

# **CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA GOVERNORS' LETTER TWO 1997-1998**



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

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

**Deadline for next Governors' Letter is December 20<sup>th</sup>, 1997**

## President's Message

I first wish to welcome our new employee Ms. Stephanie C. Powers to the CFC and wish her the best of success in her new position. One of many the benefits of this new appointment is that office now has the ability to provide services in French. As I have indicated before this is a necessary first step in order to resolve the questions related to Quebec. This brings me to the next point the status of 97-10. I had a conversation with M. Stéphane Beaudoin president of the FQE on the matter. I indicated to him that 97-10 had passed before our AGM and that the deadline had expired on the 31<sup>st</sup> of August. He indicated to me that he would be presenting the motion to the FQE board. I indicated to him that if there is a positive vote from FQE on this then 97-10 would be presented for a vote again to the Assembly. He had no problem with this arrangement. Although some governors were under the impression that 97-10 was open ended this is by no means the case. 97-10 is not in force and can only be implemented now by a second positive vote of the CFC Governors.

The most significant new initiative by the office has been the new school program. Organizers and teachers have very well received the school teaching manual. The approach that is taken is to provide teachers with the resource materials to teach chess even though the teacher may have little or no knowledge of chess. The program is still very new however it is already opening many doors for the CFC in the area of scholastic chess. If any of you know of any school that is interested please contact the school so that they can obtain a manual from the CFC. The manual is sent free of charge to the school.

I had the opportunity to accompany Mr. Phil Haley to the FIDE meeting in Kishinev. I will not go into the details of this meeting since this is covered in the FIDE Representative's report in En Passant. I will instead focus on where I see the CFC's role in FIDE. It is fair to say that there have been many problems in FIDE; however it must also be said that there are many things in FIDE that actually do work. On the other side of the equation, one of the comments I heard from many delegates is the wish that Canada can increase its participation in FIDE events. This is particularly true of the Americas where there are individual and team events that Canada can send participants. It is also true that Canada could host some of these events. For example the individual championship is an excellent tournament to provide norm opportunities to Canadian Players. The youth tournaments are planned for Mexico for 1998 making it one of the years where travel costs from Canada will be comparatively low. It is fair to say that our financial resources are limited; however increasing participation in FIDE events is a worthwhile objective for the CFC. On a related topic the recent trend towards more FIDE title and rating events with events such as the recent Canadian Open in Winnipeg, the North Bay International, the Quebec Open and the Toronto International is a very positive development in this area.

*Francisco Cabañas*

## Further comments from the President

In response to Mr. Thomson's question regarding the 1996 Canadian Closed I must say that this question should really be placed to the Past President. In view of the allegations regarding this in Mr. Thomson's remarks I will not comment on this matter until Mr. Farges has had a chance to comment on this matter. The question regarding who organized the vote of the National Appeals committee on the matter of the 1995 Closed I can answer since I organized the vote. I must say however that I answered the same question in Calgary in 1996, and the assembly in the 1996 AGM debated the question of the 1995 Closed at considerable length.

I wish to advise the assembly that 98-3 is very broad. A vote for 98-3 is basically a vote against all woman's chess programs including not only the Woman's Olympic Team and the Woman's Championship but also matters we may have not even thought of such as for example the question of Canada sponsoring FIDE events which also include woman's events, or allowing and funding players from Canada who qualify, under sex neutral rules such as 2230, to participate in FIDE woman only events. The wording is fine for a straw vote topic but the broad implications will have to be made clear for such a motion to be in order.

I also wish to advise the assembly that 98-2 as worded applies only to the Canadian Closed Championship.

*Francisco Cabañas*

## DISCUSSION OF MOTION 98-1

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

**Gordon Taylor:** I shall assume this motion is up for discussion although it was not properly presented as such in GL#1. I say this because there was no "Motions for Discussion" page at the back of GL#1, with the blank lines inviting comments. I assume this was an error of omission and not because of some procedural technicality. When I made this motion at the Annual Meeting I asked that it be presented as a Motion for Discussion in GL#1, and then for vote with GL#2, and there was no indication that this would not be done.

I was moved to present this motion after Phil Haley brought up this topic early in the meeting. As I recall, Phil simply said he did not understand why the Past President was on the executive when he was no longer the immediate past president. Of course, this situation will only occur when a President serves for two or more years.

