

The World Science Fiction Society

Minutes of the Business Meeting 1993

[This version reformatted and some typos corrected by Tim Illingworth, June 1998.]

MINUTES - CONFRANCISCO BUSINESS MEETING

Preliminary Session - September 3, 1993

Kevin Standlee began with the traditional ceremony of Bell, Book, and /C/a/n/d/l/e/ Gavel and an explanation of his ribbon, "The Ribbon Bruce Pelz Doesn't Have."

I. Opening Remarks by Chair

John Lorentz called the meeting to order at 12:14. Rick Katze, official timekeeper, was replaced by Jeff Canfield for this meeting. The room was divided into non-smoking (most of the room) and smoking (that chair back there); however, smoking is not allowed at all due to the laws of the State of California. In honor of the theme of the convention, "Building Bridges," we will not necessarily hew strictly to Robert's Rules. This, the Preliminary Business Meeting, is intended to set the agenda and times for tomorrow's actual Business Meeting.

II. Business Passed On by MagiCon

If passed at this convention, they become part of the Constitution. Richard Russell: is it too late to get new motions in? The Chairman: No, the chair may allow additional new business; but you must produce 200 copies and they will be last on the agenda.

A. Short Title: "Open The Site, Hal" (Default time: 6 minutes)

MOVED, to add the following proviso to Section 3.7 of the WSFS Constitution:

"PROVIDED THAT for purposes of site selection for the 2001 Worldcon, the Eastern region shall be defined to include the entire world. Whatever site is chosen, there shall be no NASFiC in 2001."

Comment: The makers of this motion believe that any location should be allowed to bid for the 2001 Worldcon, since "2001 is one of the most recognizable years in the science fiction genre." The effect of this motion on site selection would be as follows (with a non-North American bid allowed in any year):

Year Current Rule If Item 1 Passes

1998 Eastern Eastern

1999 Western	Western
2000 Central	Central
2001 Eastern	anywhere in world (except within 60 miles of 1998 site)
2002 Western	Western
2003 Central	Central
2004 Eastern	Eastern (etc.)

- B. Point of information: this is similar to a later motion. Are they discussed together?
The Chairman: No, it's a completely separate motion.
- C. Suggested times were 10, 6, and 3 minutes. 10 minutes failed 29-30. 6 minutes passed many-few.
- D. Short Title: "Northwest Territories Division Amendment" (6 minutes)
MOVED, to amend Section 3.6 of the WSFS Constitution by replacing all appearances of "states and provinces" by "states, provinces, and territories".
Comment: The original intent of this motion was to provide for the planned separation of Nunavut from the Northwest Territories of Canada, with Nunavut to be included in the Central region. The current text would have the same effect (assuming that the remainder of the Northwest Territories retains that name), and would also allow for future changes in territorial boundaries.

Suggested times were 1 and 2 minutes. Times of 30 and 10 seconds were also suggested, but intervals of less than 30 seconds were rejected by the chair.

Inquiry: Could this not be delegated to the Secretary as a housekeeping chore? No.

Almost everyone was opposed to 6 minutes. Most opposed 2 minutes. 1 minute passed by a reasonable majority.

Point of information: This is the amount of time we will spend on the motion tomorrow? Yes, and it can be extended if need be.

- E. Short Title: "Clarifying Best Fan Writer Definition" (6 minutes)
MOVED, to add to Paragraph 2.2.12 of the WSFS Constitution (Best Fan Writer) the words "during the previous calendar year".
Comment: This would make the definition of Best Fan Writer consistent with the other Hugo categories. (The words in question were in fact first included in the Constitution in 1974, but inadvertently omitted during a later redrafting.)

Suggested times were 6, 3 and 1 minutes. 6 minutes was unanimously opposed. 3 minutes was largely opposed. 1 minute passed unanimously.

F. Short Title: "Reduce NASFiC Lead Time" (20 minutes)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

(1) Amend Paragraph 3.8.1 to read:

Voting shall be by written ballot administered by the following year's Worldcon, if there is no NASFiC in that year, or by the following year's NASFiC, if there is one, with ballots cast at the administering convention or by mail, and with only members of the administering convention allowed to vote.

(2) Amend the last sentence of Section 3.5 to read:

For both Worldcon and NASFiC bids, the aforementioned rules and agreements, along with an announcement of intent to bid, must be filed with the Committee that will administer the voting no later than 180 days prior to the official opening of the administering convention.

Comment: When an overseas Worldcon site is selected, the site of the resulting NASFiC is now chosen in the same year (either at the Worldcon that chose the overseas site or at a following NASFiC). This motion would postpone the NASFiC selection for a year, allowing time for orderly filing and for mail balloting. If ratified, it would first affect the selection of a possible 1997 NASFiC. For an example of its effect: Suppose that in 1994 an overseas site is selected for the 1997 Worldcon; selection of the 1997 NASFiC site would then take place in 1995, with voting (including mail balloting) administered by the 1995 NASFiC; if there were no 1995 NASFiC, the voting would be administered by the 1995 Worldcon.

Suggested times were 20, 15, 10, 5, 3, and 1 minute. 20 minutes was massively opposed. 15 minutes was largely opposed. 10 minutes was largely favored; passed.

G. Report of the WSFS Mark Protection Committee and Nominations for the Committee

See the World Science Fiction Society Constitution, Sections 4.4 and 4.5.

Officers: Donald Eastlake (Chairman), Scott Dennis (Treasurer), George Flynn (Secretary)

Membership: (elected until Conadian) Scott Dennis, Donald Eastlake and Ben Yalow; (elected until Intersection) Tim Illingworth, John Lorentz and Bruce Pelz; (Worldcon Appointees) Tom Veal (Magicon), Kevin Standlee (ConFrancisco), Linda Ross-Mansfield (Conadian) and Paul Dormer (Intersection); (NASFiC Appointees) Don Cook (Dragon*Con). Three members to be elected (no more than 1 from the Eastern Zone, no more than 2 from the Central Zone, no more than 1 from the Western Zone); one to be appointed by the 1996 Worldcon.

Postal address: [Address Removed]

If you would like to report an apparent infringement on WSFS marks, please write to the committee.

Donald Eastlake said that there were some problems with reproduction and wanted to present the report tomorrow. This was allowed.

It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules and take care of all the time setting at once and the reports later. The Parliamentarian objected. Ben Yalow pointed out that the reports might include motions. Robert Sacks also spoke against the motion. Motion failed, many to 2.

The Chairman briefly explained the purpose and composition of the Mark Protection Committee. Johnny Carruthers: What regions do the expiring members represent? Donald Eastlake: Australia, Central, and East. The Parliamentarian suggested that we suspend the rules and allow nominees to accept their nominations (in writing) by 6:00 PM today instead of by the end of the meeting. The suspension of the rules passed by unanimous consent. Give nominations to the office to give to the Chairman.

