Lists: The Initial Rating List is the last published rating list on the CFC Internet site 16 calendar months before the announced date by FIDE for the start of the Olympics. The Final Rating List is the last published rating list on the CFC Internet site 4 calendar months before the announced date by FIDE for the start of the Olympics.

(c) Initial Rating: The initial rating is the "new" rating from the most recent regular tournament cross-table rated before and including the initial rating list, provided that 12 CFC rated games have been played in regular

tournaments during the 12 calendar month period before and including the initial rating list. If the required 12 games above have not been played then the initial rating is the "new" rating from the earliest regular tournament cross-table, in which the required 12th game was played, provided this regular tournament is rated after the initial rating list but before and including the final rating list.

(d) Selection Rating: The Selection Rating is the highest of the Initial Rating and all the "new" ratings

from the regular tournament cross-tables rated after the regular tournament cross-table that determines the initial rating for the player but before and including the final rating list.

(e) The Selection Rating List: The interim selection rating list shall be published on the CFC Internet Site after each rating update during the period between the initial rating list and the final rating list, provided the dates of the Olympiad are known. The final selection rating list shall be published on CFC Internet Site and in the Magazine.

The Selection Committee for 2000 shall comprise of the following individuals:

The Canadian Closed and Zonal Champion  
Mr. Dennis Allan

Discussion:

**Kevin Spraggett:** I think the country needs the selection committee' approach to fielding the Olympic team. Please re-read my report on the Canadian Nation Team's participation in Kalmykia to fully understand my position.

The Selection Committee was done away with in '98. Probably not without some reason. The CFC had erred the year before in picking people who were too young and inexperienced to do the job that was expected of them.

However, I think that the CFC's reaction was drastic and at best premature.

It is now time to reconsider our options, as the deadline for picking the 2000 Olympic Team approaches.

Under the rules now in place the next National Olympic Team will be picked by rating (plus the Canadian Champion, who happens to be rated number two at the present) If all 6 top rated players accepted to play on next years' National Team then we would have quite a good team...in fact we would probably have our best team ever fielded for the Olympics.

But experience, and years of it, has shown that our very best players aren't very interested in all coming out at the same time! The epidemic of last minute withdrawals and refusals says it all.

So, why should we be stuck with the 'rating criteria when it doesn't give us our best chances for putting up a really good team? As pointed out in my report, the level of our 'best' rated players drops very quickly after we pass 5th or 6th position on the rating list.

We need to incorporate our younger players on our team. Give them a chance to gain experience and

develop as players. Most of our top young players aren't any where near high enough rated to qualify for the next National

Team, yet some of them would be able to make real contributions if they had the chance. What I am arguing for is for us to give them that chance-via the selection committee.

In Canada the lack of strong tournaments means that the chances to improve the younger players' ratings in just a few years time is unlikely. The 'established' players with higher ratings (some of whom hardly play enough)

have a big advantage over our younger, rapidly improving players when it comes time to picking the National Team...unless we have the selection committee.

But please note that I don't want to see the Selection Committee re-instated just to see it 'behave' as it has in the past. I want to see some positive changes. What I would like to see is a selection committee that stops picking 'established' players over 40 years old, and instead concentrates exclusively on our younger players! I think Canada has a number of 'non-established' players between the ages of 15 and 35 who just don't have the rating to qualify for our National Team, but who have a lot to give if they had the chance to play on that team!

If we re-instate the selection committee in time for the 2000' Olympics, we still won't have a really great team, but by allowing our younger players the experience and the opportunity to contribute to our National Team we will be building towards the day when we will have a really great team.

Support this motion.

**Peter Stockhausen:** This motion is intended to reverse 98-8 which abolished the Selection Committee. Going ONLY by rating does not provide the best possible team. Motivation, attitude, team spirit and a host of other "non chess" factors contribute to this.

**Motion 00-6 (Barnes-Stringer):** "That tournament announcements for En Passant's Coming Events section be accepted for publication irrespective of prize fund format."

**Mark Barnes:** This motion will reverse the Executive motion announced in Governors' letter three that banished tournament ads from En Passant's Coming Events section unless they conformed to a format favored principally by large Ontario organizers.

Volunteer tournament organizers who return all entry fees after expenses do not have profits from well attended tournaments that allow the subsidizing of poorly attended tournaments. Each tournament must pay its own way. This is a perfectly legitimate way to run things, but the Executive's ban on our tournament announcements

seeks to bully organizers into adopting a business model which we have rejected. As a consequence, only the richest or the most foolhardy organizers will be entitled to use En Passant, and the rest of us are shut out.

The Executive apparently decided this matter was "urgent and pressing" if they bypassed the Governors and acted without consulting us. It seems to me that their criteria in making that assessment are far too lax. It may be inconvenient to consult us, but it should be done, nevertheless.

En Passant should be used to promote chess. It is not a tool for Skinnerian experiments in modifying chess organizers behavior.

**Lyle Craver:** The Executive motion requiring prize fund info in EP is something which ought to have been decided by the Governors rather than the Executive. Can anyone seriously consider this an emergency matter where there was no time to discuss the issue in the GL?

**Maurice Smith:** The Executive motion concerning organizers indicating a percentage of entry fees being returned as prizes was initiated to ensure that players would at least have an idea of what to expect. Also, players would not be subjected to the possibility of organizers choosing whatever amount they felt like to give out as prizes AFTER all entry fees had been received. It makes organizers have a sense of accountability and still gives them the flexibility to state whatever percentage of entry fees is most appropriate to be given out as prizes for their tournament. Governor Barnes suggests that there should have been more consulting before the motion was drafted. However, players and organizers alike have said that the present system of "Prizes \$\$BEN" means absolutely nothing and something should be done about it. Likewise, a system of "Prizes = Entry fees minus expenses" is too vague. Anything can be thrown into expenses. A miscellaneous expense section could become quite expansive. The system in the Executive Motion gives us the best of both worlds, accountability for organizers, and protection for players.