At the meeting I made an analogy between the executive and a boat being rowed through the water. The boat should have the President at the tiller and the executive should be his crew, working in unison to propel the boat forward. I added that the Past President is often not rowing, and at times is more like a log being dragged behind the boat on a chain!

Francisco Cabanas made a good point that the Past President can be in an adversarial position, when, for example he ran against the new president but was defeated. Even in that case, there may be some virtue in the Past President sitting for one year on the executive, where he can act as a counter-weight, and of course speak to how policy was made the previous year. But I see little value in his continued presence after this first year. In my experience, the Past President tends to withdraw from decision making (he's in the boat but not rowing). Some perform well, most do not. But I really see no reason why a Past President should be on the executive after one year.

Please note that for this motion to pass:

- 1) at least half of the Governors must vote (either for, against or abstain) and,
- 2) that two-thirds of the votes be in favour of the motion (not counting abstentions).

I therefore implore all Governors to vote on this motion, regardless of their stand on the issue.

**Jim Ferguson:** I cannot see this motion affecting the CFC very much either way. The only question is what happens when the Executive either keeps a "bad" Past President or loses a "good" one. In the former case, the members of the Executive won't listen to him/her anyway and in the latter, the Past President can still advise the Executive in a less formal manner if he/she wishes.

**Lyle Craver:** What is the constitutional import of this motion? If the intent is to remove the position of Past President from the Executive when the President is in his second or later term then this simply makes the Executive one position smaller, right?

Are we being asked for a vote on this motion with this GL? If so – YES

## COMMENTS

**Brad Thomson:** I noticed the names of two Governors on the Canadian Open crosstable whose names did not appear among those who attended the Annual Meeting, and who do not reside close enough to Winnipeg to have been at work during the day. This is an absolute disgrace and the two individuals might want to consider doing the only honourable thing, which is to immediately resign and allow someone who cares for and respects the privilege of being a Governor to assume their places. Apathy among the Governors is chronic, with a normal response rate of well below 50%. If you have nothing to say, fine, and if you have no opinion on a motion being voted upon, fine, but if you can't at least take the time to "abstain," then what are you doing as a Governor apart from wasting staff time, paper and postage costs?

Is 97-10 now in effect, or did the FQE not amend its own rules to allow for this motion to come into effect?

Mr. Cabanas stated during the discussion of the Secretary's report that some of the information is confidential and can't be released publicly. This statement is not accurate. Because the CFC is a registered charity, all of its dealings, books and so forth must be open, not only to members but to the entire general public as well. This is the law. And this improper policy has led to many terribly underhanded dealings. To wit, I was personally instructed by the President (Mr. Farges) that the Executive had voted to run a Closed and Zonal in 1996 and to go ahead with the preparations. Later I was informed by two members of the Executive (Mr. Haley and Mr. Majstorovic) that they had never been asked to partake in a vote on the matter. I would like to ask Mr. Cabanas and Mr. Quiring if they were part of the voting or not? I recall a Governor at the time (Mr. O'Donnell), asking in the GL that the vote be made public. It was not. No doubt this was one of those sensitive matters requiring confidentiality. All Executive votes ought to appear in the Governors' Letter. Accountability must be maintained. And the laws that govern our land must be adhered to.

I would like to apologize to Stephen Ball for falsely attributing to him the organization of the Sunday phone calls to the National Appeals Committee during the 1995 Canadian Closed. I was under the impression that Mr. Ball had been the organizer since he was the one who informed me that the session would take place. May I ask Mr. Ball if he knows whom the person was that did organize the session?

I agree completely with Gordon Taylor when he suggests that the merits of Bryon Nickoloff's idea of having the four Olympic team members who qualify by rating pick the other two players be considered. Further, I agree completely with Mr. Nickoloff's idea. Who better to choose than the players themselves? But I would suggest that a reputable person be appointed to oversee the decision making process of the players.

I commend Kevin Spraggett for his willingness to relinquish one of his championship spots if the FIDE cycle falls behind, but I would respectfully suggest that it be gotten in writing if it is decided that he be taken up on his offer. With respect to Mr. Cabanas' comment that we should hold a Zonal in 1999 otherwise we would go at least four years without one: so what? We should hold our next Zonal when we don't have a champion declared for the next World Championship, and not before. Should FIDE hold two events before 1999 then I

agree with Mr. Cabanas, but not otherwise. We cannot afford meaningless championships at this time.

