

CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA GOVERNORS' LETTER THREE 1997-1998



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

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

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is February 28th, 1998

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In this message I will address an issue that has been a concern of mine for a considerable amount of time namely the relationship between the CFC and the Association Échecs et Maths (AEM) and the question of junior and scholastic chess in Canada. This is a topic that leads me to ask many questions. For example: What are its constitution and by laws? Who are its directors? What is its financial picture? What visions for chess in Quebec does it have? What visions for chess in Canada does it have? I consider these and similar questions to be relevant to the members of the Assembly primarily because the CFC has provided and is providing AEM with the right to run certain Canadian Championships. The following reasons are also significant. The organization describes itself as "Canada's National Scholastic Chess Organization" in English and "L'organisme national du jeu d'échecs en milieu scolaire" in French. Do the English and French versions mean the same thing in the context of Quebec today? I have seen a set of unaudited financial statements that indicated gross revenue of approximately \$900,000 and a net profit of approximately \$90,000, I am quoting these figure from memory. It has certainly had very strong growth over the last 10 years. This is not an insignificant organization in the Canadian Chess Scene.

My understanding is that the AEM is incorporated as a non-profit society under the laws of the Province of Quebec. It has an elected board of directors. The membership consists of the parents of the players who participate in AEM events. I have met M Bevand, on various occasions and this has led to even more questions. For example is the Executive Director of AEM to all intensive purposes in control of the organization? What kind of control does in practice the elected board have? Can he be terminated at any time by the elected board? How is the board elected? Are there any provisions in place to ensure a balanced representation from the various parts of Canada in the elected board? Is the election process fair? What are the implications of the degree of control that the Executive Director of AEM has? What is the accountability? Are there questions of conflict of interest?

The AEM has a very significant Books and Equipment business. This has made it a competitor of the CFC. It also proposed to buy the CFC's book and equipment business in May of 1995 for five payments of approximately \$38,000. The equivalent revenue that the CFC would lose was budgeted for this year at approximately \$34,000. One of the provisions was a no competition agreement from the CFC for five years. There were other requirements such as the provision of space to the AEM in the current office facilities of the CFC and four pages per issue of free advertising in EP. The practical result is that had the CFC accepted such a proposal in 1995 we would lose our revenue from book and equipment sales in a little over two years from now. This leads to the following questions how would the CFC replace the lost revenue in two years had we accepted this offer? What would have been the impact on prices paid by chessplayers in Canada for books and equipment had the CFC left the market?

I have in my possession in Vancouver the catalogue that AEM under the name Boutique Stratégie sent to all FQE

members along with the November – December issue of Échec plus in which a chess clock is advertised for \$69.95. Shortly thereafter this same organization under the name Chess'n Math sends a catalogue to all OCA members advertising the same clock for \$42.50. The FQE price is over 64% higher than the OCA price. The CFC sells the same item to our members for \$49.95. The entire AEM (FQE) catalogue when compared to the AEM (OCA) catalogue follows the same pattern namely considerably higher prices for FQE members and somewhat lower AEM (OCA) prices than the corresponding CFC prices. One may ask what is the motivation for these distinct prices? AEM also produced an Alberta catalogue with prices that were different from both the Ontario and Quebec prices. One can ask the following questions: Is this an attempt by the AEM to gain market share at the expense of the CFC on the back of Quebec chessplayers? Was Alberta used as a trail run before the main move in Ontario? I will let the reader be the judge regarding these and similar questions. The reality is that these types of distinct prices typically do fail. Although the CFC has lost sales over the short term, this kind of action has the potential to hurt AEM more than the CFC over the long term particularly once the word gets out. This leads to the following questions. How will chessplayers in Quebec feel after being treated in this fashion by an organization that has profited so handsomely from Quebec chessplayers? By the way the FQE is well aware of this situation so we may have some answers. The next issue of Échec plus may prove to be quite interesting.

My most significant concern here is that this will lead to conflict between the CFC and the OCA. The OCA president informed the office that at NO TIME did it that M. Bevand from AEM have any access to our membership information. A professional mailing house did the actual mailing, M Bevand dropped off the catalogues and the OCA provided the labels. I do not believe that the officials of the OCA knew about the differential pricing between Ontario and Quebec. Was the OCA taken advantage of in this affair? This issue does raise many issues and has been discussed by the Assembly before. The current policy is that the membership list is to be provided only to Provincial Affiliates. Should this policy be changed?

It is difficult to consider these events without considering the differences between the CFC and the FQE dating back to the 70's. I have read through the governor's letters from that period in order to gain a better understanding of the CFC - FQE dispute and the different issues involved. Among these materials I found a letter written in Montreal on February 7 1979 by M. Jacques Labelle (at the time the President of the FQE when the FQE was still a CFC affiliate) and addressed to both Mr. W. Ferner, then Secretary of the CFC and Mr. Martin Jaeger, then President of the CFC. This letter was included in GL #6 78-79. I will include a quote from this letter because it raises even more questions.

"e) Back to the FQE-CFC relations. The Quebec Chess League is promoting the CFC mainly because of good administration and good work from J. Berry, your business manager. If only the Montréal Chess League (with L Bevand) would do the same thing there would simply be no problem. What can the FQE do? If we force a FQE-CFC common membership at \$15 no tournament director

(especially Larry) will charge that much to a new player. He will just start his 'Montréal rating'."

Is there a deeper question here that we need to take into consideration? Are there only financial considerations here? What are the links between the current issues between the CFC and the AEM and the entire CFC – FQE relationship? On the question of ratings it is important to recognize that the AEM does not rate its scholastic tournaments in Quebec under the FQE rating system. As we well know AEM does not rate its scholastic tournaments under the CFC rating system. Is the problem just the CFC rating or any rating also used for adult chess? The CFC has a book and equipment business but the FQE does not. Does the sale of books and equipment have anything to do with ratings? How does one rate a player that plays under both adult and junior only events, and take into consideration all that players games in determining a rating and use different rating systems for both type of tournaments? What advantage is there in segregating adults from juniors in this fashion? Is it not just better and simpler just to have one rating system for all players regardless of age? Or do we also need separate rating systems based on sex, race, ethnic origin, religion, etc?