The other point raised by Governors Barnes and Craver was that this was not an "emergency" situation and that control of the C.F.C. was being shifted from the Governors to the Executive. Well, first of all, it is ridiculous to think that the Executive

can only act in an "emergency" situation. The Executive manages the affairs of the C.F.C. The Handbook itself states that. The Executive has to decide if decisions to be made will benefit either the C.F.C., organizers and/or players during the possible eight month period before a vote can be taken from the Governors. If the answer is yes, the Executive have to go ahead promptly and efficiently with their decisions. This is the way business is handled today. It is both practical and realistic. The Governors still have full control. Every issue of the G.L. usually contains one or two motions from Governors to be discussed and voted on. Any Executive motion can be overturned. The Governors can turn the Constitution upside down, inside out, and make whatever changes they wish, with the required majority of course. In the meantime, the Executive have to run the organization to the best of their ability, and contrary to what Governors Barnes and Craver might believe, a lot of thought goes into each decision.

**Motion 00-7** (Jaeger-Langen) "that in Motion 00-5 the proposed 1203 a) be replaced by the following "a) The National Team shall be composed of 5 or 6 players. Three shall be the top finishers at the most recent Canadian Closed and zonal (with tiebreakers for third place as used to break ties for first place in the Closed), one player shall be chosen by a Selection Committee from among players under 25 as of the first day of the Olympiad and the remaining players shall be chosen from the selection rating list as outlined in 1204. If a player declines after selection, the replacement player shall be filled first from any loser(s) in tiebreaks for third place in the Closed and then from the selection rating list".

**Maurice Smith:** Motion 00-7 at first glance is actually an amendment of Motion 00-5. Both motions deal with the same subject, and 00-7 virtually leaves the second half of 00-5 untouched. However, 00-7 is an entirely different proposal than 00-5 both in substance and in spirit. Therefore I am allowing one more discussion period for both these motions. Then based on the 00-7 movers reaction to Mr. Spraggett's suggestion of withdrawal of 00-7 with a later reintroduction, voting on both items will be asked for in the next G.L.

*See discussion of Motion 00-5.*

**Motion 00-8** (Bunning/Palsson) "that the CFC refuse to rate and further advertise the Toronto International scheduled to be held in August 2000"

<b>VOTES YES (4)</b>	<b>NO (29)</b>
Bunning	Keshet
Palsson	Haley
Stockhausen	Webb

<b>Carr</b>	<b>Hartman, Brodie,</b>
<b>O'Donnell, Ottosen, Rosner, Boross-Harmer,</b>	
<b>Brown, Stringer,</b>	
	<b>Lamb, Wong, Deline,</b>
	<b>Craver, Obradovich,</b>
	<b>Mills, Ficzere, Quiring,</b>
	<b>Kneven, Weis, Taylor,</b>
	<b>Gulati, Smith, Langen,</b>
	<b>Mendrinos, Charlton,</b>
	<b>Allen and Jaeger</b>

### **MOTION FAILS.**

**Motion 00-9** (Smith/Stockhausen) "Amend 340a in the Handbook to read: All comments by Governors for submission to the Governors' Letters will be published except for the following:

- 1 Obscene material.
- 2 Libelous material
- 3 Personal attacks on an individual.
- 4 Items that exceed a reasonable length".

340a presently reads: Comments by Governors on motions under consideration are not censored. All comments are published in the Governors' Letters provided that they do not exceed a reasonable length.

**Maurice Smith:** The Governors' Letters are for a serious exchange of facts and opinions between Governors to develop and maintain policies and procedures that benefit the C.F.C. Obscene, libelous and personal attack comments add nothing to the above and only lower the standard and class of the G.L. Also, many people find these kind of remarks extremely offensive. This motion allows for all comments, both critical and complimentary of C.F.C. policies to be retained, while eliminating the unnecessary low class material that drags the C.F.C. down and creates a bad impression of our organization and its Governors.

**00-1 STRAW VOTE TOPIC** (Martin Jaeger) "That for Closed [CYCC National] Events with no upper bound on entry numbers, Northwestern Ontario be allowed to name an entry."

<b>VOTES YES (3)</b>	<b>NO (3)</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
<b>(1)</b>		
Jaeger	Hartman Weis	
Bunning	Webb	
Charleton	Mendrinos	

**00-2 STRAW VOTE TOPIC** (Halldor Palsson)  
"That the rules for the Canadian Closed be amended to:

- (1) Lower the rating limit to 2200;
- (2) Allow GMs free entry and then three classes of entry fees for 2200-2299 at \$300, 2300-2399 at \$200 and 2400+ at \$100;

- (3) Set a CFC contribution to the prize fund at a minimum of \$2000;
- (4) Make the event annual (taken from Phil Haley & Lyle Craver).

**Halldor Palsson:** I ask that items (1) - (4) be voted on separately. I view these changes as relatively minor amendments to the existing rules for the Canadian Closed. I propose (1) for housekeeping purposes. With (1) all masters are allowed to participate. The current limit of 2250 is arbitrary. If (1) is accepted it expands the pool of eligible players from 120-130 to just under 200. I would like to see close to 50 participants in this tournament.

With (2) I am trying to give stronger players an incentive to participate in the tournament. The proposed fee structure will also give stronger players a reason to encourage lower ranked masters into the field. This year some of our finest players did not participate and encouraged others who were eligible to do likewise.

I note that (3) is still in the handbook but was probably abolished at the AGM in Ottawa in 1998. The Canadian Closed is a tournament that the membership is interested in and this justifies spending some CFC funds on the event.

The rationale for (4) is to make the tournament annual. Now the rules say follow the FIDE cycle, which may lapse to once every 2 years. I think there are good Canadian chess development reasons for holding the tournament each year. We should offer our masters a good tournament each year.

## **MOTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION**

### **Motion 00-1**

**Lyle Craver:** I see nothing in 00-1 that answers the objections I raised about 99-7 - as BCCF Secretary/Treasurer I have NEVER had difficulty persuading Knut or Troy about publishing anything I feel of generally provincial interest. 00-1 just like 99-7 seems to me to be a solution in search of a problem.

I reject Mr Jaeger's response to the above view which I've expressed numerous times - if the OCA has a problem dealing with Mr. Bevand's organization that does not justify a national policy of the kind 00-1 envisions. Again: I'm an Executive member of the BC Chess Federation and in my several year's experience I have NEVER had difficulty getting our info to our members in EP. If I seriously thought there was such a problem I'd be calling for the head of the Executive Director. Talk to Troy Mr. Jaeger - he's really a much more reasonable man than you seem to think.

## **Motion 00-2**

**Lyle Craver:** When the tournament "membership" was proposed last year it was suggested that a two year trial period was needed. At that time detailed statistics were promised concerning membership trends. Given the lack of these, I can't say that a true trial has been held.