Nominations at meeting:

Sue Francis. (Central)

Steven Boucher. (Off continent)

Robert Sacks. (Eastern)

Kent Bloom. (declined after meeting)

Mark Olson (declined).

Ruth Sachter (declined).

Gary Feldbaum. (Eastern)

Gary Louie. (Western) (Not yet accepted.)

Nominations closed. Nomination acceptances must be received by 6:00 tonight.

H. Report of the Special Committee to Codify Business Meeting Resolutions

The 1986 WSFS Business Meeting voted to create a special committee to research and codify all resolutions of the WSFS Business Meeting that are still in force. This committee has submitted reports to each Business Meeting since and was in each case continued to report to the next Business Meeting.

Chairman: Donald E. Eastlake, III.

Postal address: [Address removed]

Donald Eastlake described the purpose and function of the committee and handed out copies of its report. The report includes four motions:

Short Title: "Mark Protection Committee Ballot Relaxation"

MOVED, to amend the Standing Rules by inserting "or such later deadline as the Secretary may specify" after "Preliminary Business Meeting" in section 3.1.

Comment: The rules contemplate a written ballot that lists the nominees for the Mark Protection Committee, although write-ins are explicitly allowed. To give time for making up such ballots, nominees are currently required to submit their consent and residence before the end of the last Preliminary Business Meeting. However, this requirement has frequently been waived or stretched. This amendment gives more flexibility if the Secretary believes they can still get the ballot done with a later deadline for submissions. (We always have to do this anyway)

Short Title: "Renumbering Clarification".

MOVED, to amend the Standing Rules by striking out the first four sentences of Rule 16 and inserting the following in their place:

"Citations to Articles, Sections, or other parts of the Constitution or Standing Rules, in amendments thereto, are for the sake of easy reference only. Changes in the enumeration of Articles, Sections, Rules, and parts thereof and correct insertions, deletions, renumbering, and changes to internal cross references, when required by adopted amendments, will be provided by the Secretary of the Business Meeting in the Constitution, Standing Rules, and Business Passed On certified to the next Worldcon. Therefore, motions from the floor to renumber or correct citations, because of an adopted amendment, shall not be in order."

Comment: Standing Rule 16 was originally adopted in the context of saving the Business Meeting's time when the Constitution and Standing Rules are amended. The idea is to avoid diddling around correcting internal cross references between text being added and other parts of the rules or with motions to just provide renumbering when a new section is inserted in an Article of the Constitution or the like. It was not intended to provide any authority for the Secretary to re-organize the Constitution, re-title sections thereof, or make similar changes except as clearly mandated by adopted amendments or when the Secretary has further authority from the Business Meeting. It would, in any case, be improper to include such authority with respect to the Constitution in the Standing Rules, which are a lesser document. This change clarifies the original intent of giving the Secretary authority only in connection with effecting actual adopted amendments.

There was some question as to what the difference is. The difference is to clarify that the rule applies only to adopted amendments. Question: Does this remove the Secretary's authority to correct typographical and grammatical errors? Chairman's ruling: No, the motion does not change the Secretary's ability to fix bugs.

Richard Russell opposed the motion to pass by unanimous consent, so it didn't pass by unanimous consent. Time limits: 1, 2, 5, 7, 20 minutes. 20 failed unanimously. 7 failed unanimously. 5 failed by a large margin. 2 passed by a small majority.

Richard Russell then spoke in favor of the motion: At Chicon he pushed this rule for all it was worth in order to clean up the Constitution; however, many of his corrections were rejected. He believes that the Secretary's powers should include this editorial power. There was no opposition. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

Short Title: "Table Terminology".

MOVED, to amend Standing Rule 2 by changing "table" to "to lay on the table".

Comment: "To lay on the table" is the proper form of this amendment, and Robert's cautions against using "to table" because that way of putting it is sometimes (erroneously) used as a synonym for Postpone Indefinitely. Also, "tabling" an item in the UK means to bring it before the assembly, which is the opposite of what it means in the US. The full form should be clearer.

Passed by unanimous consent.

Short Title: "Rules Compilation Committee Continuation".

RESOLVED, that the committee to compile WSFS Resolutions and Rulings of Continuing Effect is continued and directed to report to the 1994 Business Meeting.

Passed by unanimous consent.

I. Report of the Worldcon Runner's Guide Editorial Committee

Robert Sacks, Committee Chair; Ross Pavlac, Executive Officer

Our Executive Officer and Editor, Ross Pavlac, has produced a new edition with 30 additional pages at a personal cost of \$100. Copies are available from him at cost, [Address Removed]

Robert Sacks presented copies of the current edition of the Worldcon Runners' Guide with a thud on the table in front of the Chairman, and copies of the committee report were handed out. The report included a motion to change the Standing Rules, the text of which appeared in the Report of the Committee on the Future of the NASFiC:

Short Title: "Standing Rule on Committee Powers and Procedures".

Standing Committees of WSFS and temporary committees to report to the next Business Meeting are authorized to meet by mail, select officers, adopt rules, and limit debate in order to report on matters referred to them.

Time limit: 6, 10, 1, 3 minutes. 10 minutes failed many to few. 6 minutes failed. 3 minutes passed many to few.

Ben Yalow moved to amend the motion by substitution as follows: "The Chair of the WSFS Editorial Committee for the Worldcon Runner's Guide is authorized to use whatever procedures are necessary in order to produce a final report." Most WSFS committees feel that they already have sufficient authority to conduct their own business. However, since this one committee is deadlocked, it should be granted special authority to take action. Robert Sacks: Robert's Rules do not provide for committees that meet by mail. If you grant one committee procedural authority, you must do the same for every committee, or a single point of order could block any committee. Ross Pavlac: Deadlock has not been a problem on this committee; getting contributions has been the problem. Russ Laden spoke against the amendment and Leslie Turek in favor. Richard Russell (against): the amendment gives the chair the power to do whatever is necessary; the committee as a whole should have this authority. It also narrows down to a single committee the solution to a problem which is becoming generic.

Mark Olson: this issue is more complicated than it seems; it should be referred to a committee to report back tomorrow (riotous laughter). Moved and seconded: that this issue and the corresponding issue in the NASFiC report and all related issues be referred to a small committee to be selected by the Chair, to report to tomorrow as a single item. Rick Kolvalcik: No, let's take care of it now. Robert Sacks: We had hoped to reorganize at this meeting but if this passes we won't be able to. Motion passed by a small margin. (The Chairman appointed Gary Feldbaum (chair), Gay Ellen Dennett, and Chris O'Shea as this committee after the meeting.)

The next item of business in the Editorial Committee's report was a motion to continue the committee to Conadian. It was moved and seconded to postpone discussion until tomorrow, which failed by a small margin.

Bruce Pelz moved to amend: file the report, thank the committee, and disband it. The amendment passed by a substantial margin.