In 1996 M. Bevand approached the BCCF regarding the possible expansion of AEM into Vancouver. We must keep in mind that British Columbia has a very strong CFC scholastic program. This has been the case in BC for years long before the AEM had any aspirations (in English only?) of becoming "Canada's National Scholastic Chess Organization". I have seen adult tournaments in Vancouver where 50 % of the players in the lower sections were juniors, and 20 to 30 % is not uncommon. The CFC membership statistics have over the years shown that a disproportionate number of the type 'J' and type 'P' members are in BC. The questions on multiple rating systems are particularly relevant in this case. At the meeting in which I was present the BCCF did not oppose AEM coming into Vancouver. What the BCCF did do is require that the scholastic tournaments be CFC rated (This did not preclude they be also rated under another rating system). The result AEM lost interest in Vancouver for the time being. Well I still have questions? Why would the AEM give up expanding its chess teachers program (a program that has been proven both in Montreal and Toronto) into Vancouver in order to avoid having to rate its tournaments by the CFC rating system? What does the rating of chess players have to do with the hiring and contracting of chess teachers?

The AEM opened a branch in Quebec City and subsequently shut down the operation. This leads to more questions when one considers that this is actually quite strange for an organization that is growing quite fast. Does the AEM program not work in centers equal to or smaller in population than Quebec City? Did AEM need to consolidate? In view of many if not all previous questions why should the CFC allow AEM run ALL scholastic and junior chess in Canada while the CFC would limit itself to Adult Chess? The CFC has recently started a school program. This program is very different from what AEM has offers and has been very well received. Does AEM consider this a threat? If so why? Is it appropriate for the CFC to ignore legitimate needs of chess players in Canada of any age simply in order to leave the market open for the AEM?

In view of section III-9 of the Letters Patent of the CFC which reads as follows:

"TO establish and maintain, in cooperation with its membership, a rating system which shall constitute an official record from time to time, of the relative chess ability throughout Canada."

Should or can the CFC violate its constitution for the sole purpose of avoiding a possible conflict with the AEM?

This is a report where I have provided more questions than answers. I must also say that I have many more unanswered questions on this topic. It is my hope that this will provoke constructive debate among the members of the Assembly and the chess community in Canada at large. I am all in favor of cooperation with the AEM. This has to be mutual and respect both the constitution of the CFC, and the legitimate role of the CFC in Canadian Chess. I have in the past before I was elected to the office of President urged the same from my predecessors.

Francisco Cabañas

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS BY THE PRESIDENT

Regarding the matter of 97-10. I have received an email, dated December 30 1997, from M. Stéphane Beaudoin in which he indicated to me that the FQE would consider this matter by the end of January. If the result is positive then the matter will be placed before the assembly for discussion and vote. With respect to Mr. Thomson comments on 97-10, I respectively remind the member that 97-10 did not allow for discretion by the President regarding the implementation of parts of the motion while ignoring other parts of the motion. His questions are best answered by reading the motion in question. I will also respectfully remind the member that the wording in 97-10 regarding the FQE's commitments was the wording I verified with the other CFC representatives present. I respectfully suggest that the members compare the wording in 97-10 with the wording in Mr. Thomson's comments.

In response to Mr. Knox, the comments of the members are not edited or corrected in any way. Consequently I respectfully request the members pay careful attention to questions of grammar and spelling.

I will address the question of executive confidentiality in my response to 98-4.

There is an outstanding matter that has being brought to my attention. The amount of funding provided by the CFC to the 1995 Canadian Closed was \$1000.00. This is actually stipulated in section 820-4 as standard for the Canadian Closed in non-zonal years.

Regarding the matter of 98-1. I respectfully remind the Assembly that this is a constitutional amendment. Consequently it has the following requirement to pass:

- 1) Quorum of 1/2 the eligible votes
- 2) 2/3 or more yes votes not counting abstentions
- 3) The number of yes votes must exceed the number of no votes and abstentions combined.

4) The list of eligible votes follows: Please note there are the following vacancies NF (1) NT (1)

"Walter"	"Watson"	"AB"
"David"	"Ottosen"	"AB"
"Grant"	"Brown"	"AB"
"John"	"Quiring"	"AB"
"Neil"	"Sharp"	"AB"
"Ford"	"Wong"	"AB"
"Bruce D."	"Thomas"	"AB"
"Francisco"	"Cabanas"	"BC"
"Lyle"	"Craver"	"BC"
"Yves"	"Farges"	"BC"
"Jim"	"Ferguson"	"BC"
"Nathan"	"Divinsky"	"BC"
"Jonathan"	"Berry"	"BC"
"Jason"	"Feng"	"BC"
"Peter"	"Stockhausen"	"BC"
"Jeff"	"Babb"	"MB"
"Cecil"	"Rosner"	"MB"
"Jacques"	"Blanchette"	"NB"
"Jim"	"Guimond"	"NB"
"Jacques"	"Brun"	"NB"
"David"	"Kenney"	"NS"
"Kim"	"Tufts"	"NS"
"Glenn"	"Charlton"	"NS"
"Ari"	"Mendrinis"	"ON"
"Yan"	"Teplitsky"	"ON"
"Denis"	"Allan"	"ON"
"Philip G."	"Haley"	"ON"
"Dan"	"Majstorovic"	"ON"
"Alexander N."	"Knox"	"ON"
"Derrick"	"Bessette"	"ON"
"Brian"	"Smith"	"ON"
"Herb"	"Langer"	"ON"
"Liana"	"MacMillan"	"ON"
"Mon-Fai"	"Lee"	"ON"
"John"	"Armstrong"	"ON"