[Reading the comments by myself and Mr. Jaeger on this and other motions, I have to say I'm going to keep raising the same questions until I either get the information I'm seeking or someone on the executive tells me why my request for information is unreasonable. The fact that frequently requested information is not forthcoming is one of the reasons Governors Letter deliberations take so long!]

## **Motion 00-3**

**Rodney Weis:** YES - I believe that the FIDE time-controls should be observed in the qualification events as well. What is the point of choosing representatives who qualify under conditions which do not match those in which they will be competing?

**Lynn Stringer:** Yes, each player should have the same time control and FIDE time controls for such an important tournament.

## **Motion 00-4**

**Dennis Allen:** I had the opportunity to discuss this motion at an informal meeting in Vancouver in January with Mssrs. Cabanas, Stockhausen and Keshet. Mr. Keshet suggested, and I agreed, that **I would withdraw this motion** on the understanding that separate girls events would be held in Edmonton for each age group in which 6 or more girls enter. Therefore, if the Executive supports this suggestion, 00-4 need not go to a vote. I think flexibility is important. For example, if there are less than six girls in a group, almost a certainty for U18, but they all agree to play among themselves, why not let them? After all, the top player gets expenses paid in Spain by the organizer, worth about \$1200. If the CFC is playing airfare, then the girls are playing for \$2,000! Not many players in the Canadian Open will win that much!

**Rodney Weis:** NO - I would certainly favor a round-robin or double round-robin format for girl's sections; as stated a swiss-system tournament is only adequate for finding a winner, or possibly second and third places. Too many random factors operate when trying to rank players who are likely to finish out of the top few places in each section.

**Lynn Stringer:** Mr. Allen has the experience working in these tournaments and I respect him and agree with his comments.

## **Motion 00-5**

**Dennis Allen:** Kevin and I are pretty much on the same page on this, although I don't think the problems in 1998 can be attributed to the selection committee. The difficulty, as I understand it, arose from the business office's providing the committee with an inaccurate selection list, with Nickoloff improperly positioned. In my report to the Annual Meeting in 1997 I gave a history of the selection committee's work in 1992, 1994, and 1996. I will not repeat that here, except one key point. In 1992, in the absence of selection, we would have sent a team to Manila without the Canadian Closed Champion, Alexander Lesiege, who would not have qualified by rating because he had played relatively few CFC rated events. Therefore, some element of selection, even if only one player, is beneficial.

I also like the idea of some qualification from the Closed as a mean of increasing the likelihood of strong players in the Closed – i.e. players like Dave Ross who has said that he played only for the IM chance – having got that, he is unlikely to play again without some incentive. But I think some consideration has to be given to the proximity of the Closed to the Olympiad. Too far apart means the good playing form at the Close may have dissipated. Too close may leave insufficient time for proper team selection and travel arrangements. I also think it is too late to use the 1999 Closed as a qualifier for 2000 when it was not known to be such. So the intent of the amendment (or is it a separate motion?) is good, but not for this year.

I believe it is important that the selection committee be given a set of criteria to guide their selection. I think Mr. Otteson's report on the 1998 selection did list a number of factors they used, which seemed reasonable. I don't have that report at hand, but relevant criteria could include FIDE rating, CFC and FQE ratings, past Olympic and other International performances, Canadian Closed results, current playing form, results against 2400+ opposition, significant recent improvement and apparent potential for improvement, and team chemistry.

So I support the motion, but see need for further work, including rewriting the rule for withdrawing players, and perhaps provision to deal with a player who conducts him or herself in a way which brings discredit to the team.

**Rodney Weis:** YES - Fundamentally I support this motion, which I feel offers a fair way to include on our Olympic Team both the strongest players as well

as those who are being "groomed for the future." I do have reservations, however, about specifically naming Mr. Dennis Allan as a member of the Selection Committee; not for any antipathy toward Mr. Allan, but would like to echo Lyle Craver's thoughts of re-drafting the motion to avoid the potential of having to amend the Handbook.

**Lynn Stringer:** Yes.

#### **Motion 00-6**

**Sam Carr:** I am in favour of motion 006.

**Rodney Weis:** YES - While I agree that it is important to give tournament players a better idea of what prize money will be paid than has been the case in the past, I believe that the Executive motion is too restrictive, particularly in areas of the country where chess events are run on a less-commercial scale.

**Lynn Stringer:** Yes - we always return entry fees minus bare expenses to the prize fund. It would be desirable to guarantee prize funds but we have no guarantee of participation.

#### **Motion 00-7**

**Kevin Spraggett:** I don't like this motion/amendment as it is presented.

It 'pretends' to be an amendment to 00-5 but is completely against the spirit of the original motion! In fact, rather than address the change of any specific point in 00-5 it throws the whole essence of the motion into the garbage bin.

I think that the Jaeger-Langen motion, by itself is, has many interesting points and arguments (opinions). Under other circumstances I might even support some of its ideas...

BUT... it really should have been presented as an entirely new motion standing on its own two feet, rather than 'piggy-backing' the Spraggett-Stockhausen motion! I say this because motion 00-5 got in just under the time-limit to make a difference for the next Olympic Team, and the Jaeger-Langen motion will have no effect on the next Olympics in Turkey (even if the CFC holds a Canadian Championship this year) if carried.

I think a more constructive way to have presented this motion (00-7) would have been to wait to see how 00-5 was voted on, and then act. (In time for both the next Canadian Championship and the next Olympic Team). I

believe that 00-5 has some very positive ideas for the next Olympic team. They deserved a fair chance ---if not to be voted for favourably, then at least to be voted on their own merit---before being hit by such an unfriendly amendment which has neither the pressing time-limit nor the carefully thought-out recommendations of someone who has actually played on the team!

Motion 00-5 was a long time in the works, as can be seen by re-reading my report on the 1998 Olympics!

Another incongruity of 00-7 is its emphasis on the Canadian Championship Tournament, and what the Olympic Team can do to enhance the tournament's prestige; the Spraggett-Stockhausen motion's principal focus is for the good of the Olympic Team! (And let the Canadian Championship Tournament stand on its own two feet!)

Motion 00-5 should be given a chance. If it doesn't work out well in Turkey, then it is not too late to change for the next time.

To conclude, I think 00-7 should be withdrawn and presented later as a formal 'stand-alone' motion.