Discussion on the amended motion: what is the effect of defeating the amended motion? Defeating and passing the amended motion seems to have the same effect: the report is filed. Does that make the amendment out of order? The Chair ruled that the amendment is, nonetheless, in order. Inquiry: Does this affect the motion to censure Mr. Sacks? No, it's unrelated.

The motion on the floor is now to thank and disband the committee. If it fails the committee will be disbanded without being thanked. Robert Sacks: It's all well and good to pick on those who try to do work. The rules should be suspended to allow the original motion to be voted upon. The motion to suspend the rules was seconded, but failed many to 3. The motion to thank and disband the committee then passed unanimously.

J. Worldcon Reports

1. Financial Report by ChiCon V

ChiCon V has dissolved as a corporate entity and has zero balance in all accounts and no outstanding debts.

2. Financial Report by Magicon

A report was distributed, as follows:

FANAC/MagiCon Financial Statement for 3/31/92 thru 8/27/93

EXPENDITURES		TOTAL ASSETS and LIABILITIES	
Administration	16,305.38	Bank Accounts	113,609.25
Office and Storage rent	4,200.85	Other Assets(AR)	970.04
Insurance	6,798.75		
Registration	5,733.72	INCOME	
Promotion	675.83		
Post-Con Reimbursements	51,799.79	Registration	176,511.44
Donations	10,643.40	Sales Items	29,938.99
Events Division	41,847.78	Interest	6,996.70
Exhibits Division	53,351.81	Advertising Sales	18,478.68
Facilities Division	34,376.65	Space rental fees	35,027.91
Program Division	43,000.30	Donations and Comps	26,736.79

Sales items	16,737.52	Other Income	4,126.51
Publications	31,579.02		
Security Guards	16,320.00	Total Income	297,817.02
Shuttle Busses	4,144.00		
Convention Services	32,756.26	RECONCILIATION	
Other Misc. Expenditures	4,489.07		
Bank Bal 3/31/92	142,629.75		
Total Expenditures	374,760.13	Total Income	+297,817.02
Total Expenditures	-374,760.13		
Bank Bal 8/27/93	113,609.25		

3. (Note: There are still Budgeted Expenditures of \$83,393.79)
4. Financial Report by ConFrancisco
There will be a report some time before the end of the final business meeting.
5. Financial Report by Conadian (may be combined with #6)
A written report will be handed in tomorrow.
6. Financial Report by Intersection (may be combined with #7)
It will be presented later.

K. Report by the Special Committee on the NASFiC
Ben Yalow, Committee Chair

Copies of the report were handed out. A motion was made to remove all references to NASFiC; it was amended to postpone the removal until a new organization was set up; the amended motion was referred to this committee, which deadlocked. The committee produced three motions on the NASFiC, and one motion on powers of committees which was discussed earlier. The three substantive motions all tied 4-4, so there is no committee report, but there are minority reports from various members of the committee. The committee suggests that the Business Meeting discuss "Status Quo", immediately amended by "Separation of the NASFiC", immediately amended by "Licensing the NASFiC".

Bruce Pelz: Move to file the minority reports of the committee, thank the committee, and express the regrets of last year's chair who appointed the committee. Seconded. The Chair ruled that this action causes no action to be taken on the motions in the report. Saul Jaffee: If we disband the committee, what happens to the motion and

amendment from last year? The Chairman ruled that the motion and amendment would evaporate.*

Time limits: 6, 1 minutes. 6 minutes failed; 1 minute passed. Robert Sacks: Four members of the committee felt that a motion of separation would (time ran out). Motion passed many to few. However, the chair ruled that this does not prevent the motions contained in the minority reports from being introduced at a later time, because they had not actually been formally introduced, there being no committee report.

III. New Business

A. Short Title: "Worldwide Rotation" (Default time: 20 minutes)

MOVED: To amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

1. Amend Paragraph 3.6 to read: "To ensure equitable distribution of sites, the planet is divided into four (4) regions as follows:
2. To add the following language as Paragraph 3.6.4: "Overseas. Any part of the world not mentioned in 3.6.1, 3.6.2, or 3.6.3.
3. To replace Paragraph 3.7 with the following: "Worldcon sites shall rotate in the following order: Western, Central, Eastern, and Overseas in Gregorian Calendar years which, after being divided by four (4), yield remainders of zero (0), one (1), two (2), and three (3) respectively. A site shall be ineligible if it is within one hundred (100) kilometers of the site at which selection occurs."
4. To replace Paragraph 3.8 with the following: "In Gregorian Calendar years in which, after division by four (4), leave a remainder of three (3) there shall be a NASFiC in a location described in Paragraph 3.6.1, 3.6.2, or 3.6.3. Selection of the NASFiC shall be by the identical procedure to the Worldcon selection except as provided below or elsewhere in this Constitution.
5. Should the motion short-titled "Open The Site, Hal" be ratified by ConFrancisco, the word "Eastern" in it shall be replaced by the word "Central."
6. The phrase in Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.10 of the WSFS Constitution, "three (3) years" shall be replaced with the phrase "four (4) years", and the following sentence shall be added to the WSFS Constitution as Paragraph 3.1.1: "The 1995 WorldCon shall have the responsibility for seating both the 1998 and 1999 WorldCon."

Comment: The makers of this motion believe that its passage with [sic] ensure an adequate number of non-North American cons to make Worldcon a truly WORLDcon. Should it pass, it should be noted that the current sites and rotations will be unaffected until 1999, as shown by the following table:

Year Currently If motion passes

1994 Central Central (2mod4)

1995 Overseas Overseas (3mod4)

1996 Western Western (0mod4)

1997 Central Central (1mod4)

1998 Eastern Eastern (2mod4)

1999 Western Overseas (3mod4)

2000 Central Western (0mod4)

2001 Eastern Central (1mod4)

2002 Western Eastern (2mod4)

MOVED by: Chris Carrier
SECONDED by: Michael Hopcroft

Mark Olson moved to object to consideration. Chris Carrier moved that the vote on the objection to consideration be taken by written ballot. A member (Mr. Olson?) raised a point of order that such a motion was dilatory, but the Chairman ruled the point of order not well taken and allowed the motion on balloting. Mr. Carrier's motion regarding a written ballot failed. The objection to consideration (which requires a 2/3 vote against consideration) was sustained by a substantial majority (many to two) and the motion was killed.

B. Short Title: "Motion to Censure" (20 minutes)

MOVED: For numerous acts detrimental to WSFS, WorldCon, and fandom in general, which include, but are not limited to, gross disruption of the 1990 Business Meeting of the World Science Fiction Society held at ConFiction in The Hague, Netherlands, and gross malperformance of his duties as a member of the NASFiC Resolution Committee, Robert Sacks is hereby censured by the WSFS Business Meeting.

MOVED by: Chris Carrier
SECONDED by: Michael Hopcroft

Rick Katze moved to object to consideration. A written ballot was requested and failed. The purpose of "object to consideration" was requested, and was read from Robert's Rules of Order. The objection to consideration was sustained by a substantial majority and the motion was killed.