"Lembit"	"Joselin"	"ON"
"Les"	"Bunning"	"ON"
"Ron"	"Langill"	"ON"
"Terry"	"Fleming"	"ON"
"Robert N."	"Webb"	"ON"
"Robert"	"Moline"	"ON"
"Stephen"	"Ball"	"ON"
"Hans"	"Jung"	"ON"
"Martin"	"Jaeger"	"ON"
"Mark S."	"Dutton"	"ON"
"Vojin"	"Vujosevic"	"ON"
"John W."	"Puusa"	"ON"
"Kevin"	"Spraggett"	"ON"
"Howard"	"Ridout"	"ON"
"Samuel"	"Carr"	"ON"
"Tony"	"Ficzere"	"ON"
"Shivaharan"	"Thurairasah"	"ON"
"Gordon"	"Taylor"	"ON"
"Miles"	"Obradovich"	"ON"
"Roger"	"Langen"	"ON"
"D. Andrew"	"Walls"	"ON"
"Brad"	"Thomson"	"ON"
"Richard"	"Martin"	"ON"
"Maurice"	"Smith"	"ON"
"J.Ken"	"MacDonald"	"ON"
"Deen"	"Hergott"	"ON"
"Doug"	"Burgess"	"ON"
"Michael"	"England"	"PE"
"Diane"	"Mongeau"	"PQ"
"Gilles"	"Groleau"	"PQ"
"Hugh"	"Brodie"	"PQ"
"Francois"	"Leveille"	"PQ"
"Steve"	"Siciliano"	"SK"
"George"	"Huczek"	"SK"
"Bob"	"Bowerman"	"YT"

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 really have nothing to add to my discussion on page 3 of GL#2. However, as mover of this motion I must exhort you all to vote. Naturally I want you to support this motion but, as noted in GL#2, at least half of you must vote for it to pass, and then the "yeas" must outnumber the "nays" by two to one. So please do vote!

Francisco Cabanas: I am in favor of this motion for the reasons that I stated in the AGM. Having said this I do believe that Mr. Ferguson makes a good case for an abstention in that this motion will have very little practical impact. This leads me to my next point. I strongly urge all governors to vote on this matter regardless of whether your vote is yes, no or abstain.

Lyle Craver: I don't see this as a serious difficulty. As long as the President is prepared to rule that there are no constitutional issues involved I'd be prepared to vote yes in an immediate vote.

Yves Farges: As the current Past President of the C.F.C., I feel that a term of one year is enough. The concept of providing a bridge of information and some policy continuation in the executive is a good one, enhancing stability. Amending the Past President tem on the executive to on year is sound. Should the executive wish to "keep" a Past President (or someone else), they can appoint them as special officers as per the constitution.

Gilles Groleau: I agree with Jim Ferguson when he say :”I cannot see this motion affecting the CFC very much either way”. But people working with executive in real life know that small details may become very important. So my vote : YES

Deen Hergott: Makes good sense. There is no need or purpose to continually increasing the size of the CFC Executive. If former Presidents wish to contribute to current Executive policies, they are able and welcome to apply for positions at the AGM. And as continuing Governors, their insightful comments still appear in the GL.

Lembit Joselin: Yes

David Kenney: I agree with this motion. It does not appear to make any sense to have someone who is not the "Immediate Past President" serve on the Executive. I would be in favour of making this amendment to By-Law #2.

Alex Knox: I agree with the motion, (Taylor/Burgess) 98-1 to amend sec: 10 of by-law #2. It more correctly defines grammatically the true purpose of the position for everyone to understand, finally.

Herb Langer: Yes, most appropriate.

Miles Obradovich: I support the motion introduced by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Burgess. It is quite acceptable to understand that in electing a candidate to the position of President that the result will be a 2 year stint on the executive. One year as President and the second as Past President. The current system allows this 2 year term to be extended indefinitely, without the vote of the Governors and without the Past President satisfying any criteria or qualification. The extension is dependant solely on the success or perhaps popularity of the succeeding President. This is not the best way to determine the composition of the executive.

In those years when there will not be an immediate Past President the Governors may appoint a special officer if the incoming executive feels that its manpower is compromised. Although it is probably in my view unnecessary to do this it is a process whereby the Governors will have the appropriate power to decide who is on the Executive. It would still be possible for any past President to be elected to such a position.

Furthermore, past Presidents can always be called upon to furnish information for the purposes of continuity whether or not they are on the executive.

May I also suggest that the membership be reminded of the constitutional requirements to be met in order for this vote to pass.

David Ottosen : I think this motion is a good idea. The purpose of having the past president on the board is to give new board members (including the new president) some idea and explanation of decisions made by the previous board. In the event that a president is re-elected, he can fulfil this role. I was swayed by Jim Ferguson's comments until I remembered that the Past President still gets a vote, so even if he is a "bad" Past President, the new board cannot entirely ignore him.

Maurice Smith: There is only one minor problem that I foresee with this motion. It is when we have a President for two years, it means that the first year we would have seven members on the Executive, and the second year there would be six. This could result in tied votes in the second year.

However if there is a tie it would mean that a motion does not pass, so we could probably live with that.

I believe that the Past President should on the Executive the first year for " continuation " purposes. Consulting with the person who just did the job is often helpful for the new incumbent. However, one year is probably enough. After all there are still phones, faxes and e-mails where you can keep in contact if necessary in the future.

Brad Thomson: I would echo the request of Gordon Taylor when he implores all governors to vote on the issue, regardless of their stand. All governors should vote on every issue, regardless of their stand. Further, I will support the motion. Having a Past President on the executive only makes sense if he/she was the President in the previous year. When an incumbent President wins a second term, or any further number of consecutive terms, then there should be no Past President on the executive.

DISCUSSION OF STRAW VOTE 98-2

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

817. Dress Code

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

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

Grant Brown: I am opposed to 98-2. There are general clauses in the CFC Handbook which give Tournament Directors discretion over things like behaviour and dress; we don't need anything more specific. In fact, expressly prohibiting "running shoes, jeans, shorts, and T-shirts" would certainly eliminate this 20-year CFC member from tournament play....