**Rodney Weis:** NO - The selection of two players by a selection committee seems more attractive than having the selection of one player under the age of 25 carved in stone. I have no doubt that the basic criteria for selection to the team; i.e. Canadian Closed Champion and the top three on the rating list will likely include the top one or more younger players in any case, but should they not then the Selection Committee would surely take this into account when deciding who should be offered a place on the team. I prefer the original motion 00-5.

**Lynn Stringer:** Yes.

#### **COMMENTS RECEIVED on Motion 00-8**

**Joshua Keshet:** I vote NO on Motion 00-8. The reason for the NO vote is the same as previously provided by me. I still believe that we have no rights to refuse rating of any event. Also, for me to support the other part of the motion, the language must change. Also, despite the previous communications regarding the facts by Mr. Smith, I have yet to be actually convinced that Mr. Dutton had bad intentions for his deeds.

**Robert Webb:** There is no doubt that this matter should have been handled better by all concerned. The situation, as it currently stands, has been given to the Governors for "resolution." But, we cannot legislate good manners. Do not take from this that I consider Mark Dutton to be the culprit in this regard.

The North Bay organizers could have, nay should have, announced the dates for 2000 in 1999. I was at North Bay 1999 when Derek Bessette told all present that there would be a North Bay 2000. Mr. Bessette then had an obligation to see that the dates were set as early as possible. Planning for appearances by GMs is done early. This is plain common sense.

I am at fault too: I sent at least two e-mails to Ron Smith after the 1999 event, and did not receive replies. In past years the February "En Passant" has had a clear full page ad. for the event. Not so for this year, nor was there any information on the "grapevine." These were sufficient warning bells that not everything in the garden was rosy. When action was taken it was too late for a rescue.

To censure Mr Dutton at this point is at best a knee-jerk reaction. His position is awkward also. He has a contract with the Primrose Hotel, and that entails a financial obligation to them that they may exercise. If his business relationship with them deteriorates, the whole scheme will fail. We don't need an economics professor to work that one out.

To let the event go ahead, but to not rate the games would be the kiss of death. Even if the GMs are still committed to play at this very minute, I cannot see them staying that way if the games will not be recognized. I ask that the Executive arrange a Meeting. Go back to Mr Dutton, Mr Bessette and the Manager of the Primrose Hotel, and find a way to resolve this.

Mr Bunning, in moving a motion of censure, states that the Dutton event will likely be cancelled if not rated, and that then North Bay would be reinstated. Oh? Well, I have no wish to be used as a sledgehammer, no matter how valid the purpose. Mr Palsson states, in seconding a motion of censure, that we should protect the dates for major tournaments like North Bay. That may very well be necessary now. But by seconding it he makes Mr. Dutton responsible for date protection when the CFC fails to do it. Besides, legislation from the Board of Governors is not a solution, it is a postponement. I vote AGAINST the Motion.

**Francisco Cabañas:** I am raising 2 questions of privilege and 3 points of order, and I request a ruling of the chair on each one. These comments are to be included in GL#5.

1) Question of Privilege . The amount of time given to some governors to respond may well be unreasonable. Those governors who receive the governors letter by postal mail, and respond by postal mail may have little or no time to meet the March 10th, 2000, deadline. Remedy sought: Will the chair please inform the Assembly when the mail governor letters were sent out, how

much time for mail delivery was allowed. And how this time compares to the Canada Post standard delivery time between Ottawa, ON, and the most remote center where governors receive their letter by postal mail.

2) Question of Privilege. The Rating Auditor is not being allowed to address the concerns a member of the executive regarding the integrity of the rating system as they relate to a motion before the Assembly before such motion is brought to a vote. This has occurred after the existence of these concerns have been brought to the attention of the Assembly by the Vice President. Remedy Sought: The member of the executive must be allowed to express those concerns to the Assembly and the Rating Auditor must be allowed to address them before a vote is taken on the motion.

3) Point of Order. A motion to suppress debate (technically a call for the Previous Question) must be voted on, and pass by a 2/3 majority before the vote asked for by the chair can take place. What has occurred here is the following: The Mover and Seconder have, spoken, a guest has spoken, and the Chair has spoken. At this point debate has effectively been suppressed, since the customary process of allowing the views of all the governors to be heard before a vote is taken is not allowed here. I must the reader remind that not all governors are on email. Remedy sought: The vote on the "call for the previous question" must be voted on and pass by 2/3 before the vote on the main motion can take place.

4) Point of Order. A vote on a motion has been called and all the governors have not properly being informed. The layout of the governor's letter has a deadline on the first page of March 27, 2000, together with a deadline on the last page indicating March 27, 2000. This is where this information has historically appeared. Yet in the middle of the document there is a much shorter deadline of March 10, 2000 for a particular motion. A reasonable person could read the first page, schedule say March 14th 2000 to reply to this letter only to find out that s/he has missed the earlier March 10, 2000 deadline. Remedy sought the response deadline must be extended to March 27, 2000 for the entire document.

5) Point of Order. Motion 00-8 as presented is in conflict with Bylaw 2-11 of the Constitution. It is very important here to consider the President's comments here "Because of the nature of this issue, I am calling for an immediate vote. Obviously, organizers of both events cannot wait until June or beyond to see this matter resolved. Therefore for this motion only, please send your vote to the Business Office by midnight, Friday March 10th. Governors

on line can respond by e-mail. Governors not on line may respond by regular mail. No phone in votes. " It is very clear that the President does not believe that there was proper time for discussion and vote. The only way this vote can take place is for the governors to agree to close debate as I indicated in Point of Order #3. Without the governors agreeing to close debate the decision of the executive must stand according to 2-11 thereby making 00-8 out of order. Remedy Sought: If the vote to close debate fails to get the required 2/3 vote (point of order #3), then the motion 00-8 must be ruled out of order by the chair in order to avoid a conflict with the constitution.

This is a situation that has to be handled by the executive and NOT the governors. Once the executive defeated the proposal by a 3-3 vote the matter should have been considered closed. The governors are simply not suited for this kind of "emergency" vote.

**Maurice Smith:** The following are my answers to the questions raised.

1} The Governors Letter was mailed out February 28th. The standard for first class mail delivery in Canada is two days. Obviously there can be differences based on all kinds of variations. The Post Office can not be specific on those items. The worst scenario is that a letter gets lost in the mail. However, that seems to even happen sometimes in the electronic version. Suffice to say, the standard is two days, with the bulk being delivered the next day. The deadline of March 10th for a reply is twelve days after the mail out.