C. Short Title: "Incompatible Activities Amendment" (20 minutes)

MOVED, to add the following language to the WSFS Constitution as Section 1.9:
1.9.1: The following activities are incompatible with membership in WSFS and attendance at WorldCon:

1.9.2: Lewd and lascivious conduct by an adult over the age of 21 with a child under the age of 14, no matter where committed.

1.9.3: Sexual harassment at a science fiction convention, whether or not said convention is under the auspices of WSFS.

1.9.4: Deliberate and wilful cruelty to a physically or mentally challenged person, whether conducted in person or by mail. For the purpose of this section, a "challenged person" is a person who has been declared disabled by the social insurance authorities of the jurisdiction where the challenged person lives.

1.9.5: Violence, or the serious and credible threat of violence, at any WSFS function.

1.9.6: Theft, embezzlement or deliberate misappropriation of WSFS funds.

1.9.7: Conviction, or a plea of nolo contendere, by a duly constituted court of law shall be considered proof of guilt for the purpose of this section.

1.9.8: Any member of WSFS may bring charges against any other member of WSFS for violating any provision in Section 1.9 by bringing a motion before the WSFS Business Meeting, and presenting evidence in support of said motion. The motion shall be argued in the same manner as any motion of 50 words or more. Should the motion carry by a simple majority vote, the accused shall have his or her money refunded by the WorldCon Committee and be banned from that particular WorldCon, and the motion shall be part of the business passed on to the next WorldCon. Should the motion be ratified at the following WorldCon, that WorldCon shall also refund the admission fee to the accused, as well as any committee for a future WorldCon for whom the accused has purchased membership, and the accused shall be banned from WorldCon permanently, or until such time as a majority vote at a future WSFS Business Meeting not less than three years later sees fit to un-ban such person.

Comment: The makers of this motion believe that while fandom should be tolerant of differing life-styles, it should not be tolerant of everything done by everyone, and it should definitely not be tolerant of any of the conduct this motion seeks to condemn. In particular we would like to point out that children attend WorldCons, and that a ban on child molesters and sexual harassers attending our con is an excellent idea to prevent WSFS from legal liability should such an incident occur at a future WorldCon.

MOVED by: Chris Carrier

SECONDED by: Michael Hopcroft

Gavin Claypool moved to object to consideration. A written ballot was requested, found not dilatory, and failed. The objection to consideration was sustained by a substantial majority and the motion was killed.

D. Short Title: "Site Selection Radius" (20 minutes)

MOVED, to add the following language to the WSFS Constitution as Section 3.11: No future WorldCon shall be held within a radius of one hundred (100) kilometers from the residence of Robert Sacks. Should Robert Sacks establish permanent residence within one hundred (100) kilometers of the site of a future WorldCon, the WorldCon Committee governing that WorldCon shall relocate the con to another site

within the same region; and if the WorldCon Committee does not do so, it shall be declared "unable to perform its duties" and appropriate action shall be taken, as defined in Section 3.10 of the WSFS Constitution.

MOVED by: Chris Carrier
SECONDED by: Michael Hopcroft

The chair ruled that the motion was in order. Sharon Sbarsky moved to object to consideration. A written ballot was requested and failed. The objection to consideration was sustained by a substantial majority and the motion was killed.

E. Short Title: "Retro-Hugos" (20 minutes)

Move to amend Article II, Hugo Awards, by adding:

Section 2.11: Retrospective Hugos. A Worldcon held 50 or 100 years after a Worldcon at which no Hugos were presented may conduct nominations and elections for Hugos which would have been presented at that previous Worldcon. Procedures shall be as for the current Hugos. Categories receiving insignificant numbers of nominations may be dropped. Once Hugos have been awarded for a Worldcon by the Worldcon 50 years later, no other Worldcon (e.g., that of 100 years later) shall present Hugos for that Worldcon.

Moved by: Bruce E. Pelz
Seconded by: Moshe Feder

Comment: The original intent of the maker of this motion was to limit Retro-Hugos to Worldcons 50 or 100 years after a non-Awarding Worldcon in the same locale. This would probably have limited the Retro-Hugos to L.A. in 1996, unless the Rotation System were changed. However, other voices wanted the Retro-Hugos open to any Worldcon eligible by Time Frame but not by geography, and I have therefore dropped the geographic limit.

It should be pointed out that there are relatively few years in which the Retro-Hugos could be given out: 1939 through 1941 would have to wait for 2039-2041; 1996-2002, and 2004, would be the closest eligible years. Total possible years: 11.

I expect the idea to be pretty much a Funny-Once, and that other Worldcons will not want to try this. But with a 1946-1996 Opportunity, I would like to be able to try it at least once.

--- Bruce Pelz

Time limit: 2, 5, 15, 10 minutes, 50 years (ruled dilatory). 20 minutes failed by a substantial margin; 15 minutes failed; 10 minutes passed.

F. Short Title: "Moved--to Amend the Standing Rules" (6 minutes)

Moved--to amend the Standing Rules by adding the following:

Before voting on a motion to call the question, the presiding officer shall, without

debate, ask for a show of hands of those persons still wishing to speak on the matter under consideration.

(signed) Gary Keith Feldbaum
(signed) Mark L. Olson
(signed) Sue Ellen Adkins
(signed) George Flynn

John Galt moved to amend the motion to include Objection to Consideration as well as Call the Question. Gary Feldbaum moved to divide the discussion into two separate motions. The current amendment, however, is not divisible, so the chair ruled the motion to divide out of order. Robert Sacks spoke in favor of both the amendment and the motion. Someone else: what would this show of hands indicate? Response: it would give the sense of the meeting. Roger Wells: the proposed show of hands is the purpose of the Objection to Consideration in the first place. Chris Carrier: the Objection to Consideration has been abused and should be removed. Don Tim: This is a business meeting, not a debating society or a political soapbox. Richard Russell: The Motion to Object is grossly abused, people should have the opportunity to present their reasons for a motion. However, the amendment clutters a reasonable motion. Donald Franson: we can't override Robert's Rules. Chair: Yes, we can; Standing Rules supercede Robert's Rules. Mr. Galt's amendment failed by a substantial majority.

Returning to the original motion (with "still" removed by unanimous consent): The Chair ruled that, if it passes, the motion takes effect next year, not at the next session of the Business Meeting. A motion to appeal the Chairman's ruling was made and seconded. Donald Eastlake argued that the appeal should not be allowed. Mark Olson asked whether we could suspend the rules and apply the motion immediately (if it passes). We can. The appeal was withdrawn.

The motion passed by a large majority. Mark Olson moved to suspend the rules and allow the change to take effect immediately, which passed by unanimous consent.