Francisco Cabanas: First I wish to commend Mr. Thomson on the format of this straw vote topic. This has nothing to do with the substance of the Straw Vote topic, it has to do with the fact that he has taken the time to figure out exactly what wording he wishes to add to the handbook and where he wishes to put it. This is not a requirement for a Straw Vote topic (In fact Straw vote topics are the proper way to present a matter for discussion before the Assembly without working out formal precise wording in advance); however this is the proper way to present a motion designed to set policy before the Assembly.

I will now address the substance of the Straw Vote Topic. The subject of "Dress Codes" is always very tricky. Why? Because it is impossible to legislate style. The easiest dress code to enforce is the most severe; namely formal wear. Anyone who has watched snooker on TV can understand why the snooker federation has chosen the

formal wear approach. The more liberal a dress code the greater the chance of trouble. The wording proposed is a perfect example. Consider two players that show up to the Canadian Closed under the proposed regulations. One of the players is wearing a track suit. The other player shows up wearing a tweed jacket, shirt, tie and jeans. Both players meet the cleanliness standard and there are no further violations. Do I have any volunteers for the appeals committee? Read the proposed regulations carefully. The point here is not to suggest that "track suit" be added to the list of prohibited articles of clothing, but rather to illustrate the fact that it is very easy to break the letter of the law and conform to the spirit of a liberal dress code and conversely to obey the letter of the law and violate the spirit of a liberal dress code.

Is there a solution to this question? Maybe. I will propose the following wording for discussion:

817 Dress Code.

All participants, the Tournament Director, persons assigned to demo-boards and any other individuals visibly associated with the competition during the playing of games shall dress in a proper businesslike manner. A proper businesslike manner shall refer to the typical dress standards for the employees in an office environment of the sponsors or potential sponsors of the Canadian Closed.

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.

One advantage of this approach is to allow for changes in dress standards in society (either more liberal or formal) without having to keep changing the rules. This is not an easy question from a wording point of view and I am quite interested in what other suggestions are proposed. There is one thing on this issue that I cannot support; namely lists of prohibited and allowed articles of clothing enshrined as policy in the handbook for posterity.

Lyle Craver: A dress code for the Canadian Closed would be a good idea. Given that chess is after all a recreational activity I would not favor a 'jacket and tie' code but having played in tournaments where the demo board operators were looking like the Unabomber isn't much fun when the local media are present to catch the whole thing on film.

Deen Hergott: I found the use of the phrase "minimum acceptable standard" very ironic. Particularly as I used the same expression when discussing the current state of the Canadian Closed and Zonal in *En Passant*. We need minimum acceptable standards in all aspects of our national championship, and while I agree that a Dress Code would be a good idea, it has a lower priority, in my opinion, than the more basic issues of tournament site, playing conditions, accommodation, prize fund, etc.

Lembit Joselin: Yes. Public image curling 1960-1997!

David Kenney: This motion will be somewhat controversial. If the primary goal of a chess tournament is to

attract corporate sponsorship, then I believe a "dress code" is a must! Although most chess players dress appropriately, there are always some people who show up in ripped and/or dirty looking clothes which I would agree would not attract any corporate sponsorship.

However, I believe most chess players come out to a tournament for the enjoyment of competitive chess and do not care whether it is sponsored by a major corporation. Most competitors will want to dress comfortably and may not participate in a tournament which requires them to wear a suit or something equivalent. Perhaps, the CFC could make suggestions as to proper attire when organizing and / or competing in a tournament rather than making a "dress code" mandatory.

Alex Knox: As well-intentioned is the reasoning to improve the image of chess in Canada, (or sophisticate it) by a dress code, I suggest no harsh standards be imposed. Rather, moderate dress, cleanliness, and good character be emphasized, all to be the responsibility of the organizers. As a senior, I am well aware of the changes society has experienced. Thus, adjustment is required.

Herb Langer: I agree, but how can this be enforced without loss of participation in tournaments? Will the C.F.C. supply uniforms for sale that will be acceptable.

Gille Grouleau: I agree with Brad that Dress code is important if we want to get sponsorship and media attention. But it is not a high priority. Players' behavior is more important. As example, this summer, Lesiege was playing against Schleifer in Quebec Open (last round). Alex came 45 min late and agree for a draw after only a few moves. Well he got his GMI norm but it was very bad for media.

Many years ago, Quebec City players organized some chess matches on local community TV. As I remember Jonathan Berry was one of the 8 players. In one match, no players were at the board for 45 min. What kind of game is this for people watching it on TV.

Ron Langill: I can sympathize with the idea behind this. It brings forth recollections of seeing a higher rated player in North Bay two years ago in dirty jeans which had more holes than material. Still, it has ramifications I have trouble with even in its straw vote format. 1) I recall as a T.D. having many more things to worry about and cases to rule on without worrying about/ruling on what someone is wearing 2) Does the guy with uncombed hair down to his shoulders (also unshaven) look any better because he isn't wearing running shoes?-appearance is a subjective matter. 3) In local tournaments, I'm more worried about how many people show up than how they look 4) With recent ventures to lure more young people into chess, is this a good way to turn them off? I can picture many local tourneys ignoring such a ruling. I don't agree with it, but if it did go through (since we're worried about sponsorship) maybe it can be tested at a few major national events first or even be limited to national/provincial championships - my gut feeling is it would be opposed even at that level - imagine the outcome of an important event being affected by a clothing ruling!

Miles Obradovich: I oppose this motion on 2 grounds. Firstly, the penalty to be imposed is rather draconian for what is a very meaningful competition (the section referred to is for the Canadian Championship and not tournaments generally). There could be some very good reason why the proposal could not be complied with and by legislating the penalty the Director would not have any discretion to deal with the situation by other means such as a warning.