2} It is unfortunate that there was no time for the Rating Auditor to make his views known before the vote. However, this is an unusual situation, that calls for an unusual solution. It is absolutely not practical, not workable and entirely unreasonable to delay a decision for approximately four months when the relevant organizers are trying to plan their events.

3} Since voting had already started on Motion 00-8 before a motion to suppress debate had been initiated, any motion designed to postpone the original motion is out of order.

4} Surely if a Governor is interested in reading and/or voting on motions at all, he/she is going to look at the relevant section in the G.L. either the day it arrives or shortly after. The deadline for 00-8 is clearly indicated.

5} The key word here is discussion. By Law 2-11 does not mention the word. It states that if there is time for the matter to be voted upon by the Assembly in a mail vote, then such vote shall be taken. I considered there to be enough time. In the section

Transacting Business By Mail a similar situation exists. It requires for a resolution to be transmitted to each member of the Assembly and then each member to record their vote and send it in at a time fixed by the President. Again there is no mention of a discussion period. Obviously in these cases, time is of the essence, therefore a quick mail vote is required. Subsequently Motion 00-8 is not out of order.

I sympathize and understand the concerns of the Rating Auditor, however the following is what I perceive to be the bottom line.

a} There was a tie vote by the Executive on the issue.

b} Following the tie vote the movers wished to seek the opinion of the Governors.

c} Both sides of the issue were well represented allowing concerned Governors to accurately record their vote.

d} Both electronic and regular mail users should have enough time to vote.

e} It is an unusual situation, whereby the usual procedure would have been unrealistic and ineffective.

f} The procedure involved, though unusual, did not actually conflict with the Handbook in regards to business being transacted by mail.

Maurice Smith  
President  
Chess Federation Of Canada

**Tom O'Donnell:** Let me see if I understand what is happening here. The CFC Business Office, who for some reason didn't clue in to the fact that the North Bay International would be held in August (even though the Business Office staff has actually attended the event), accepted an advertisement for the Toronto International without thinking of contacting the CFC Executive. Did they contact the North Bay organizers?

Now, after a number of months, the CFC Executive tells Mr. Dutton that in effect the Office Staff made a booboo (though perhaps their only mistake was not informing the Executive), and all of his work was a waste of time. They refuse to accept his advertising, threaten not to rate his event, and imply that somehow he is at fault for not being cooperative and for actually (gasp!) trying to organize a quality event.

Presumably if he organized a rinky-dink event in Toronto no one would have raised an eyebrow.

Many people cannot get time off of work/school for extended periods except over the summer months.

Thus Mr. Dutton is fairly constrained as to when he can hold his event. If he tries to hold it in July, there will be complaints about conflicting with the Canadian Open and the Quebec Open. If he tries to hold it in August, he is conflicting with North Bay. If he tries for late August, he is in conflict with the Toronto Labour Day event. Is it unreasonable for Mr. Dutton to try and hold a major event in Canada's largest city? And has he in the past (though I can only wonder why) been a staunch supporter of the CFC? In fact, I doubt that there is another person in the country who has filled the CFC coffers with as much lucre as Mr. Dutton's organization. And this is the way he gets treated!

The CFC has no right to meddle in this scheduling of events, especially in light of the Office Staff's actions and the lateness of this Motion. Let the organizers of North Bay and Toronto run their events - or not. And let the Canadian chess player decide how to spend his vacation time and money. I vote NO to this motion.

Mr. Secretary, please insert the following exchange into the Governors' Letter. Append it to my original commentary. Thank you.

Mr. Vail:

- 1) You are simply an employee of the Chess Federation of Canada. If I wanted your opinion on this matter, I would have asked for it.
- 2) I am not at all faulting the business office staff for accepting Mr. Dutton's tournament advertising. On the contrary, it strikes me as the correct course of action. I do, however, believe that much of the problems that have arisen would have been avoided had the business office informed the Executive of Mr. Dutton's tournament ASAP. Your personal history of making bad decisions unilaterally is well known. This is yet another one.
- 3) As you can see from my vote (if you could read, which having worked with you in the past, is not so clear to me) you would see that I voted AGAINST the motion. Not that I require YOUR approval of how I vote, but this alone would seem to indicate that we are at least in agreement that there is nothing in the CFC regulations that empower the Executive to take this course of action. Perhaps if you spent more time thinking about your job and less time sticking your nose in things that you do not understand, problems like these would not arise.

**Peter Boross-Harmer:** The nature of this motion perplexes me in light of the fact that I see absolutely no reason for the CFC to take such a measure. I find it very disappointing that our organization should be faced with such an ultimatum.

To cancel an event on the basis of the notion that another event might take away some of its players is illogical especially in light of the fact that I actually see the two tournaments being able to help each other. It has been documented extensively that North Bay has traditionally attracted many players from the US. Recent Toronto events have also attracted their fair share of US players and therefore I can already envision many of these players who participate in North Bay making a stop in Toronto a week later to participate in the Toronto International. A great number of chess players will likely look forward to their chess vacation knowing that there will be two great events in which they could participate. I am very strongly against the motion in light of the fact that 1/ we have accepted Mark Dutton's ad and therefore have no option to discontinue our support for the event 2/ he has to this date incurred costs and signed contracts and 3/ We have absolutely no legal right to infringe upon the rights of an organizer without just cause. I sincerely hope that the motion is soundly defeated and that the North Bay organizers come up with some sort of a plan to make their event happen as well.

**Grant Brown:** Although I consider Dutton's placement of his tournament (in direct competition with North Bay) to have been stupid and even nasty – the worst kind of uncooperative behaviour which undermines chess in Canada, to nobody's ultimate benefit -- I nevertheless don't think the CFC should act punitively toward him in the absence of rules which clearly indicate that he has done anything wrong. A fundamental principle of justice is that one cannot be guilty of an offense retroactively. Besides, any punitive action at this point is more likely to leave both tournaments seriously damaged than to rectify anything. Dutton has made commitments that cannot easily be reversed at this point, whereas North Bay (evidently) has not. So I vote against motion 00-8.

However, I would probably support a motion of censure against Dutton, making it clear that if he pulls a lame-brained stunt like this again, his tournaments will forever be boycotted by the CFC. What I really hope is that the Ontario Chess Association does a better job at monitoring its organizers in the future, possibly passing some rule to prevent this kind of encroachment. Since Ontario is the only place where such an issue is likely to arise, I feel the matter should be dealt with by the OCA. I don't think the CFC should be dragged into it unless there is no other possible enforcement mechanism for a made-in-Ontario solution.