G. Short Title: "Modification of Campbell Award" (6 minutes)

Moved, To amend section 2.6 of the WSFS Constitution by striking out "John W. Campbell Memorial Award for Best New Writer" and inserting "John W. Campbell Award for Best New Science Fiction Writer".

(signed) David Bratman
(signed) Seth Goldberg
Stanley Schmidt

Time limit: 30 seconds, 1 minute, 1:37 (ruled dilatory), 3 minutes. 6 minutes failed unanimously; 3 minutes failed by a substantial margin; 1 minute passed.

H. Short Title: "No-Zone Rotation" (6 minutes)

Moved: To replace the current rotation with a no-zone rotation, prohibiting the Worldcon from being held within 500 miles of the site selection location. Provided

That for the first 3 years after ratification, sites are eligible for selection if they would be eligible under the current rotation or the original one.

(signed) Ben Yalow
(signed) Kent Bloom

Parliamentary inquiry: does this allow the Secretary to make up the wording? Yes.

Chris Carrier: Object to consideration. Objection failed.

Time limits: 20 minutes, 10, 15, 1, 25. 25 minutes failed many-3; 20 passed.

Robert Sacks moved the motion, previously distributed, entitled "Separation of the NASFiC from WSFS":

Whereas the organization and operation of the North American Regional Science Fiction Conventions is not within the purposes of WSFS; Move to eliminate all references to NASFiC from the WSFS Constitution.

Bruce Pelz: Object to consideration. Objection sustained and motion killed.

Bruce Pelz made the following motion:

Move to appoint a WSFS Editorial Committee for the Worldcon Runner's Guide, chaired by Ross Pavlac, with authority to appoint others to the committee as he needs.

(signed) Bruce Pelz
(signed) Donald Eastlake
(signed) Robert Sacks

Passed by unanimous consent.

Ben Yalow: Move Paragraph 3 of the "Status Quo" motion in the NASFiC report:

That the business meeting adopt the following amendment to section 3.8.4 of the WSFS Constitution:

3.8.4: If "None of the Above" wins on the first ballot, or if no eligible bid files by the deadline, then no NASFiC shall be held and ~~all~~ any voting fees collected for the NASFiC site selection shall be refunded by the administering convention without undue delay.

This amendment would cancel the NASFiC whenever "None of the Above" wins or whenever no qualified bid files before the deadline. Currently, such a cancellation can occur only if "None of the Above" wins on the first ballot; in all other cases, the Business Meeting has to select a site under the fall-back provisions, and it is unclear whether the Business Meeting has the right to choose not to hold the NASFiC.

Time limit: 6 minutes by acclamation.

Richard Russell: Move to amend Standing Rule #7: Add to the last sentence "in increments of 2 minutes". Chris Carrier: Amend the motion to "1 minute". Amendment passed by unanimous consent. Robert Sacks moved to amend by substitution: "any positive whole number of minutes". Amendment passed by unanimous consent. Donald Eastlake said that zero should be allowed. Amendment passed. Amended motion passed. A motion was made to

suspend the rules and have the change take effect immediately, which passed by unanimous consent.

The following motion was submitted by John Galt:

Short Title: "Modify Objection to Consideration"

Moved: To amend the Standing Rules by adding the following.

The motion "To object to consideration of the question" shall not be in order until the motion it refers to is read in full.

Mark Olson: Would this require reading the entire motion, or would referral to the printed copy suffice? The Chair ruled that referral suffices (if there is a printed copy available). Rick Katze objected to consideration. Objection was sustained by a substantial majority.

Robert Sacks moved to adjourn; all those in favor stood up. Meeting adjourned 2:40 PM.

** [Added by Parliamentarian in May 1994]* I advised the Chairman that this was the best way to handle this situation. Upon reflection and a somewhat closer reading of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, I conclude that, per RROONR, when the committee deadlocked, the original motion and the amendment tacked on to it should have come back to the Business Meeting in their original form. However, this has no effect on the final outcome, because when the Chair ruled that the motion evaporated and nobody appealed it, it happened as he ruled it. I've added this comment because I don't really want that ruling to become a precedent, so I'm calling it to the attention of the archives.-KS

MINUTES - CONFRANCISCO BUSINESS MEETING

First Main Session September 4, 1993

Note: Items "skipped" in this agenda were handled at the Preliminary Business Meeting.

I. Opening Remarks by Chair

John called the meeting to order at 12:11. The agendas were late due to a copying foul-up. (The agendas were inadvertently sent out in the morning copy order, rather than the previous evening.)

II. Business Passed On by MagiCon

A. A. Short Title: "Open The Site, Hal" (6 minutes)

Robert Sacks attempted to amend the motion to include "but not within 60 miles of the 1998 Worldcon", but this was ruled out of order because the amendment would have applied to the description rather than the motion itself. Richard Russell inquired whether the "provided that" clause would vanish from the Constitution after 1998; the Chair ruled that it would. Chris Carrier proposed an amendment to strike the sentence containing "there will be no NASFiC in 2001"; seconded by Robert Sacks. Chris Carrier said that, 2001 being a special year, there should be a special convention in North America if there is no North American Worldcon. Joni Brill-Dashoff said that we should have a true Worldcon for the new millennium. Seth Breidbart pointed out

that, since the Eastern zone would be expanded to the entire world, the entire world would be eligible for the NASFiC. Robert Sacks suggested an alternate reading: anywhere in the world that happens to be in North America would be eligible. This point of order was ruled not well taken.

Would there have to be a NASFiC if the site selected were in North America? No.

If the Eastern Zone contains the entire world, how could a NASFiC be held, since the NASFiC is held only if the convention is outside the Eastern Zone? Parliamentarian's answer: The section of the constitution which calls for a NASFiC (Section 3.8) is not related to the definition of the Eastern Zone (Section 3.6.3). Section 3.8 says "In the event of [a Worldcon site outside of North America] being selected, there shall be a NASFiC in the region whose turn it would normally have been...." Therefore, the wording implies that, even with the special provision that the "Eastern Zone" include the entire world, selecting a Worldcon site outside of North America (geographic definition) would trigger a NASFiC in the Eastern Zone, even though the Eastern Zone would temporarily include areas outside North America. George Flynn said that as last year's secretary the second sentence was intended only for clarification, and not for substantive effect.

Robert Sacks appealed for clarification: that everywhere in the world is eligible for the Worldcon, and anywhere in the world is eligible for the NASFiC; the NASFiC could be held no matter where the Worldcon was held. Ben Yalow: Since the last Worldcon passed this motion with the understanding that the last sentence had no effect, this amendment would be a substantive change to the motion. The Chair ruled that the last sentence does have an effect. Ben appealed this ruling. [Discussion time ran out.]

Chair's ruling: If the pending amendment (Sacks' motion to strike the second sentence) passed, the effect of the amended motion would be to make anywhere in the world (outside of 60 miles from the voting site) eligible for the Worldcon and for the NASFiC. The appeal, to change this to allow the NASFiC only in North America, failed by a reasonable majority. Ben Yalow: this interpretation would be a greater change to the motion, requiring re-ratification. The chair ruled this point of order not well-taken; the chair's ruling was that this would be a lesser change. Mr. Yalow appealed the chair's ruling.