Concerning the bid for the 1999 Canadian Open, I agree completely with Ford Wong in opposing the payment of \$4000 to the organizers. I oppose the payment of any money at all to the organizers, including concession fees for the CFC store on site, and the waving of rating fees. The CFC cannot afford such luxuries. Indeed the Canadian Open is our "showcase" event, but if this is the case, ought it not make the CFC money rather than bankrupt it? It would be better to have no event than to lose money on it. I agree with Troy Vail and Tom O'Donnell in their viewpoint that the requirement of feature articles for the promotion of the Canadian Open infringes upon editorial policy. The Executive should keep their hands off of *En Passant* and leave it to the employees of the business office. If you don't like your coach, then fire him, but don't tell him what players to put on the ice. I am in agreement with Gordon Taylor and John Quiring when they maintain that the Canadian Open should be played in only one section. Part of the beauty of the event is the opportunity that all of us are given to get a real game with a Grandmaster. Let's not give that up. The notion of holding the Annual Meeting before the Canadian Open begins is absolutely idiotic. Attendance at these meetings is already too sparse as it is. Governors from around the country can play by taking one week off work. Now we want to ask them to take two weeks off, and incur several days of extra expenses so that we aren't tired when we play two or three of our games? Do we not think that this will hurt the already dismal attendance at some of our meetings? Do we want to cover staff expenses for these extra days just so that a few more of us are fresh when we show up to play a couple of times? Let's attempt to be realistic.

Regarding the report of the Executive Director, I am in full agreement with Mr. Vail when he suggests that the CFC Executive must become more fiscally responsible. As Troy points out, the rules indicate that we only send a Women's team to the Olympiad when finances permit. But with respect to the last Olympiad, finances did not permit, and yet the Executive decided to send a team anyway. During that same year, the Executive decided to expend an additional \$6500, which was \$2500 over and above what the rules call for, in order to line up people to represent Canada at the World Championships. Lining up players is something that was never done when FIDE was consistently performing on schedule, let alone when it is in a state of disarray! Mr. Cabanas suggests in his President's report that we have two champions in inventory due to FIDE's problems. This is false. We have this absurd predicament because the Executive chose to run a Closed before the winner of the previous event had ever represented Canada internationally. With respect to both of these events, the Executive should have listened to the opinions of the Executive Director and the rest of the staff, which because they are professionals dealing with these matters day in and day out, were far more educated than their own. Mr. Vail also points out, correctly, that taking what he refers to as "option two" will make some people angry. Sure it will. But sometimes these sorts of decisions have to be made for the long-term health of any organization. A responsible Executive will not simply throw money all over the place so as to keep everyone happy in the hopes of getting re-elected, and so as to build monuments to themselves. It will, rather, make

good, fiscally responsible decisions and have the satisfaction of knowing that the right decisions were honourably made, and then accept the consequences.

Congratulations and thanks to John Quiring for his efforts in providing the minutes of the Annual Meeting (punctilious?), and to Tom O'Donnell for his work on the Women's survey.

**Jonathan Berry:** Office Software (page 9). Troy's membership software is way more friendly than the software I wrote circa 1980. In case of disaster, it could have been run by an outsider, but only after an intensive course of reading the documentation. Troy's software has the familiar WIMP interface. The "Visual" aspect of the software should make it easier to maintain. He also fixed the "Year 2000" bomb.

- Grant Brown's remarks / Chess Futures Committee

I hope that every governor has had the chance to read Grant's wake-up call on pages 5-6. I like a lot of what he says, but I will put a few issues into perspective. On September 24<sup>th</sup>, the CFC celebrated (missed?) its 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The CFC was run on a volunteer basis, just as the Alberta Chess Association (ACA) is today. The CFC's address was a small room in the basement of its Secretary, George Bryant. In 1972, the CFC adopted a business plan formulated by Kalev Pugi. This called for a permanent office and paid staff. In fact, with the Fischer boom, it was impossible for volunteers to do the job anymore. By 1975, the CFC still had a "members' equity" of only about \$800. I don't remember if that was in addition to the IBM Selectric typewriter (now worth about \$45), or whether the equity <l>was</l> the typewriter.