Although I have only played at North Bay once, I hold the opinion shared by many that the North Bay International is a very important chess event for Ontario and for Canada. I am disappointed to hear of

the possibility of its being cancelled. However I cannot support the current motion.

**John Quiring :** Mr. Dutton has not been particularly cooperative in this matter, but it's too late now to undo what has been done. We need to cooperate with Mr. Dutton now, and work together better in the future to avoid these types of conflicts.

I have a lot of sympathy for the North Bay organizers in these circumstances. Mr. Dutton has been uncooperative and inconsiderate in scheduling his tournament so close to North Bay; it is quite reasonable to assume that Toronto players will bypass the 7 hour drive to North Bay when another, more convenient, major tournament is just a few days later. I believe Mr. Dutton is exploiting the power of his location and running over whoever gets in the way. He's the big boy on the block, he doesn't have to care about anyone else, so he doesn't. However, I don't think he's being deliberately malicious and trying to kill North Bay. There are only so many dates available, and he's picking the dates that are best for him. But as Mr. Dutton builds his chess organizing praxis, I wish he would be a bit more considerate of others who are building theirs. The chess world is not large enough for this type of competition.

**Bryan Lamb:** On reading the possible reasons for the cancellation outlined in the previous letter, the tournaments "2000 Simcoe Day in Toronto" run by Mark Dutton, "2000 Summer International In Toronto" run by Mark Dutton, and a closed Event in Montreal of category 9. Of these events, the Montreal event and the Simcoe Day event are beside the point, as one is in another province (and in particular has nothing to do with Mr. Dutton). On the other hand, the Simcoe Day event is organized by Mr. Dutton however it is an event that is sanctioned by the Greater Toronto Chess League and has always existed in previous years along with North Bay. A number of players play both the Simcoe Day and North Bay tournaments.

To be sure, the current situation is disagreeable and should not have happened. I do not wish to place any blame, though it appears that there were actions that both the CFC and Mr. Dutton could have taken to avoid the current problem. However these actions that were not taken seem much less appropriate at the current time. It appears that the worst thing that Mr. Dutton may have done is to plan his event far enough ahead as to catch others by surprise to some extent.

Mr. Dutton may appear inflexible on this issue, which does not help matters, but I think he has legitimate reasons for this stance, given that the Toronto event has already been planned and commitments made. From his perspective he probably is considering the

possible negative effect to his reputation as a chess organizer if the event is cancelled.

The Greater Toronto Chess League confronted similar questions a year ago when Mr. Dutton began running non-GTCL sanctioned events in alternate months to GTCL sanctioned events. The overall impact seems at the moment to have been a greater total participation at tournaments but a lower average participation, which is not surprising I think.

The issue of "competitive tournaments" is legitimate I think, and it is quite possible that if both tournaments

Were held, that there would be some corresponding decrease in the expected turnout. However, there has always been some events in other parts of Ontario that are not too far away from the Dates of North Bay. The Toronto Summer International is not the only such event.

Since the former Toronto International Open (held in May) is currently in limbo, and at the moment The Ontario Open has been moved back to the Victoria Day weekend to replace it, there is first of all a motivation for bringing an international event back to Toronto and second of all a lack of feasibility to hold it any time other than in the Summer this year. For these reasons an international in Toronto is not a bad idea, were it not for the scheduling problem.

In the future, if Mr. Dutton intends to continue with the idea of a Toronto Summer international, then he and the North Bay Organizers and the CFC will have to have discussion well in advance to sort out problems before they occur. Unfortunately, I think trying to solve the problem with this motion Is quite likely to make the situation worse and more disagreeable. I wish to see North Bay remain an important summer event in Ontario, if not this year then next year and in the future, but this is not the way to do it.

I would suggest that the North Bay event is sufficiently popular to attract a fair number of players despite The possible existence of the Toronto event. It is known as a "vacation tournament" in Toronto and Probably a lot of Toronto players will continue to support that event despite another event in Toronto.

Regardless of what happens this summer, the North Bay tournament should be preserved in the future by all means. Mr. Dutton should realize this also and be as reasonably cooperative as he can. However, the only way to show that the Toronto Summer International would have a negative impact on North Bay is to actually run both events. Otherwise it will be harder to decide how to handle the issue if it arises again.

My experience with the Pan-Am International tournament in Toronto, which drew 330+ participants, provided me with an incredible learning experience in organizing a large event. It required a great amount of preparation, energy and time investment. I therefore appreciate the work that has been done both by the North Bay Organizers and by Mr. Dutton. It would be a shame for either event to be cancelled. I, for one, would hope to play in both events if they were both held. I would certainly not allow the existence of a Toronto Summer International to decide for me whether I play in North Bay or not.

**Ford Wong:** It is a competitive world and people should be encouraged to host events. Mark Dutton should have used his brain when choosing a date so that he didn't undermine any other tournaments. This kind of thing will always be a possibility. Where do you draw the line? The Canadian chess player should be able to choose what events that they want to attend.

Many years ago the Alberta Chess Association faced a similar situation where Saskatchewan held the "Prairie Open" with its larger prize fund and stronger players on the same date (Thanksgiving Weekend) as the "Alberta Open" (the ACAs premier Open event). The "Alberta Open" lost players to the "Prairie Open". In this instance the Alberta chess player made their own choice. Note: both organizing groups attempted to resolve the date issue to no avail. The Saskatchewan organizers wanted the ACA to choose a different date and vice versa. I would have loved to play in the "Prairie Open" but my loyalty was to the Alberta Open. As much as I would like chess players to attend "BOTH", it is sometimes not possible (e.g. I can only afford to go to one tournament but not both). It is up to the organizers to "SELL" their event. It is a competitive world and both must do their best to attract players. Yes, I believe that North Bay and Duttons tournament competed against each other (and probably negatively) but ideally one should let the customer themselves decide.

Organizers should give some thought about when they host their events and whether or not their event would impact other events. However I suspect that Mark Dutton does his events with the idea of making money and doesn't care about his impact on other events. This I find disgusting. Correct me if I am wrong about why Mark does it.

If this motion passes, I believe that the CFC is going to have to plan the schedules for all events in Canada by sanctioning them. Who is to say that two events (one in Vancouver say and another in Toronto) can't be held on the same date or nearby to each other.

The final say goes to the Canadian chess player who is ultimately the one to decide on which event he/she chooses to play in. It's a free world. As an organizer one should do their best not to go into direct competition with another but this may not always be possible.

