

CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA GOVERNORS' LETTER FIVE 2000-2001



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

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 if interested.

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is May 15, 2001

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

We start this one off on a positive note as we report that the second CFC/ICC tournament more than doubled the number of participants from the first event. Hopefully this will continue to increase and be of some benefit to both organizations. This is one more addition to the variety of services we offer to chess players. We have tournaments, ratings, cross tables, web site, books, equipment, computers, a magazine and many other items that we have continually added over the years. As the world changes so do we. It is always a constant challenge, but I believe that we manage to meet these challenges and give our chess players a great deal of variety in the services that we offer, using the latest technology wherever possible.

There are some major tournaments upcoming in the next few months that I believe we all should participate in or otherwise support if possible. The events that immediately come to mind are the Paul Keres Memorial in Vancouver in May, and the CYCC and Canadian Open in Sackville in July. Organizers across the Country have many more events and I urge you all to participate wherever you can. Our organizers are the backbone of our chess world.

Next month our Business Office will advise each Province of the number of Governors allowed according to the one for every fifty fee equivalent members. In early June the Office needs to have from each Province the list of names and addresses of the Governors that they have elected. Please be on time with these lists. We need them well before the Annual Meeting.

The next G.L. will be the last of the current administration. It will contain proxy forms and the agenda for the Annual Meeting. One very important note. Votes on motions MUST be received either by the Secretary or the Business Office by the deadline shown on the front of the G.L. Any votes received after the deadline will NOT be recorded. Also there is no obligation to include comments received after the deadline, however it is possible they could be included if it does not make for much extra time or problems formatting.

So, until next time, have a great Spring and I hope that our problems decrease and our ratings increase.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED

The Executive has hired Serge Archambault to work in the CFC Business Office. Serge has a long history in Quebec, both as a player and an arbiter, and I am sure that his experience and involvement in the chess world will be of considerable advantage to the CFC.

The Executive has decided to issue monetary compensation to Dan Decastro, the CFC/ICC Tournament Director. It appears that these tournaments will be successful and we appreciate Dan's involvement in making this happen.

The Executive approved the following motion "That the Junior Co-ordinator, in conjunction with the "Junior Committee", in the years 2002 and beyond, be empowered to negotiate with and bring outside agencies in to participate in the running of the CYCC program at the Regional Level, with the understanding that any financial or contractual agreements are subject to the approval of the Executive. The final terms of any agreement to be negotiated with outside parties shall be put to a vote of the full CFC Executive before adoption. Such events would qualify players directly to the Nationals. Anybody would be eligible to put a proposal forward for a Regional event.

In addition, should the respective Provincial authorities choose not to organize the "official" Provincial event as per the existing rules, these events, too, can be awarded to interested parties."

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

MOTIONS VOTED ON IN GL#4

Motion 01-3: (Richard Bowes / Ken Craft) That in Motion 01-1a, the clause "exclusive of privately arranged matches or private

tournaments not previously approved by the CFC" under articles 1 & 2 be eliminated.

FAILED

Yes - 7 No - 16 Abstain - 3

L.Craver: Yes - seems a reasonable amendment of what I consider a bad motion.

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

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

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

FAILED

Yes -4 No - 22 Abstain - 1

Motion 01-1b: (Roger Langen-Robert Webb): Whereas titles assist chess players to advertise competence for chess teaching and otherwise to enjoy the recognition of their peers for an achieved level of play;
be it resolved that the CFC adopt a certificate system for class players such that:

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

4) A player who attains a rating of 1200 be certified a D-class player.

FAILED

Yes - 3 No - 24

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

FAILED

Yes - 2 No - 23 Abstain - 2

L.Craver: No - there are several good reasons why a good Olympic Team member might not be able to play in the Canadian Closed. I don't feel this motion improves the Olympic Team selection process.

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

FAILED

Yes - 4 No - 14 Abstain - 4

L.Craver: No - I think a match would be a good thing - I do NOT think it would add anything to make it required.