The CFC paid its staff of one by commission. There was so much for each membership, so much for each issue of the magazine, and 50% of the profits from sales. As there were no salaries, the CFC was safe from loss (at least unless the Business Manager bought trainloads of stuff that couldn't be sold), and in fact made about \$15,000 per year most years, and that's after the Olympics etc were paid for. The Business Manager in turn hired staff, and paid them salaries. About 1984, the CFC Executive decided that a "proper" organization couldn't be run this way, and put all the staff on salary. The "Business Manager" was made into an "Executive Director", but with greatly circumscribed spending power.

So, Grant says that the membership fees go to pay the salaries. Historically, the profits from sales went to pay the salaries, so that the membership fees could pay for the member services. Without the sales, there would be no money for programs. Even though the sales make a needed profit, they are a "service" to members. In those days, the CFC had a wider and cheaper book selection than the USCF, and there was no match in Canada. Sales are still a service to members.

Much of Grant's fiscal criticism is not much different from bashing the school system for losing money. The root cause: you pay teachers and janitors and the oil company.

The ACA is a **particularly** well-run volunteer organization. No other provincial chess association is as successful as the ACA, and most of them, well, they make the CFC look good. As it is.

Still, Grant makes good points.

I think that the CFC needs a "Chess Futures Committee" comprised of maybe a couple of executive members, interested governors such as Grant, chess

personalities who are not governors (it might not hurt to ask the mercurial Mr. Bevand and/or a leader from the FQE), strong players who are not necessarily governors, a chess teacher, a parent, a strong young player, an internet technologist, an accountant, a business person, etc. Maybe a dozen people in all. The mandate would have a fixed term, say 18 months (one of the disincentives to becoming a governor is that it tends to become a lifetime vocation), and would include consultation with all chess “stakeholders” (not just CFC people). At the end of the mandate the committee would present a blueprint for the future of chess in Canada for approval (or, of course, rejection) by the Governors and/or Provincial Associations.

This is a process that many organizations engage in to renew themselves. It’s all too easy for us as governors to get too involved in minutiae, as Grant points out. And it is important that the committee not be dominated by the CFC-as-it-is.

To get its work done in 18 months, the committee would have to be extremely active, with things happening on a weekly basis, not just wait three months for the Governors’ letter. I think the work is possible on a “CFC-sized” budget only if all committee members are on the Internet.

#### - Single section Canadian Open

I would like to add the following to the discussion on page 17:

As has been documented before, a traditional single section Open (even with Haley Accelerated Pairings) results in most players experiencing the “yo-yo” effect. You rarely play somebody of near your own strength, unless you are in the leading or trailing groups.

Regarding norms, we have the example of the 1997 Canadian Open with more GMs than anybody has dreamed about (outside the 1988 World Chess Festival in Saint John), yet no norms achieved. If you look at the crosstable (in EP # 145, p. 9), you will see that the top non-GM or non-IM players were largely eliminated from norm contention already by round 3 or 4 because they had played too many FIDE-unrated opponents. Sure, norms will be possible, but only in exceptional or fluke circumstances. In fact, the problem of unrated players in norm events is much worse than it was a few years ago, because then an unrated opponent counted as 2200 in the average rating calculation, now it counts as 2000.

Compare the North Bay International Open. With one less round and far less in the way of titled firepower, in 1997 it had one IM norm achieved (with a round to spare, incidentally). In 1996 it had one norm, and another was possible up to the very last round, but the player lost a game he needed to win.

In my opinion, the clause in the Canadian Open contract (last page of GL # 1) “to make it’s [sic] best efforts so that the tournament offers IM and GM norm opportunities” is tantamount to false advertising if it applies to a traditional one-section (accelerated or not) Swiss. Having twice as many players as 1997 would make the hurdles even higher. I’m not saying that norms are a necessary part of the Canadian Open—but they are if you advertise them.

Therefore I ask what steps the 1999 committee is taking. Are they devising a new pairing system? Remembering the embarrassment of 1976 when the untested pairing system had to be doctored in the 5<sup>th</sup> round, will they present the new

system in good time to some august committee of the CFC for approval? If they are taking other steps to make norms a realistic possibility, let’s hear about them.