Secondly, I think it is somewhat askance to ask the players to abide by certain standards but not impose similar conditions concerning the tournament hall, playing conditions, organization of publicity, the welfare of the players during the tournament, etc.

These matters and dress code may all be dealt with in consideration of the approval of bids for the running of this and other tournaments.

David Ottosen: While I am in favor of this idea, I would like to know the exact section where you wish to add this section. Of course, if the organizers do not attempt to attract sponsorship, the players will likely be upset about being "forced" to dress in a professional manner. I am not exactly sure if this is necessary to add to the handbook; in the event that an organizer attracts sponsors, is it not possible to simply add a dress code requirement to the player's invitation?

Peter Stockhausen: Yes - Let's discuss it

Brad Thomson: I would like to thank the President for pointing out that 98-2 applies only to the Canadian Closed Championship. This was my intent.

DISCUSSION OF STRAW VOTE 98-3

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

Grant Brown: I am opposed to 98-3 as worded. The positive side of holding female-only events is that they might attract participation where otherwise none might be forthcoming. The negative side is the cost. If the motion were worded so as to eliminate funding for female-only events, it might be acceptable; but where cost is not an issue, why prohibit the organization of female-only tournaments? Perhaps apportioning funds to female-only events according to the proportion of females in the CFC might be a fair compromise. (I.e. if 10% of CFC members are female, then give female-only championships 10% of the funding of open championships.)

Francisco Cabanas: Unlike Straw Vote topic 98-2 the wording in case needs considerable change before it can be presented as a motion. It is of course fine for a straw vote since it will give an indication on whether or not the Assembly wishes to have a woman's program. I ask the members to treat it as such and not be concerned about the picky details when voting on this straw vote. I will treat voting YES as a No to woman's only chess programs. I must mention that this wording as policy can lead to unintended results. In fact you can remove all references to women as different from men from the handbook and change the

constitution to prevent the passing motions which make any such distinctions in the future, and yet have a fully funded Women's Olympic Team! How? Consider the changing 2230 to read as follows:

2230 Support for other international events:

Where there are no rules for selection to a particular event, the President shall approach the highest rated player or players eligible to participate to determine if that player or those players wish to participate. The CFC will cover the travel expenses of the player or players.

I have done three things. First I have removed the President's discretion. Secondly allowed for team events and finally required the CFC rather than the players to pay the travel expenses. I certainly do not recommend that the Assembly change 2230 to read as above. In fact it will be very irresponsible to do so. Yet the wording as above will require the CFC to fund the Woman's Olympic team and does not conflict with the wording proposed in the Straw Vote Topic. We must consider that there is nothing "sexist" about the above wording and one can argue that the "sexism" is entirely on FIDE's part. All the CFC is doing is supporting Canadian Players in International Events. If the Assembly wishes to deny funding to players travelling women only events or to preclude Canada from sending representatives to such events removing all "sexist" language from the handbook, or blanket statements about "sexism" will not work as long as FIDE holds gender based events, or for that matter as long as organizers in Canada hold gender based events. We have to address these questions directly and not just in blanket statements.

In order to properly address this question we have to deal with the following questions:

1) Do we wish to deny funding or do we wish to deny participation as well as funding with respect to international events?

2) Do we wish to deny funding or do we wish to deny participation as well as funding with respect to national events?

3) Are we prepared to provide a structure for qualification to international events? A question as simple as identifying the highest rated woman for qualification to the world event. Providing rules for a Canadian woman's championship but no funding etc.

4) Are we going to provide any (even minimal assistance) to groups wishing to Canada's participation in FIDE gender based events? For example provide tax receipts to a Woman's chess fund, used for example to fund participation in Woman only FIDE events.

5) Are we prepared to rate gender based events? For example the BC under 12 girls championship etc.

6) Are we prepared to apply to FIDE for gender based titles? Or titles earned in "sexist" events? For example an IA norm earned by a Canadian Arbiter in a woman's only event outside of Canada.

7) What about a bid from Canada for a FIDE event that is "sexist"?

I will now express my observations on the whole woman's chess issue. My first comment is that this is a

subject where many if not most members of the Assembly have very strong feelings on both sides of the debate. For this reason there have been many attempts at compromise in an attempt to preserve harmony and avoid conflict. The unfortunate result of this is that woman's chess in Canada has been left in limbo and uncertainty resulting in a very ineffective yet expensive program. There is a very important principle here that the members of the Assembly must keep in mind. A woman cannot be half pregnant. Personally I do not have strong feelings whether or not we should send for example a Woman's Team to the Olympics, or hold a Canadian Woman's Championship. On the other hand I am very opposed to the CFC being involved with programs in a half hearted manner; consequently I am very displeased with the current situation regarding woman's chess. My hope is that this debate will lead to a clear resolution of these questions one way or the other. We must make a choice we make it a policy to send a Woman's Olympic Team every year or not. Both are perfectly reasonable options. Similarly for the Canadian Woman's Championship, etc. If we choose to have a woman's program we must fund it and support it properly. In particular I ask those members of the Assembly on the losing side to stand behind the result for the good of the CFC. We can have an ambitious woman's program, a modest one or none at all. The important thing is to stand 100% behind whatever parts (if any) of the woman's program we choose to keep.

Lyle Craver: Eliminating all mention of women in the Handbook would be a bad idea - quite apart from anything else it would eliminate all Canadian involvement in FIDE sponsored women's events. If an organizer wishes to organize women-only events he/she should be free to do so. This is no more discriminatory than the organization of junior or senior events.

On the whole 98-3 seems to be a solution in search of a problem - it's not even the usual Ontario attempt to impose a national solution on a local Toronto problem!

Deen Hergott: Our current policy is to follow the conventions of FIDE. Has anyone considered addressing FIDE directly on what many feel is an obvious case of sexual discrimination? Or other federations? At the very least, perhaps their responses would shed some light on new perspectives concerning this issue.