CURRENT MOTIONS

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

Richard Bowes: The New Brunswick Governors wish to express their great displeasure with the

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

The CFC procedures for selecting the Olympic team ensure that an objective test will be applied in selecting players for the team. These procedures exist with the approval of the Assembly of Governors. The Governors are the representatives of the CFC members and work to ensure that the interests of the members are protected and respected by the governing body. In this instance the governing body (in the person of the President) has acted in such a manner as to ignore the proper procedures and to trample on the rights of certain members by not following the rules under the CFC Constitution.

It is noted that the President has asserted that he acted within his authority inasmuch as the situation was one of great urgency. Presumably he considers that this event constituted an "issue" under By-Law 2, Article 11. However, assuming this to be the case, this claim of urgency has not been substantiated by facts. It has been noted that the President had several days after receiving notice of Teplitsky's & Livshits' quitting in which to, at the very least, contact the Board and to have them decide the course of action as stipulated under By-Law 2, Article 11. The President first learned of the pullout on Friday, October 20th and failed to even try to contact the members of the Board for the next 2 days. In fact it was certain Board members who contacted him eventually and when they gave their decision as to how to proceed (via the selection list) the President ignored their decision. Furthermore, there has been no evidence presented to indicate that

Jack Yoos and David Cummings were contacted by the President any earlier than the following Monday, illustrating that there was plenty of time to telephone everyone on the selection list.

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

Moved 01-6: (David Cohen/ David Gebhardt) That the CFC policy on rating events be that a tournament, which is otherwise qualified to be rated, cannot be prevented from being rated on the grounds that its dates conflict, whether directly or indirectly, with those of another event.

David Cohen: We are a free enterprise society. Events which cannot survive on their own in a competitive environment should not be propped up by regulation.

It is the CFC's job to promote chess across Canada. Preventing an event from being rated by the CFC MIGHT be helping an event that cannot survive on its own. However, it would DEFINITELY be hurting the second event, which could be run successfully in another location.

In the best situation, we would have many tournaments across Canada every weekend. North Bay and Toronto could run events on the same weekend or one after the other. In a competitive environment, players will choose one or the other. In a cooperative environment, the organizers will arrange for players to play in both! There no need to prevent one event from coming into being.

Furthermore, there is no need to place an organizer in the position of being threatened with not having an event rated. This situation has occurred twice within the past year to the CFC's largest customer. I do not think that we should treat our best customer and our most prolific organizer in this fashion. This motion will ensure that no organizer will be placed in this position.

Moved 01-7 (Amendment to 01-6): (Martin Jaeger / Wolfgang Ferner) That 01-6 be amended by adding the following: subject to the right of affiliated provinces / territories to reserve

three periods / calendar year, giving six months notice, for all or part of its territory.

Martin Jaeger: 01-6 Has been put forward in the wake of the OCA attempt (in accordance with the OCA constitution) to protect the dates of the Ontario Open. The CFC decided not to collaborate in the protection. The question of what are the terms of the unwritten affiliation agreement between the CFC and affiliated provincial / territorial authorities is therefore raised and should be addressed by formalizing agreements. The motion Cohen/Gebhardt seeks to pre-establish a term that the CFC would seek in such an agreement.

In the discussion which has swirled around the subject, Mr Craver stated that he would be willing to support a provincial authority having the right to protect up to three tournaments a year. The amendment to 01-6 follows Mr Craver's notion.

The amended motion would provide affiliates with a reasonable ability to organize the affairs consistent with a reasonable right of all organizers to organize.

MOTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION

Second & Final Discussion of motion 01-4

Refer to previous comments by M.Smith, R.Langens, GL#3, R.Langens (Executive OCA), K.Spraggett, D.Cohen, B.Campbell, P.Stockhausen, P.Haley, R.Bowes & K.Craft, A.Mendrinios, G.Taylor, D.Allan, M.Jaeger, K.Spraggett, GL#4.