David Berry inquired, in the form of a point of order, whether there had been an explicit statement of the motion's effect at last year's meeting. The chair ruled the point of order as not well taken, and that the inquiry was not actually relevant to deciding the pending appeal.

The vote on the appeal was 38 in favor of sustaining the chair's ruling and 39 for overturning it; the ruling of the chair was therefore overturned, and the amendment, if passed, would be considered a "greater change," requiring re-ratification at Conadian.

Richard Russell moved to extend debate on the amendment by a total of 6 minutes. The motion failed. Time for debate on the amendment having expired, the vote was finally called. The amendment failed by a large majority.

Returning to the original motion with 22 seconds left on the clock... Robert Sacks moved to extend debate on the motion by 6 minutes, which failed. Time having expired, the vote was finally called. The motion failed by 32 to 52. (Applause.) Saul Jaffee sought and received permission to stand and be counted, because he has difficulty raising his hand.

B. Short Title: "Northwest Territories Division Amendment" (1 minute)

Chris Carrier spoke against the motion, since it has no practical effect: Nunuvut will never have the necessary facilities for a Worldcon. Don Eastlake pointed out that the national annual motorcycle convention doubles the population of North Dakota when it's held, so anything is possible. Johnny Carruthers stated that the motion is intended only to clarify the Constitution. The motion passed many to 1.

C. Short Title: "Clarifying Best Fan Writer Definition" (1 minute)

The motion passed many to 3.

D. Short Title: "Reduce NASFiC Lead Time" (10 minutes)

Inquiry: Does the motion reduce the lead time to "a year less than the Worldcon" or "2 years"? Chairman: A year less than the Worldcon. Chris Carrier stated that the NASFiC is too big to put together a reasonable bid in 18 hours. Robert Sacks said that it has been the custom to award the NASFiC to the defeated North American Worldcon bid; the motion would cause the defeated bid to lose its hotel contract, with only half a year to put together a new one. Patrick Malloy: There may be enough time for the committee to put together a bid, but not enough time for the voters to make a good decision. Johnny Carruthers: Doesn't it take as much time to prepare a NASFiC as a Worldcon, requiring the full 3 years? Martin Hoare: The NASFiC needn't be on the same weekend anyway, so Sacks' argument is moot. Kent Bloom moved to amend by removing the NASFiC from the Constitution; the amendment was ruled not germane. Terry Berry: Two years is not sufficient lead time for [an election for] a NASFiC-sized convention. Richard Russell: America's "second-tier" cities can host NASFiCs but not Worldcons; giving them 180 days to put together a NASFiC bid gives them a chance to do so. Don Eastlake: This will increase the probability that a NASFiC will be selected at a NASFiC; this is a good thing. A motion to close debate was moved and seconded. Under the rule passed yesterday, a show of hands was held: one person wished to continue debate, and the motion to close debate was withdrawn. Marten Sandberg: this would allow a NASFiC to occur when a failed North American Worldcon doesn't wish to host a NASFiC. Joni Brill Dashoff: This prevents a foreign Worldcon that selects a foreign Worldcon from also selecting the NASFiC (as happened in Brighton). Time for debate in favor expired, and nobody else wanted to speak against the motion, so the vote was called. The motion passed by a large majority.

E. Report of the WSFS Mark Protection Committee and Elections to the Committee
Donald E. Eastlake III, Committee Chair

Membership: (elected until Conadian) Scott Dennis, Donald Eastlake and Ben Yalow; (elected until Intersection) Tim Illingworth, John Lorentz and Bruce Pelz; (Worldcon Appointees) Tom Veal (Magicon), Kevin Standlee (ConFrancisco), Linda Ross-Mansfield (Conadian) and Paul Dormer (Intersection); (NASFiC Appointees) Don Cook (Dragon*Con). Three members to be elected (no more than 1 from the Eastern Zone, no more than 2 from the Central Zone, no more than 1 from the Western Zone); one to be appointed by the 1996 Worldcon.

Nominees: Sue Francis (Central), Steven Boucher (Off continent), Robert Sacks (Eastern), Gary Feldbaum (Eastern), Gary Louie (Western).

The report was handed out (however, the next meeting of the Mark Protection Committee was rescheduled to Sunday). Mark Olson: has there been any discussion on protecting the rocketship symbol? No. The winning 1996 convention was requested to select its representative immediately.

Sharon Sbarsky conducted the ballot. It was decided by unanimous consent to conduct the written vote simultaneously with the meeting and allow the results to be reported tomorrow. Richard Russell: Do we usually have a statement from the nominees? No, we customarily just vote.

- G. Report of the temporary committee to consider a Standing Rule on Committee Powers and Procedures (Gary Feldbaum, chair; Gay Ellen Dennett; Chris O'Shea).

The committee requested permission to report tomorrow, which was granted by unanimous consent.

H. Worldcon Reports

3. Financial Report by ConFrancisco
Postponed until tomorrow.
4. Financial Report by Conadian
One copy was submitted to the secretary; copies will be available tomorrow.
5. Financial Report by Intersection
Postponed until tomorrow.
6. Presentation by, and Question Time for, Conadian
Postponed until tomorrow.
7. Presentation by, and Question Time for, Intersection
Postponed until tomorrow.
8. Presentation by 1997 Candidate
Postponed until tomorrow.

III. New Business (to be passed on to Conadian if they pass)

- E. Short Title: "Retro-Hugos" (10 minutes) (see handout)

Bruce Pelz: 50 years before the 1996 Worldcon, the 4th Worldcon was held in LA; this predated the invention of the Hugos. A 50-year gap invites a retrospective, which would be a Fun Thing, but requires permission of this meeting to implement. If the

motion passes, 11 forthcoming Worldcons will be eligible to do this if they wish on the 50-year anniversary; others will be eligible on the 100-year anniversary. Robert Sacks: I used to have a turtle called Goldfish; calling it a goldfish doesn't make it a goldfish. 50 years late is too late for all of the nominees and most of the electorate; consent is difficult to achieve (and probably impossible after 100 years). Mark Olson: If we say it's a Hugo, it's a Hugo. Many people have read a larger fraction of the 1946 SF than the current output. And, though it's likely to be a one-shot, it could work well. He then moved to amend by adding 75 years to the list and add "No Worldcon may present more than one set of retrospective Hugos." The chair ruled that the amendment means that no single Worldcon could present retrospective Hugos for both, e.g. 50 and 75 years ago. Bruce Pelz pointed out that this is impossible; no non-Hugo-granting Worldcons existed at 25-year intervals. Mark Olson withdrew the sentence, leaving only the 75-year addition. Louis Gray would like to have a chance to award the "war year" Hugos. J.F. Sigling: Which listing of Hugos are we talking about? Bruce Pelz: we'll use the current categories, but with an eligibility date of 1945. David Bratman: If we're going to do this at all, we should encourage as many Worldcons to do it as possible. The question was called; the "75-year" amendment passed by a large majority.