As much as I would LOVE to punish Mark Dutton, I don't feel that this is right.

**Rodney Weis:** I cannot support an arbitrary decision to refuse to rate a tournament. While I find it unfortunate that Dutton Chess decided to hold this event within a week of a tournament such as the North Bay International Open, should the CFC adopt such measures it would clearly be compromising its mandate to promote chess activity in Canada.

**Sam Carr:** I am voting yes to motion 008. All sanctions possible need to be placed against Dutton chess and to anyone who will not move a tournament to help a fellow organizer have success. I would say even harder sanctions against an organizer who deliberately places his tournament close to another in order to hurt that organizer and help himself. Such selfish conduct is foreign to gentlemen.

**Gordon Taylor:** I feel I have to vote NO to this motion. My concern is that if the Motion were to pass, the CFC could be successfully sued by Mr. Dutton for loss of revenue. On the other side, I'm not convinced this event is the sole reason the North Bay tournament has been cancelled.

**Justin Gulati:** It would be incredibly petty on the part of the CFC if they were to do this.

**Roger Langen:** An incredible Motion! *En Passant* advertises the Toronto Summer International for three months before the CFC Executive realizes it's even there. Wow!

Long before the Toronto Summer International was even an idea, North Bay was wondering if they could keep on. Obviously this created an opening for another event. The other argument, of course, involves the idea of an "addition" to the circuit: If North Bay was to continue - and who knew if it would? - a Toronto event in the following week would add luster to an Ontario swing. GMs might prefer two tournaments to one.

The alleged cancellation of North Bay due to an estimated possible 40-player loss to the TSI makes the present Motion hardly credible.

I do not believe that this Motion should ever have been entertained, especially as it failed to pass at the Executive level. (Should such an extraordinary measure have been tried have been even attempted there?)

The salient point is that North Bay cancelled. Had North Bay wished to put on its event, and had it clearly insisted that the CFC challenge the proposed Toronto event (so that it might guarantee its own event if Toronto relented), then one could think there might be grounds for a Motion. But there is no North Bay event. So what exactly is the Motion about?

One is forced to speculate. Judging from the unpleasantness of so much of what reads on Chesstalk.com, it seems clear that the feud between the CFC and AEM is the subtext, i.e. Dutton is a front for Bevand, Bevand is bad, let's get Dutton. An irony, of course, is that the anti-Bevand element of the CFC is employing Chesstalk, a Bevand-created medium, to issue its invectives.

The Motion is pure subterfuge, and I resent having to vote on it. The Vancouver-Ottawa alliance of the last few years, with its sole Toronto delegate, has made the promotion of chess in Canada a highly contentious affair. And as always in Canada, it seems, resentment towards Ontario seems to be an actuating theme.

I hope that this miserable Motion fails and that its backers find something else to do than plague chess.

**Dennis Allen:** I voted No to this motion, largely for the reasons given by Mr. Smith. As well, I was aware of the Dutton tournament before it appeared in En Passant, simply by seeing the flyer on display at one or more tournaments in Toronto, where I visited but did not play. It seemed to me to be a logical time frame, designed to pick up players, particularly GMs who might be available at lower than usual cost, coming from North Bay. It did not occur to me that it would hurt North Bay. One might suspect that it did occur to Mr. Dutton, and that he was indifferent to that effect, but I doubt he would have wanted North Bay cancelled. To inflict such a draconian penalty on suspicion, without any basis in existing rules or practice, cannot be justified.

**Lyle Craver:** In my view there are two issues here: (1) was the process of this motion justifiable and (2) is the motion itself a good thing.

The North Bay organizers are now having their 3rd kick at the can. The President declined to rule their way, so they asked for an Executive vote which failed on a tie vote. So now they are attempting the end run via the Governors. And to do so by telescoping the discussion period by forcing a vote \*without discussion\* at a time prior to the main GL responses. This is totally wrong. Either the issue is an emergency or it's not. If it truly WAS an emergency then the Executive was the appropriate place. If it was NOT an emergency then the Governors was the

appropriate place. To "double dip" by voting at both levels is totally out of order and I feel the President should have so ruled 00-8 out of order.

Having said that the original deadline for 00-8 as it did not allow time for governors who receive the GL by mail to vote - bear in mind that phone in votes were specifically disallowed. It absolutely should NOT be a qualification for the position of Governor for a member to have access to e-mail or a fax machine. Even if he did not rule 00-8 out of order, the President acted correctly in extending the voting date.

Overall I really do feel the whole motion is an abuse of power - which the President did right in at least partially limiting.

As for the motion itself: First - I do not consider that an event the previous or following weekend constitutes that much of a "threat" - the Washington Open has run the week after our Keres Memorial for years and the effect has been symbiotic not antagonistic. This is best exemplified in our 98 event where we cooperated with the Seattle organizers with the result that both Spraggett and Lesiege played in both events. The Seattle organizers considered this a plus - and I believe that had the goodwill been there the North Bay organizers COULD have made a mutually beneficial arrangement with Mr. Dutton.

Second - given Dutton's advert was already accepted by EP months ago he presumably has both incurred costs and received funds from players. As such passage of 00-8 would presumably incur liability by the CFC towards Mr. Dutton. Certainly morally if not legally. Motion 00-8 effectively creates 2 classes of tournaments - those in a position to dictate which other events can run and the rest of them. If I choose to organize a weekend Swiss in Vancouver in July are the Edmonton organizers in a position to dictate to the CFC that they must emasculate my event after I have in good faith advertised it?

If we are to "protect" certain events the "protected" period must be spelled out in advance rather than leaving an organizer not sure for certain that he's "allowed" to hold his event. Creating uncertainty in organizers' minds by retroactively making rules after the fact serves no one's interests.

As I see it the only sure winner in this situation if we pass 00-8 is Larry Bevand.

In any case, the North Bay organizers appear to be using blackmail tactics against the Governors. This is unfortunate and out in BC has lost them a lot of sympathy among the 3 BC governors I've talked to. If it means the end of a good tournament I'm sorry - but do not feel their demands are justified. Particularly

not cancelling the event and then hoping the CFC Governors will "allow" them to reinstate it. We must not reward these kinds of tactics.

I would hold this position even if Mr. Dutton had not seen fit to use the Governors Letter for what was basically a database dump. (I know Halldor was trying to be scrupulously fair but should the GL really go completely unedited?)