Lembit Joselin: Abstain

David Kenney: I agree that all distinctions between the sexes should be removed from the CFC Handbook. I can not think of any reason why there should be a distinction made between men and woman playing chess.

Alex Knox: To my knowledge, there is no difference between males and females, except sexual make-up, which is not of our doing. Therefore, eliminate the discriminatory practice. Right reason dictates chess as a mind challenge form does not recognize biology.

Herb Langer: Abstain - I agree that women should be treated equal. Would this create difficulties with FIDE? If so, I would recant and tolerate it until a solution is found -

either acceptance of women's equality in FIDE, or a new world organization that accepts it.

Ron Langill: I see no sense in this if it has the ramifications in it that Mr. Cabanas implies. I would not want to stop a women from competing in international women's events, just as I would not want to stop a junior from competing in junior events.

Miles Obradovich: This motion is too vague and should be withdrawn as it is capable of conflicting interpretation. Does the mover intend that the women's championship and Olympic team be eliminated or does he intend that they be funded in an identical amount and manner. To recognize the differences between men and women is only to state the obvious. To treat people inequitably because of their differences (whether sexual, racial, or otherwise) is discriminatory. In almost every sporting competition imaginable men and women compete separately. This is hardly considered discriminatory. The real problem in Canada is the wide disparity in participation rates as between men and women in chess. A Canadian women's chess federation would not be able to support these activities out of its own resources if constituted by the present women's membership. The question is whether they should be left to their own devices. The present wording in the constitution as it relates to the funding of the Olympic team is really not all that objectionable in the circumstances.

David Ottosen: Again, I am in favor. I once was supportive of Women's events, but the results were (and are) disheartening. No new women players are being attracted by the chance of winning a women's event, and the few that are held do not attract many people. By encouraging women to reach this (easier) goal, women set lower expectations of themselves (witness Manon Leger's interview in EP a few years back; "I couldn't possibly compete with the big guys"), and as with anyone who sets low expectations, they never fail to live down to them.

Peter Stockhausen: Yes - Let's discuss it

Brad Thomson: Mr. Cabañas comments with respect to 98-3 are appropriate and correct. There is no point in expending a great deal of time and effort in working out a motion to abolish sexism unless a consensus is reached to the effect that we should. And there are indeed, as the President has correctly pointed out, many ramifications that I had not considered, but that would have to be dealt with. If the general opinion of the assembly is in favour of abolishing sexism, then I shall seek a seconder for an appropriate motion.

OTHER COMMENTS

Grant Brown: I agree with Brad Thomson that all CFC dealings must be open. Accountability to the membership is a more important reason than legal requirements for this; but either reason is decisive.

I disagree with the idea of allowing the four Olympic Team members who are selected by rating to pick the other two members. There should be objective criteria in

place for all selections; at the very least, the selection criteria should be announced by whoever does the selecting.

I strongly urge the organizers of future Canadian Opens to hold a sectional tournament, even a sectional tournament with only 2 or 3 sections as opposed to the present format. It just makes no sense to be playing people 350 or more points out of one's own rating range, either higher or lower, half the time or more. Those A-class players who want the cheap thrill of playing a GM should take up sky-diving or race-car driving instead of chess.

I am much in favour of Jonathan Berry's idea of establishing a Chess Futures Committee. One specific suggestion I have is to find ways of rewarding organizers better than we presently do. Chess thrives when competent organizers can be found; it disappears when nobody takes the initiative to make chess attractive to old and prospective members alike.

Although most of Mr. Berry's response to my initial comments was flattering, I object to one comment: "Much of Grant's fiscal criticism is not much different from bashing the school system for losing money..." That was not the point at all. Rather, the point was that the average member pays over \$42 per year to the CFC just to cover overhead expenses. This is not a great deal. The cost relative to benefits received could very well be inhibiting potential players from joining the CFC, especially now that the FQE and Chess 'n' Math provide potentially more cost-effective alternatives. Cost is something we need to look at, I think.

Francisco Cabanas: There are various comments from Mr. Thomson that need to be addressed. First the suggestion of waiting until the FIDE world championship is over before planning the Canadian Closed and Zonal for the next cycle is a prescription for disaster. Why? Because with a two year cycle you allow for barely six months to plan the event in order to hold it in the Summer, to avoid winter travel, and before the FIDE deadline for the next cycle. One year lead time is the minimum with two years or more optimal.

The question of the attendance of governors at the CFC AGM is an important question, and apathy in the Assembly is a problem, but to ask for a resignation from governors that participate in the Canadian Open on the sole grounds that they were not present at the AGM is entirely inappropriate. First no consideration was given to the participation of these governors in the letters during the year. I know for a fact that one of the governors that Mr. Thomson refers to in his comments was actually very active in the discussions during the year. Holding the AGM during the first days of the Canadian Open is very stressful to any governor that also participates in the tournament; particularly when combined with two rounds on the Sunday and the jet lag of travelling to the event. Jet lag is a far greater problem when travelling east and is particularly a problem for players from the Pacific Time Zone (British Columbia and Yukon) playing in National Canadian Events. Jet lag when travelling east before a chess tournament in Canada is something a player who lives in Ontario seldom gets to experience. We must also keep in mind that the current format for the AGM keeps the governors from attending many of the side events at the Canadian Open. I have a personal experience in this regard at the 1994 Canadian Open, where I could not attend the lecture of a

Grandmaster who was analyzing my own game! Moving the AGM to the two days before the Canadian Open (the format used in Vancouver in 1982) was actually preferred by a majority of the governors that were present at the AGM. I respectfully suggest that before asking for the resignations of any governor or governors we actually take the time to look at all the issues involved. This is not as simple as it seems at first sight.

Lyle Craver: Given the demise of motion 97-10 due to non-action by the FQE it would seem any similar motion in response to action by the FQE would be a completely new motion of the Governors to be voted on the usual way. In general my read of the BC Governors is that such an action would be welcome though its passage would not be automatic by any means.