Robert Sacks moved to restrict the award to Novel, Novelette, Novella, and Short Story. Mark Olson: admittedly the full set of 13 is ludicrous, but if this limit is brought up next year would it be a greater or lesser change? The Chairman: it would be a lesser change. Mark Olson: This issue is very complicated, and we should consider it for a year and vote on it next year. Robert Sacks: the 4 fiction Hugos are practical; the others are not. The previous question was called on the amendment; a few people still wished to speak, but the motion to close debate passed. The amendment failed by a small majority.

Returning to the original motion (amended to include 75 years): Gavin Claypool raised a question that the amended motion does not refer to 75 years in the latter half; the Secretary was directed to clean it up if it passes. David Bratman: I like fun things, but I fear this would not be one. The early Hugos' eligibility requirements were very loose; questions of what would be eligible for a retrospective Hugo adjacent to a year with a real Hugo could be sticky. The retrospective Hugos would reflect modern rather than contemporary tastes. Also, the Hugos are intended to provide egoboo for the winners, the retrospective Hugos couldn't do this. Johnny Carruthers: the motion would provide motivation for publishers to reprint some of the good old stuff.

Lew Wolkoff: Move to change "a Worldcon in which" to "a year in which" (to include the war years, during which there were no Worldcons). It was pointed out that this would allow 100-year-old fiction to be voted on in all intervening years. (Someone else): This is getting sillier and sillier and we would all look like a bunch of fools. Chris Carrier: This is good, and would allow retrospective Hugos for works that preceded the Worldcon. David Berry: This would allow Hugos for fiction as old as 1895; it would be better to add "after the Worldcon existed". Mr. Berry then attempted to move this as an amendment to Mr. Wolkoff's amendment. The chair ruled Mr. Berry's motion to be out of order, as secondary amendments are generally out of order under Standing Rule 9. The question was called; Mr. Wolkoff's amendment failed by 28 to 40.

Returning to the amended original motion: Can we resolve any serious problems prior to 1996? It can be covered under housekeeping; the Secretary can clean up the wording. Motion passed by a comfortable margin; it will be passed on to Conadian.

The polls for the WSFS Mark Protection Committee closed at 1:49.

G. Short Title: "Modification of Campbell Award" (1 minute)

The change would remove "Memorial" from the name shown in the Constitution; David Bratman allowed the insertion of "Memorial" as a friendly amendment. The sponsor wishes to make the change since Campbell was an SF, not Fantasy, editor. Time for debate expired. Richard Russell moved to postpone discussion until tomorrow, since there is some question about its effect. It was agreed to refer the motion back to its maker (Mr. Bratman) with instructions to report back tomorrow.

The Secretary noted that we will be out of time in 5 minutes and there are at least 26 minutes of debate remaining; can we postpone the last 2 items until tomorrow? This was considered a motion to adjourn, which passed, so the meeting adjourned at 1:55 PM.

MINUTES - CONFRANCISCO BUSINESS MEETING

Second Main Session September 5, 1993

Note: Items "skipped" in this agenda were handled at the Preliminary Business Meeting or the First Main Session.

0. Site Selection Results

	By Mail	At the Door	Total
LA in '96	206	926	1132
Write-Ins:			
Hawaii	1	18	19
I-6 in '96	0	2	2
"La-la Land"	0	2	2
Others	1	10	11
(one vote each for Rottnest Island, W.A., Prudhoe Bay AK, Hold Over Funds, Timbuktu, R'lyeh in '96, Ougadogou, Reykjuvik (sic) Iceland, L-5 in '95, Spuzzum BC)			
Illegal Ballots	1	0	1
None of the Above	11	50	61

Total Expressing a Preference 220	1011	1231	
No Preference/Blank	12	43	55
Total Ballots			
Cast	232	1054	1286
Needed to Elect (Majority of Ballots Expressing a Preference)			616

The LA in '96 Bid Committee graciously waived the requirement of validating the site selection ballots. It took approximately three hours to count the ballots.

For ConFrancisco:

George Brickner, Site Selection Administrator, ConFrancisco

Kevin Standlee, WSFS and External Affairs Division Chief, ConFrancisco

For LA in '96:

Mike Glycer

II. Business Passed On by MagiCon

E. Results of Elections of New Members to the WSFS Mark Protection Committee

Sharon Sbarsky presented the results:

1st Seat

	1st	2nd	3rd*	3rd*	4th
Boucher	16	17	22	-	-
Feldbaum	25	27	31	32	38
Francis	21	22	30	34	45 Sue Francis (C)
Louie	17	17	-	17	-
Sacks	4	-	-	-	-
None	1	-	-	-	-
>Total	84	83	83	83	83

2nd Seat

	1st	2nd	3rd	
Boucher	30	34	41	
Feldbaum	38	31	42	Gary Feldbaum (E)
Louie	18	18	-	
Sacks	7	-	-	
None	1	-	-	
Total	84	83	83	

3rd Seat (Sacks
ineligible (East))

	1st	
Boucher	48	Stephen Boucher (Off)
Louie	34	
Sacks	X	
None	1	
No Pref.	1	
Total	84	

* To break the tie on the 2nd ballot for the 1st seat, I determined that Boucher would be the next eliminated if Louie was eliminated first and Louie the next, if Boucher was eliminated first, thus there was no difference and went on to the 4th ballot.

I would like to thank Glenn Glazer for his help.

--- Sharon Sbarsky

New members are Sue Francis (Central), Gary Feldbaum (East), and Stephen Boucher (Off-continent). LA did not announce its representative at this time.

- G. Report of the temporary committee to consider a Standing Rule on Committee Powers and Procedures (Gary Feldbaum, chair; Gay Ellen Dennett; Chris O'Shea).

The report was not available due to a reproduction snafu, and was postponed until later.

It was agreed to suspend the rules, skip the reports, and get to the new business.

Robert Sacks raised an objection to the publication of an incorrect date in an Intersection progress report. The objection was answered by Tim Illingworth; further discussion could wait until later.

III. New Business (to be passed on to Conadian if they pass)

- G. Short Title: "Modification of Campbell Award"

Questions about this motion were referred yesterday to one of its makers (David Bratman), who was directed to report back to today's meeting.

The "other" Campbell award is the "John W. Campbell Memorial Award"; ours is the "John W. Campbell Award". Mr. Bratman's opinion is that the word "Memorial" in the current Constitution is an error. The second appearance of "Memorial" in the current amendment was removed by unanimous consent, restoring the motion to its original printed form.

The motion passed many to 1.