Canada has a dismal record in providing norm opportunities (aside from the Zonal windfall). Even tournaments where foreigners can get norms will result in reciprocal invitations. Norms are a motherhood issue, and it’s easy to pay lip service to them without making the efforts necessary for them to come about. The norms for 1997 came at North Bay and the Quebec Open, neither of which receives CFC sponsorship.

The USCF makes money every year from the US Open. Traditionally, Canadian Opens did not ask for subsidy from the CFC, and in many cases (St. John’s 1970, for example), local sponsorship paid GM expenses/fees and guaranteed the prize fund. In 1978, the Canadian Open in Hamilton donated \$1,000 to the Canadian Championship in Toronto. Without that money, it is unlikely that the Closed could have been held! With our \$4,000 investment in the 1999 Open, we spend more on the Open than we do (annualized) on the Championship, an event which by its nature must be subsidized. And if you want norms, you can get them by investing the \$4,000 in a different format.

#### - Olympic Selection Committee

On the second page of his report, Denis Allan mixes two events together. The 1972 Canadian Junior was won by John MacPhail, ahead of future-GM Kevin Spraggett and IM Jean Hebert. Nigel Fullbrook won the 1974 event ahead of Spraggett, Hebert, and future-IM Nickoloff. He did that despite being two points off the pace and tied for 3<sup>rd</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> with only 3 rounds to go. There was a second Canadian Junior (won by Peter Nurmi) in 1974, organized at short notice when FIDE decided to hold the then biennial World Junior every year. In the two latter events, Murray Campbell, future co-author of “Deep Blue”, represented Alberta.

#### -Employee Report

Items (8 & 9). The fact that a tournament cannot normally be submitted for rating electronically is troubling. I think that the office needs to work out a procedure which makes this possible. The suggestion that I made several years ago was to set up debit accounts.

Shipping charges: While I like Tom’s suggestion of reducing shipping charges for increasing orders, an \$8 charge is a big disincentive for a member making her **first** order. I remember we would frequently get a first order for a \$7 book (there were such things in those days), and ten days later get another order for \$80 (that’s \$8,000 in today’s prices) from the same new member, freshly having received her initial purchase.

In 1975-1985 there were no shipping charges, that was included in the price. That was consistent with the principle that all CFC members, wherever they lived, were equal. There are costs to do with off-the-street customers (display area, supervision, work disruption), so they paid the same.

The catalogue used to have an indication of which books were “recommended” and which were new since the previous catalogue. You could also tell from the catalogue number who the publisher was. Such touches turned the bare

listings of fact that were the catalogue into an "information-rich" resource. There were no book reviews in the magazine.

I don't think we will ever see the same quantity of book purchasing as when the latest Informant was #18, but I'm sure that with Tom at the book helm we will see improvements.

- Certificates (97-12 Straw vote topic)

I still think the approach is wrong-headed: decide in principle whether you want certificates, then ask the Office how best to implement them.

The USCF tried to introduce unfamiliar titles and had to beat a costly retreat. 2000-2199 is Expert, 2200-2399 is Master, 2400 and above is Senior Master. Mess with that at your peril.

**Ron Langill:** 97-12 - The comments of Yves Farges were dead on. The non-recognition of the average player has been a pet peeve of mine, especially when it came to the editing of my tourney reports. It appears that Mr. O'Donnell is addressing the editing part, and the idea behind this motion is a good step forward in recognizing non-titled players as important members of the C.F.C.

(note: not intended as part of comment - I don't think this is up for vote yet-if it is, my vote is yes)

Other comments:

Re: junior event rating fees - Page 11 of G.L.#1 shows the passing of a motion to reduce the fees from \$2.00 to \$1.00. Our latest issue of En Passant now speaks of an experiment reducing the fee to zero! Is someone unilaterally over-riding the entire motion process?

Re: scholastic chess: - The initiatives mentioned in En Passant is a good step in addressing the need to develop this area. I'm sure there are some who gagged when reading Mr. Brown's suggestion of inviting Larry Bevand for discussions but there is a good point made there. Chess 'n Math's specialty is promoting chess at a young age. In my mind, anything that helps youth chess is good for chess in general and good for the C.F.C. I hope that this is kept in mind during the development of any future initiatives. We need to get past some old-style thinking I have heard which portrays Chess 'n Math as a rival. We should be trying to work together for the good of youth chess and leave politics out of it.