I agree with Mr. Thomson that more governors need to take part in discussions. I would point out that distribution of this particular Governors' Letter was badly flawed. I do not know whether this was due to the postal strike or some other reason, but I only got my copy by e-mail the day before the deadline. Hopefully this is a one-time only occurrence.

I also agree with Brad that holding the AGM before the Open is a terrible idea. As someone who has never been able to attend an AGM in the six years I have been a Governor and is looking forward to doing so in 1999 (when the Canadian Open is scheduled for Vancouver) I think such a move would be calculated to reduce rather than increase attendance at the meeting. I fail to see how this could be considered a good thing.

Alex Knox: The governors' letter makeup is poor compared to how it used to be. I resent having to decipher it, (spelling and grammar). Who actually is responsible for this?

Peter Stockhausen: 1, Brad comments re: governors attending Canadian Open but not annual meeting. One can understand Brad's dislike for the above happening. However, after playing in the 1997 Canadian Open, attending three days of Governors Meetings and one and a half days of Executive committee meetings I have lot of sympathy for those governors. Come to think of it, I might try this myself.

2, Brad comments on financial support by the CFC to the 1999 Canadian Open. It is very easy to make sweeping comments such as: "...I oppose the payment of any money at all to the organizers including concession fees for the CFC store on site..." "The CFC cannot afford such luxury." "The Canadian Open is our "showcase" event." "...ought it not to make the CFC money, rather than bankrupt it?" "It would be better to have no event than to lose money on it." It is quite something else to marshal coherent arguments to support the above statements and to outline alternative proposals on how the CFC can better invest it's funds to promote chess at large. If so, where should the money be spent?? For example, who should pay for the space rental for a CFC store at a Canadian Open?? If, as Brad proposes, the CFC should invest absolutely nothing in the Canadian Opens, why should it reap any potential benefits?? If the Canadian Open is a "showcase" event, what constitutes "showcase"? Is it the name of the event only or are there qualitative and

quantitative benchmarks to be met before the term "showcase" applies? Maybe Brad can share with us his business plan including a detailed rationale and budget on how a "showcase" Canadian Open can make money for the CFC. I would be particularly interested in hearing his proposed approaches to potential corporate advertisers, government agencies, etc. Brad, in your mind if we had a Canadian Open in which players from all or most Canadian provinces compete, in which f class players are as represented as GMs, an event which attracts newcomers to the CFC, an event which gives chess another boost in the community in which it is held, an event in which many chess players of other countries participate and have only praise for that chess event, an event in which the CFC store sells+-\$10,000 worth of material mainly to local participants and prize winners, if that event were to cost the CFC say \$2,000 after all debits and credits are accounted for, would this be a poor investment in your opinion? If so, how could the CFC better invest the \$2,000 given it's constitutional mandate??

3, Single Section Canadian Open, Jonathan Berry's comments The 1997 Canadian Open did not produce a norm. Mr. Berry's explanation of this fact, in my opinion, is incomplete, misleading and dishonest. So lets complete the list of reasons : -there where only 3IMs competing. Far too few. One should have about the same # of GMs and IM's. - there where only 5 or 6 FM's. Again, way too few. - a number of the strong players took a bye in the first few rounds or lost/drew a game in the first few rounds. -I am not sure we "maximized" our pairing opportunities in the early rounds. In particular Mr. Sashikiran in round 3, Mr. Nickoloff in round 4 and Mr. Hergott in round 3. Maybe somebody (Phil are you there??) can do a forensic on this. Because if we missed some legal pairing opportunities there, we can learn from them and hopefully prevent them from occurring in future events. -too few FIDE rated experts and masters participated. I do not know what the ratio of "norms made" vs. "norm opportunities" is. Maybe 5:95, maybe even less. If so, making "a norm" is a statistical anomaly or "fluke", anywhere, anytime. So North Bay had 1 norm and 1 almost norm in two attempts. Winnipeg had 0 norm and 1 almost norm (Ben Finegold '94) in two attempts. What is your point?? It is probably more likely to make a norm in a closed or restricted event than in an open event.

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

Regarding your next question, let me assure you Jonathan that this Organizing Committee will leave no rook unturned to devise the most illogical, illegal, unusual and counterproductive pairing system ever devised. We will go out of our way to make sure that whatever happened in 1976 in whatever tournament will be exceeded by far. We have a whole historical committee working on it full-time. Under no circumstances will any committee, august or not, be advised in advance of our efforts. In order to make this perfectly fair to everybody, everybody will be equally surprised. I trust this will reassure you:)

Why, in your mind, are norms a "motherhood" issue? What actually is a "motherhood" issue? The CFC is here to promote chess. 98% of its current and future members will never come close to a "Norm". The CFC should use 98% of it's resources, fiscal and human, to the segment rated below 2200.

You obviously have not read the budgets and actual expenditure listings of the 1994, 1997 and 1999 Canadian Opens. If you do, you will discover that whatever the CFC contributed (s) to these events is insufficient to even attract 3GMs, let alone 10 or 11.

The CFC's contribution tends to go to securing a good site, pay for the store rental, defray advertising and rating costs. These contributions benefit all players.

I would love to see a detailed business plan by Jonathan Berry on how to run annual Canadian Opens that produce a profit for the CFC. Again, I am left wondering why anybody would think that the CFC is entitled to benefit from an event that in their mind, the CFC should not support?

Brad Thomson: With respect to the President's Message(s) in the previous GL, I would like to make the following observations:

It comes as no surprise that the FQE has done nothing with respect to 97-10, and that the deadline has expired. This, sadly, is quite typical of the manner in which the FQE has treated the CFC over the years. I do not feel it to be appropriate for another vote on the issue to take place. We did our part in good faith, and once again the FQE has lied to us. They are a rival, hostile, separatist organization and we ought to treat them as such. Their pattern of behaviour has not changed. I would also question the judgment of the President when he informed the FQE that the CFC would be prepared to vote on the motion again. The motion is dead and gone. It should have to be reintroduced and go through the normal period of discussion. Since when are motions, regardless of whether they are similar or identical to a previously voted upon motion, voted upon without due process? Given the fact that the FQE has once again bargained in bad faith, and the fact that the President chooses to continue with his illegitimate attempt at the implementation of 97-10 nonetheless, I feel obliged to reveal a heretofore unpublicized fact concerning the matter.