T.Ficzere: I vote no. As to "Should we get rid of the President", I think he will be gone this coming election. Yes, he did wrong by not following the rules. I do not agree with the manner in which he made his decision regarding the Olympic Team Selection. Imagine being a "volunteer" of an organization and having that much power! If I could have my way, I might have chosen the same team, but I would have consulted the executive before making any decision. Mr. Smith did not do so, and I am sure he is aware of this by now (and probably well before this writing). Should he be impeached?

What will this achieve? I doubt that Mr. Smith had ill intentions, and was perhaps influenced more by others than with what he thought was correct.

I would just try to change the rules on this one. If I had my way, I might change the selection rules to be closer to this...

The first 4 spots are awarded to...

- 1) Last Canadian Closed Champion (who knows how often this event will be run?!).
- 2) The 2 top players from the rating list (could be 1 and 3, or 2 and 3, or even 1 and 2, if the Closed winner is among the top 3 on the rating list).
- 3) The reigning Canadian Junior Champion.
- 4) 5 & 6 are chosen by the 4 qualifying players in that Olympiad.

Had this system been in place, it might have avoided much of the acrimony that took place this time around. Of course, you would have to modify this to take other scenarios into consideration. For example, what if #1 and #3 decide they don't want to play for whatever reason, then you would have to have a provision such as...

If any player decides he/she cannot play for a valid reason after accepting the responsibility of playing, then the vacant players position(s) should be decided by the remaining players of the team.. If the remaining players cannot decide on who should play, the CFC President will then request that the Executive Director produce from the CFC rating list (with a cut-off date previously determined) the players who are eligible for the team. The President and the Executive will recommend who should fill the vacancies, with final approval of the existing members of the Olympic team..

Implementing this type of structure would help to ensure team "spirit". This is something that is not taken into consideration now.

Just my thoughts.

L.Craver: Olympic Team selection: This has clearly been a hot point for several years as nearly all the recent Olympiads have seen someone withdraw the last minute. Certainly by now we all know what is involved in replacing people at the last minute. My own feeling is that the President fumbled "in time trouble" as one governor put it but that a non-confidence motion

is out of place.

From past experience we would seem to know that the President or Business Office ought to:

a) compile a list of 10-15 candidates for late replacement and poll them 4-8 weeks in advance. Players who believe themselves to be team candidates who are NOT contacted should reasonably expect to get in touch if they expect to be available.

b) each candidate should be required to 'yes', 'no' or 'maybe' about their availability as a late replacement. Candidates saying yes or maybe should be required to provide the President with one or more methods of quickly getting in touch with them and suggested best times to get in touch. No further action should be expected by the President for candidates not responding or saying no.

c) The President needs to keep a phone log for calls relating to the Olympic Team as much for "CYA" reasons as anything else.

d) Masters and Governors need to be aware that "excrement" does happen - Masters know that "the call" may come at an inopportune time (and if available but will be away from their phones for extended periods may need to make special arrangements). They should also EXPECT such a query and make a priority of making phone #s/e-mail addresses available and current with the Business Office.

e) If there are personal concerns involving players who will NOT play on the same team no way no how it is incumbent on those players to communicate this confidentially to the Team Captain who needs to be able to communicate this information to the President.

My view is that if the list described in a) above is done a month or two BEFORE the Olympiad it will take a LOT of the pressure off the President and Business Office. If he knows who is definitely NOT available it will save a lot of time if and when the "time trouble" occurs. My impression from reading the account of what happened tells me that a LOT of time was wasted calling people who need not have been called. I do NOT agree that all the responsibility to contact particular individuals should be on the President - surely there is some responsibility on the player to indicate his or her availability long before the deadline for finalizing the team. My

point is that this initial contact needs to be made well before time pressure becomes a factor and both President and Master have key responsibilities in this area.

Finally I think it amazing that the withdrawing players have received no blame at all from this motion. Much as I like and respect these players (notably Mr. Teplitsky who I consider a personal friend) I think both deserve blame not so much for withdrawing but withdrawing with so little notice. I find it equally amazing there has been no mention of rules such as 1205(b) or motions like 97-9 in this discussion.