**Gordon Taylor:**

A) re CFC's future with FIDE

I would like to correct what is written in the minutes respecting some remarks I made re Canada's future membership in FIDE (see p. 8 of GL #1, paragraph preceding ITEM 4F). In fact I said that the CFC had three options: the first would be to stay in FIDE and hope to God things got better; the second would be to remain but to work actively with other federations to create a replacement organization; and the third would be to walk. I know a lot of people don't think the third is a constructive option. Maybe so, but it is a principled one.

In my view, Canada's future, vis-...-vis FIDE, will depend greatly on how well FIDE carries out the upcoming Candidates' Knockout event to take place this December.

Regardless, we must admit that FIDE has failed to arrange a re-unification match between Kasparov and the FIDE World Champion. At present FIDE is really only working well with respect to the youth championships, FIDE ratings and titles. The Olympiad at Moscow was of a very poor standard while the one in Armenia, while it ran well enough on site, was chaotic in the months preceding it.

The minutes state that Phil thought my comments a "bit harsh." Maybe, though I don't recall this. He later thanked me for bringing the matter forward, and then related to me his deep dissatisfaction with the two FIDE Congresses in Moscow and Erevan.

B) re 1998 Canadian Open bid

On page 13, top right, we read that "Gordon Taylor presented a bid from Ottawa [attached]." Well, yes I did, and then I gave the bid to the Secretary, John Quiring. What happened? It's not attached!

Apart from these two reservations, I'd like to extend my thanks to John Quiring for a commendable job in compiling these minutes. I know from experience what a daunting task it can be.

**Jim Ferguson:**

Re: Junior Coordinator's Report - I agree with Mr. Ottosen's comments regarding higher rated juniors not playing in their own provincial/regional championship. One possible solution is to do what the BCCF does. Our policy is to guarantee to cover travel costs to our BC Junior/Cadet champions. We only fund players that get in by rating if we can afford it - but we make no promises. This encourages the top rated players to play in the regional qualifier so that they can get their expenses taken care of.

**Lyle Craver:** With all the talk about the passage of motion 97-10 I was surprised to see no mention of the FQE's response. After all, if there was no passage of equivalent motions on their part the motions die right?

Rating Auditor's Report: Has any work been done in determining how many players (a) from Quebec and (b) from other provinces have both ESTABLISHED CFC and FQE ratings? (I do not think the methodology allows comparison of non-established ratings) Does the Ratings Auditor intend to produce a statistical estimate of the expected error of any conversion factor?

Junior Coordinator's Report: Mr Hergott is confused if he seriously questions whether top juniors (or adults if we're talking about the Canadian Closed) should be encouraged or expected to take part in their provincial championships. If a provincial championship - adult, junior, cadet or whatever - is not PRIMARILY about settling who is the strongest player in that province or region then I'm obviously confused as to the purpose of holding the championship in the first place! While Mr Taylor is probably right in his thinking that some individuals bypass their championship for this reason, it's assuredly not the policy of the BCCF or any provincial federation I know of.

Tom O'Donnell's Report: In our business we do a LOT of mail order and I am surprised at Troy's comments concerning Purolator as they mirror our company's

calculations concerning Express and Priority Post. Care to share (privately) what the CFC pays?

I would note that the Executive Director's comments that it is now THEORETICALLY possible for a tournament to be completed on Sunday and rated the following Tuesday are no longer theoretical - the 1997 Vancouver Open was rated in precisely this manner. Credit where credit is due...

Danny Goldenberg - while I'm sympathetic to Mr Ottosen's views about the FQE's slandering of his playing ability, I'm particularly pleased that Danny himself has taken the high road and demonstrated that the FQE's comments were nothing but a canard in the best possible way. Danny doesn't seem to require an apology so I'd say there are bigger sins to flog the FQE for than this.

### **STRAW VOTE TOPICS:**

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

#### **817. Dress Code**

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

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

Commentary: I agree entirely with the comments of the Treasurer in his report to the Annual Meeting. If we are ever to have a hope of attracting significant sponsorship to chess, we must have a dress code in effect. Corporations who spend sponsorship dollars do so in the expectation that association with an event will enhance their name and public image. Unless we are seeking help from the Salvation Army, we must have a dress code in effect if we are to have a reasonable hope of obtaining sponsorships.

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

Commentary: Is anyone prepared to argue that women, because they are women, are inherently less capable of playing chess than men? Or vice-versa?