Shortly after the meeting in which the initial agreement was worked out, I received a call from Mr. Bérubé. He stated that the agreement, as described in the minutes of the meeting that I kept, was in error. During discussions, the FQE agreed to do their utmost to encourage all Quebec organizers to have all of their events rated CFC. This was documented by Tom O'Donnell at the meeting, and was read by the FQE representatives before the meeting was adjourned. When Mr. Bérubé called he stated emphatically that this had not been part of the agreement. In short, he lied. I immediately called President Cabañas and informed him of the conversation that I had had. I asked him if I should indicate in the GL that the FQE had performed this about-face. I was instructed to ask the other CFC representatives who were at the meeting if they had the same recollection as I, which recollection was shared by the President. Maurice Smith, Tom O'Donnell and Troy Vail all had the same recollection. I was also instructed by the

President not to inform the assembly of this fact unless it was gotten in writing. Subsequent to this, I spoke again with Mr. Bérubé and asked that their version be provided in writing. As it was not forthcoming, I respected the wishes of the President, and did not reveal this act of bad faith on the part of the FQE to the assembly. In light of all of this, I would like to ask the President if he still intends to go ahead with an attempt at implementing 97-10, and if the answer is to this question is yes, then I would like to ask him why.

I commend the President for attending the FIDE meeting in Kishinev. Phil Haley has done a tremendous amount to make Canada a well-respected voice in international chess, and the presence of our President at the meeting is very encouraging.

With respect to the matter of the 1996 Closed and Zonal, I accept the President's contention that I should have addressed the question to Mr. Farges, who was President at the time. Therefore, I ask Mr. Farges, who voted on the issue, and what were their votes? I applaud the President for indicating that he will address the issue after Mr. Farges had a chance to comment. I trust that this means Mr. Cabañas will comment regardless of whether or not Mr. Farges avails himself of the opportunity. I must say however, that the point of my initial concern has been lost in the shuffle. It was neither my intention to beat a dead horse, nor to criticize any specific individual. It was rather to object to the current President's previous statement that some matters must remain confidential. Openness and accountability are necessary in our executive, and I have brought forth the example of the 1996 Closed only to demonstrate what can happen (specifically the expenditure of \$6500 to line people up to represent Canada internationally) when an open and fully accountable executive is not present, or even required. If I may speculate, I suspect that at the time Mr. Farges obtained a positive vote from Mr. Cabañas and from Mr. Quiring. Along with his own vote he had totaled three out of the possible five (notwithstanding the existence of the past-president), meaning that the issue would carry even if the other two (three?) members of the executive cast negative votes. For this reason, I suspect, Mr. Farges did not bother to consult the other two (three?) members of the executive. This would also explain why then-governor Mr. O'Donnell's request for the vote to be made known in the GL was not forthcoming. The 1996 Closed, then, would have gone ahead regardless (?), but the manner in which the dealings took place is quite underhanded. If it were mandatory that all executive votes be recorded in the GL, then such a debacle could not take place. I request their opinions on this from all current executive members, and I ask them further if they intend to be publicly accountable for their decisions?

Can we get an update on the status of the 1998 Canadian Open please?

There was no Business Office Report in the last GL. I am of the opinion that there should be one in each GL.

I would like to thank and commend Jonathan Berry for his comments with respect to norm possibilities at the Canadian Open. As usual his logic, though generally expressed somewhat tersely, is quite impeccable. To denude the Open of the opportunity for all of us to get a game with a grandmaster so as to allow for such very scant norm possibilities, is not in my view, a good idea. To be sure one

of the drawbacks is, as Mr. Berry so eloquently puts it, the "yo-yo" effect, but so be it. Given Mr. Berry's immense expertise on these matters, I would like to ask him the following question. Is there any way to overcome the yo-yo effect, and yet still maintain the one-section philosophy that allows all of us a chance to get a game with a grandmaster?

With respect to the entire notion of a "Certificate Program," it stinks! The argument that the chess-playing abilities of the players should be recognized does not carry any weight when the simple fact of the matter is that the vast majority of the players don't care about it in the first place. Apart from this, the monetary costs, man-hours and administrative nightmares that such a program would cause are far beyond any minimal benefits that would result. If a player really wants a certificate, then there is already a mechanism in place for him or her to obtain one. This is sufficient. To automatically provide one to everyone is an utterly absurd idea, and belongs in the bottom of the garbage pail, where most of the certificates would end up anyway, if such a program were to be fully introduced. Let's reject this idea once and for all and get on with more important chess matters.

NEW STRAW VOTE TOPIC:

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

Discussion:

In GL#2 Brad Thomson wrote: "All Executive votes ought to appear in the Governors' Letter. Accountability must be maintained. And the laws that govern the land must be adhered to."

I'm not sure what was meant by the last sentence but I am in full agreement on the first two.

Last year I went to some effort to obtain a response from the Executive to a number of questions that had been "taken under consideration" at the 1996 Annual Meeting. After four GLs and no mention of these, I made my request explicit in GL#5 (March 1997) and finally got a response with GL#6 (May 1997). What then surprised me was that our Secretary, John Quiring, also gave us a complete(?) list of all the matters that had been considered by the Executive. This was most welcome, though unexpected. It showed that quite a number of decisions had been made by the Executive that the Board of Governors had not been informed of (until then). For me that was quite troubling. The Executive should not be conducting their business in secret and the Governors have a right to learn of all matters passed (if not considered) by the Executive in a timely manner. What do you think?