A.Mendrinis: I am against President's Resignation

First Discussion of Motion 01-6

Refer to previous comments by D.Gebhardt, R.Langen, GL#3

T.Ficzere: From the facts that I have gathered, it seems to me that Mr. Dutton is more concerned with how he will pay his bills than with what is best for chess in Ontario. Please don't get me wrong on this one. Mr. Dutton has every right to run an event at any time he wishes to do so. I don't believe the CFC or the OCA should have the power to dictate who can do what as an organiser (as far as when they want to hold an event in any case). As he stated in one post on Chesstalk.com, Mr. Dutton has to pay his bills. Is this in the best interests of chess in Ontario, or is this in the best interests of Mr. Dutton? Years ago, I was the secretary of the OCA, and at that time, I thought I was acting in the best interest of players across the province of Ontario when I was an advocate of rotating the Ontario Open among the regions as they were defined at that time. The idea was to promote chess in "all" of Ontario, and not just Toronto.

On his behalf, from all accounts, I hear that Mr. Dutton runs top quality events. We could use a small army of him!

Again, perhaps I am not getting all the facts on this matter. I just don't understand why Mr. Dutton chose to run this event at the same time

as the Ontario Open. I guess I just speak from the point of view of someone who wants to cooperate, and not just capitalize. I am a firm believer in the dollar (could always use more here), but I am a sucker for the cause, at least as far as I can see it.

R.Langen: This motion is ill-considered. At the moment, the CFC does not know whether to attack its friends or lie with its enemies. So it is doing both.

The motion might better be tried after the elections at Sackville, when one might hope for a change. The hope is faint perhaps.

Since the motion, moreover, appears hostile to regulation, what status does it expect to have if passed?

L.Craver: Yes - I have long felt that the possibility was there for organizers in major metropolitan centres to have the ability to wreak havoc with events in smaller locations. I once thought the CFC was a good tool to enforce some cooperation but have changed my view. This motion was in fact one of the most logical and coherent motions I've seen in the GL in many years.

Essentially the OCA has proven itself unable or unwilling to put its own house in order and gain cooperation among the various organizers. It now wants the CFC Governors to come down with an iron fist on an active organizer. I think this is a strong dereliction of duty on the OCA / GTCL organizers who could and should have cooperated with Mr. Dutton rather than seeking a Carthaginian solution. After last year's issues with North Bay the Ontario Governors had the votes to put a system in place to their satisfaction. They did not do so. Now after being surprised again they have again failed to make any attempt to either bury the hatchet or make an attempt to work out a system they can live with. Rather than negotiate they choose to invoke "big mean daddy CFC" to do their work for them. And THEN have the audacity to threaten the CFC itself if they don't get their way despite NEVER having made any attempt to make any kind of motions of any sort. The principal members of the OCA Executive have been around chess organizing a long time - they are NOT rookies and in my view know very well how the system works.

Given what I heard through CFC Executive

e-mails I expected to see such a motion in GL#4. In light of this I can only surmise that Messrs. Langen, Jaeger and others don't care nearly as much as they are claiming to. As a matter of policy I much prefer motions in favour of something rather than motions to prevent something and as such urge all Governors to support motion 01-06 by a wide margin.

A.Mendrinis: Too many Tournaments at the same time hurt the Organizers and it is poor for promoting chess in Canada which is very bad. It is better to have a big and a successful Tournament rather than 2 little and not so successful. My vote will be no to this motion.

P.Haley: I do not believe that it is appropriate to use or threaten to use the rating system as a punishment vehicle. We should always strive to maintain the integrity of the rating system

Provincial Associations can reward or penalize those putting on conflicting events. Provincial Associations are in a better position than the CFC to understand all the intricacies involved in potential conflict of events.

In addition to my comments above, I believe that David Cohen presents logical reasons in Governors' Letter No. 4 to support the motion Cohen/Gebhardt.