Since I believe 00-8 is dead wrong both in process and on its own merits I hope this motion gets a resounding defeat from the Governors.

**A. Mendrinos:** The reason that I vote no is that chess must be promoted here in Canada as much as possible. [It] makes no difference to me if the event is held in North Bay or Toronto. Besides the North Bay dates are early August the Toronto dates are in mid August. Finally, CFC accepted the Toronto Ad in the first place.

#### 00-1 STRAW VOTE TOPIC

**Rodney Weis:** It seems to me that this is primarily a provincial responsibility, and I cannot offer a relevant opinion, being far removed from the source.

#### 00-2 STRAW VOTE TOPIC

**Rodney Weis:** (1) YES - The 2250 rating floor seems completely arbitrary, and the potential of an additional 40-50 qualified entrants can't help but improve attendance, and, therefore, prize money.

(2) YES - While I feel that the dollar amounts mentioned could stand review, the goal of free entry to GM's and a reduced entry fee for stronger players would increase the participation of the country's best.

(3) YES - Certainly a good use of CFC funds.

(4) NO - An annual event may result in widely disparate attendance depending on whether the tournament falls in a zonal year or not. Perhaps alternating formats of the traditional round-robin Closed for non-zonal years, together with the swiss format now in place for zonal qualification?

**Justin Gulati:** My votes for each of the four points are as follows: 1) Yes; 2) This warrants some discussion. GM's receiving free entry is of course common practice, I have no problem with that. However the \$300 rating fee for players rated at 2200-2399 players is ridiculously high, and I think of it as an attempt to discourage players in this rating category from attending. To make a long story short: A) GM's receiving free entry: Yes (I guess they already do?) B) \$300 rating fee for players rated 2200-2399: No; 3) Yes; 4) Yes.

## GENERAL REMARKS ON CFC BUSINESS

**Lyle Craver:** Glad to hear more steps are being taken to better offer services in the French language.

**Lyle Craver:** I am shocked to see motions 00-1 and 00-2 defeated with only 10-11 votes being cast - that speaks volumes about the attitude of too many governors. In my role as BCCF Secretary at last year's BCCF AGM I told people that there was no point in allowing your name to stand for CFC Governor if you weren't going to respond to all or nearly all of the GLs. I still feel strongly that way.

**Peter Stockhausen:** **FIDE Costs to the CFC (in answer to Martin Jaeger's inquiry)**

There is no fee by FIDE associated with the publication of rating lists. But so that everybody is informed I am explaining below the various costs associated with being a FIDE member and a single country Zone.

1, Fixed Expense: CHF 1,237 per year for single countries that form a Zone. (Canada, USA, Russia) For countries that are not a Zone the fees are sliding based on membership with a minimum fee of CHF 537.

2, Variable Expenses:

A, CHF 5 per player who have a FIDE rating. The first 100 players are free. Currently Canada has 146 players with a FIDE rating so we pay CHF 230 for 1999.

B, For Titles awarded: CHF 100 for FMs, CHF 150 for IMs and CHF 250 for GMs.

Note that the CFC only pays for IMs and GMs. Players, who fulfill the FM requirement and wish to have the Title reimburse the CFC and the CFC will process the Application.

C, For FIDE rated tournaments there is a mixture of fixed and variable fees. Generally the cost runs CHF 2 per participant with a minimum fee. In total for the 1999 billing we had 15 tournaments with 673 participants which cost CHF 1,396.

D, For participants in FIDE events (WCC, Olympiads, World Junior, World Cadet, World Youth, World Children etc.) fees per participant are variable. For example the fee for the World Youth Championship is CHF 100 per age group per sex for the first boards. (i.e. the maximum is CHF 1,000 for the 10 players) For additional players the fee is CHF

150. Note the CFC pays only the fees for the top qualifiers. The "non qualifiers" reimburse the CFC.

We also receive a discount if we pay our annual bill by March 15, which is what we do. For 1999 the discount is CHF 317. The total expense for the CFC, net of reimbursed items, is about CHF 3,800 less the discount mentioned above.

**John Rutherford:** In the interests of survival of Youth Chess in Canada, all youth membership in Canada (up to age 17) should first be introduced to the Chess'n Math Association. As Canadian Youth turn age 18, Chess'n Math Association can "graduate" players in to the Chess Federation of Canada. The \$40.00 CFC membership fee should be the fee no matter who, where & what age the member. Despite the fact that Canada is such a large country, the population is too small to expect two organizations to adequately service chess for Canadian youth. Chess'n Math does a terrific job for the youth. The Chess Federation does a terrific job for adults and for youth who excel at the game. Those youth who do excel want to receive En Passant and probably get more out of the magazine than 90% of the rest of the membership, so why not make CFC

memberships \$40.00 across the board? I keep reading how the Chess Federation and Chess'n Math are going to work more closely in the future. This is the best way. Chess'n Math nurtures a youth's interest in the game through its proven grade/age level tournaments. Chess'n Math has the youth system in place: I think it's time for the CFC to swallow its pride and get out of Youth Chess. I don't see any problem in the CFC continuing to organize and run the CYCC - a once a year attempt to recruit more Youth, but at a \$40 fee level (and, at the same time, hilly advertising Chess'n Math)! Beginners should be in Chess'n Math. In Northwestern Ontario, all my Regional events are rated by Chess'n Math (75cent rating fee); but my Finals' event, the Qualifier to the Provincial Finals of the CYCC is rated by both organizations. That way, Youth of NW Ont. have 2 National ratings!

The above is my last suggestion as Area Governor for the CFC. I hereby resign as CFC Governor.

With the support of the active members of the Northwestern Ontario Chess League, I submit the name of Dave Nock (CFC # 100042) to be my replacement as CFC Governor for this area.

## **MOTIONS FOR VOTE**

00-3    **YES ( )**    **NO ( )**    **Abstain ( )**  
00-4    **WITHDRAWN**

### 00-2 STRAW VOTE TOPIC

00-2 (1) **YES ( )**    **NO ( )**    **Abstain ( )**  
00-2 (2) **YES ( )**    **NO ( )**    **Abstain ( )**  
00-2 (3) **YES ( )**    **NO ( )**    **Abstain ( )**  
00-2 (4) **YES ( )**    **NO ( )**    **Abstain ( )**

## **MOTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**

00-5 [see ruling by CFC President Maurice Smith]  
00-6  
00-7  
00-9