B.Campbell: To comment on David Gebhardt's motion 01-6. I agree with it. In a free society with an open market system (like any system, capitalism has its virtues and flaws), an individual should have the right to organize and run, in this case, a chess tournament. I mean, in this specific example we are looking at two events on the same weekend in different cities. Most would agree that most chess players, if given a choice, will play a tournament in their home town. So the conflict may influence attendance at both events, which I admit is unfortunate. But trying to make a living, or even break even, running chess tournaments, is a very risky proposition at the best of times, and anyone who is doing this I admire.

Somehow, people involved in chess at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels (and here our present structure associated with these levels is the CFC, OCA, and GTCL) have to work together to promote chess, and that includes working things out as much as possible with prominent individuals who are promoting

chess on their own.

REPORT FROM THE FIDE REPRESENTATIVE

To: President H.E.Kirsan Ilyumzhinov
From: Phil Haley, Zonal President and FIDE representative, Canada

After review with the executive of the Chess Federation of Canada I am in a position to formally advise the following:

1. The Chess Federation of Canada formally protests the manner in which the new time control plan was promulgated. The minutes of the General Assembly meeting in Istanbul make it very clear that the fact that there was no objection to giving the Presidential Board authority in this area was based on the understanding given to the General Assembly that a questionnaire would be given to every player in the Olympiad. This was not done.

2. The Chess Federation of Canada strongly supports the present system of qualifying from Zonal championships directly to the World Championship and strongly supports the continued emphasis on the importance of Zones and Zonal championships and the ongoing ability to win FIDE titles directly as a result of achievements in Zonal championships. We understand that Dr. Pedro Barrera, Continental President of the Americas, feels the same way

3. The Chess Federation of Canada supports the idea of Continental championships qualifying additional players directly to the first round of the World Championship.

4. The Chess Federation of Canada would like clarification of a number of important points including the question of how many players from Canada will be eligible to participate in the Continental championship. We also recommend that Canada and all other single country zones be able to decide internally on how these players will be chosen...that is Canada may or may not decide to use the Zonal championship for determining these qualifiers.

5. Because of the significant prize fund being provided to the Continental championship, the Chess Federation of Canada recommends that

their zonal champion be allowed to participate in the Continental championship if he or she so chooses...in addition to participating in the first round of the world championship itself. The Zonal champion would be eligible for prizes in the Continental championship but would not take one of the qualifying places for the World Championship as the Zonal champion would have already qualified for the first round of the World Championship. Any Zonal champion who decides to play in the Continental will result in an additional number of players in the Continental and will not have any impact on the allocated number of entries from each Zone to the Continental.

6. The Chess Federation of Canada proposes that the present time control structure in use in the World Championship be maintained until such time as a thorough player survey is completed. This could be done at the Olympiad in Bled. In the intervening period the proposed new time control system should be tested and evaluated in several major tournaments.

7. The Chess Federation of Canada expresses concern that the Continental championships are planned to be held in July. For the year 2001 in particular this presents two serious problems:

(a). This provides very little time for details to be finalized, bid packages to be prepared and bids to be obtained and compared.

(b). The early date is inconsistent with the plans of any Zones that propose August or later for the date of their Zonal championship.

If FIDE does not change the July timing for the 2001 Continental championships, then each zone should be given the right to determine their qualifiers to the first round of the World Championship and their qualifiers to the Continental championship by some other means rather than by their Zonal Championship.

8. The Chess Federation of Canada expresses general support for the protests of the Chess Federations of Germany, France, the Netherlands, Spain and Switzerland and expresses the opinion that the number and intensity of these protests reflects to a large degree the fact that there was an inadequate degree of discussion, communication and agreement in advance of decision making.

Phil Haley,

Zonal President and FIDE Representative,
Canada
March 10, 2001

Maurice Smith's proposed strategy for the CFC. I do not think that we should be wasting our time with efforts to promote chess in the schools and in French speaking Canada; these tasks are being carried out sufficiently well by two other organizations (CMA and FQE). We should be forming alliances and co-operating with these organizations, rather than duplicating their efforts by competing with them.

GENERAL REMARKS on CFC BUSINESS

a) General comments

R.Langens: I regret that straightforward OCA positions on behalf of Ontario chess, or my own modest motion on titles, have led to such fear and trembling in the nation. In this context, I have noticed and appreciate the support of Denis Allan, Phil Haley, and others who have kept a level head and stayed with the information. Their civility of expression is much to be admired.

L.Craver: My respect for Mr. Spraggett continues to grow and I am pleasantly shocked that he feels he has the time and energy to be so active with the Governors. Would that every strong master chose to participate in such a positive way!

N.Sutherland: As the Governor for the Northwest Territories I personally am voting no to all motions up for vote in the governor's Letter #4. My reason is that they do not make the CFC an approved body and I for one support the CFC strongly.

b) CFC Strategy Proposal

D.Cohen: I strongly disagree with two elements of

As to the direction the CFC should be taking, I propose that we get back to the purpose for which the organization was founded in 1872: running the Canadian Championship. It is a disgrace that we have only held 74 Championships in 128 years. Furthermore, there is only one Championship in recent memory that has drawn praise from the participants (Hamilton 1994), and one has to go back to Ottawa 1955 to recall another Championship that received general praise.

I think that a series of annual, well-run Closed Championships (together with well-attended and well-run Open Championships - another story) will draw the good publicity to chess in Canada that we have been seeking.

c) GL#4 President's Message

M.Jaeger: Re President's Message GL#4 Mr Smith and I have had a protracted email exchange on the propriety of the President commenting in the GL on internal OCA matters. Any governor interested in this question can email me at martin.jaeger@utoronto.ca and I will forward the exchange.

APPENDIX

VOTING RECORD from GL#4

	1-3	1-1a	1-5 N/A	1-1b	1-2	SV 1-1
Stringer	yes	no	yes	no	no	abstain
Craver	yes	no	no	no	no	no
Craft	yes	no	no	no	no	abstain
Jaeger	no	yes	abstain	yes	yes	yes
Campbell	no	no	no	no	no	abstain
Dutton	no	no	no	no	no	no
Gebhardt	no	no	no	no	no	yes
Stockhausen	no	no	no	no	no	
Palsson	no	no	no	no	no	yes

Bowes	yes	no	no	no	no	
Taylor	no	no	no	no	no	abstain
Haley	no	abstain	abstain	no	no	no
Wong	no	no	no	no	no	no
Neven	no	no	no	no	no	no
Sutherland	no	no	no	no	no	no
Mendrin	abstain	yes	yes	no	abstain	no
Ficzere		no		no	no	
Groleau	no	no	no	no	no	no
Niksic	abstain	no	no	no	no	no
Barnes	no	no	no	no	no	no
Ferner	no	no	no	no	yes	no
Cohen	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Brodie	abstain	no	no	no	no	yes
Langen	yes	yes	yes	yes	abstain	
Spraggett	no	no	no	no	no	
Kirton	no	no	no	no	no	no
Mckim	yes	no	no	no	no	no
	yes - 7	yes - 4		yes - 3	yes - 2	yes - 4
	no - 16	no - 22		no - 24	no - 23	no - 14
	abs - 3	abs - 1			abs - 2	abs - 4

1-05 (1-01a amended by 1-03) Was not tallied since 1-03 was defeated.

Motions for Vote

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

YES _____ NO _____
ABSTAIN _____

Only votes received by May 15, 2001 will be counted. *Three late votes were accepted for the last vote. This relaxation of the rule will not be repeated.*

Motion for Second Discussion (will be called for vote in the next GL)

01-6 Cohen/Gebhardt. CFC Rating policy for conflicting events.

Amendment

01-7 Jaeger/Ferner. Rights of affiliates to designated exempted periods.

Deadline for next Governor's letter is May 15, 2001

Chess Federation of Canada - Governor's Letter #5 - 2000/01