- H. Short Title: "No-Zone Rotation" (20 minutes)

Ben Yalow: The purpose of this motion is to eliminate the current rotation system and replace it with a new one. Its practical effect is to make overseas sites slightly more restricted; for example, Dover and Liege could not alternate on a permanent basis. [Robert Sacks: What recent site selections would have been banned under this motion? Ben Yalow: The current one (LA) would probably have been (depending on exactly where in the LA area Anaheim is). The Hague might have been. Winnipeg would have been.] In North America, this motion only has a significant effect in the East zone. In two years out of three, this opens the available sites up. In effect, this motion eliminates the so-called "Wimpy Zone" problem. It will mean more-heavily-contested races because a larger area will be eligible; it reduces "I've got to vote for them because there's nobody else." More competition, more choices for Fandom in general. Temporary restrictions, but a more wide-open race. A transition period is provided to ease the transition; the length of this period can be adjusted if desired.

Linda Deneroff: The motion defeats the purpose of rotation; it would allow the Worldcon to bounce from Boston to San Francisco in alternate years. Louis Gray: The motion allows more fairness and removes a lot of bureaucratic rigidity. Lew Wolkoff: The motion would prohibit SF-LA, Baltimore-Boston, etc., but would allow Scotland, Germany, France, Scotland, Germany, France... Also, why pass a motion that won't take effect for 8 years? Mark Olson: Practically speaking, this wouldn't result in two-

city alternation; neither the committees nor the voters would stand for it. Scott Dennis originally had complicated language for the transition, but this was intended to force the voters to move things around, which they want to do anyway. The biggest problem with the current system is that it forces voting in the zone of the competition; the 500-mile limit (1 day's drive) will prevent locals from packing the vote. Another reason for the change is that sites that are popular with mundane conventions could get forced out of their site in the only year that they are eligible for. [Time ran out for arguments in favor; Mark Olson moved to extend debate by 10 minutes; the motion passed.] Terry Berry: Westercon site selection used to alternate north-south; we changed it a few years ago and it failed miserably, and we changed it back. Roger Wells: Westercon without rotation did not "fail miserably". The current three-zone system solves the problem of another day and age. Fandom used to be younger and poorer; it's no longer as necessary to take special effort to keep the con close to the fans. Also, these days a long airplane flight can be cheaper than a short one.

Donald Eastlake moved to strike out "500 miles" and create a blank (which we would fill in as we fill in debate times, largest first). Robert Sacks moved to suspend the rules and call the previous question (not debate the blank, just go straight to filling in the blank). Sacks' motion to suspend passed. The question of the amendment to create a blank was then called. The amendment then passed. [There was some discussion as to how time is being charged to the two sides; 2:55 remains to In Favor, 11:51 remains to Opposed.] Bids to fill in the blank: 5000, 2001, 1000, 750, 1000km (621 mi), 500, 750km (466 mi), 400, 300, 250, 200, 100, 60. The question was called; all alternatives failed to achieve a majority and the blank was left unfilled.* The question was then called; the amended motion (with a blank) failed.

I. Report of the temporary committee to consider a Standing Rule on Committee Powers and Procedures

The copies having arrived, the motion contained in the report was addressed:

All committees are authorized to organize themselves in any lawful manner and to adopt rules for the conduct of their business, which may include mail ballots, subject to any contrary provisions of the Constitution, the Standing Rules, or the instructions of the Society.

Comment: This standing rule is intended to give all WSFS Committees the right to adopt rules for conducting their business, and to select a chair or other officers if that selection has not been made by the appointing officer or WSFS. This rule is explicitly intended to satisfy any provisions of Robert's Rules that a committee must be authorized to adopt its own rules which may vary from those of the Business Meeting itself. The Business Meeting may, if it wishes, give specific instructions or prescribe specific rules for a committee. A committee may be organized by mail, phone, or any other manner.

Gary Feldbaum (Chair), Gay Ellen Dennett, Chris O'Shea

Richard Russell: does the motion mean that the committee can elect a different chair?
Gary Feldbaum: that would be covered under "instructions of the Society".** The motion passed unanimously, and the members of the committee were thanked

individually. The rules were suspended and the motion put into effect immediately by unanimous consent.

J. Short Title: "Status Quo" (6 minutes)

Moved: That section 3.8.4 of the WSFS Constitution be changed to read "If 'None of the Above' wins, or if no eligible bid files by the deadline, then no NASFiC shall be held and any voting fees collected for the NASFiC site selection shall be refunded by the administering convention without undue delay."

Robert Sacks objected that the short title is not descriptive; it was changed to "Modify NASFiC Provisions" by unanimous consent. Richard Russell said that the motion is a clarification of the existing language, and that, which it technically was moved by Mr. Yalow, it was actually written by Kevin Standlee, who might feel uncomfortable speaking on its substance while sitting as Parliamentarian. On a motion by Mr. Russell, Kevin was allowed to speak by unanimous consent. Kevin: This is in line with recent changes to make it easier for No Award to win the Hugo. Robert Sacks: This motion eliminates the power of the Business Meeting to decide whether or not to hold a NASFiC; this is another in a line of motions to attack and destroy the NASFiC. Ben Yalow: This means that the Business Meeting is not going to have to select a NASFiC; it would prevent 400-500-person Business Meetings filled with NASFiC politickers and bid stickers. If the majority of the voters really don't like anybody, we should kill the NASFiC; but this applies only to that year. Gary Feldbaum: The NASFiC lead time motion would solve this problem, but under the current scheme of "snap elections" this change would not be a good idea.

Larry Rue: If None of the Above wins, the Business Meeting could still override the rules. Robert Sacks: Is that true? The chair ruled Mr. Rue's comment and Mr. Sacks' inquiry as not relevant to the discussion, and thus declined to make a ruling.*** Time having expired for debate, the motion passed many to few.

Richard Russell announced his "NASFiC Organization" (basically an APA to discuss the future of the NASFiC). Kent Bloom sought to reconsider his motion from last year to eliminate the NASFiC from the Constitution; his motion died for lack of a second.

Robert Sacks moved to adjourn sine die, but withdrew it immediately saying "I forgot there was still business."

We now return to our regular schedule.

H. Worldcon Reports

3. Financial Report by ConFrancisco

The report is as of the close of the previous fiscal year. If you want to know how we did this year, come next year. [The report is not reproduced here because none of the podium staff received copies.] [Despite repeated requests, the Parliamentarian regrets to report that he was unable to obtain a copy of the report from ConFrancisco's Treasury Department.]

4. Financial Report by Conadian

The podium staff failed to reproduce the report; it will be included in the printed minutes. [Here it is.]

CONADIAN - BALANCE SHEET AS AT (sic) AUGUST 15, 1993

ASSETS

Bank	123,248
Accounts Receivable	1,645
Prepaid Expenses	1,054
Unrealized Exchange loss	2,971
TOTAL	128,918

LIABILITIES

Accounts Payable	280
Earnings to date	128,638
TOTAL	128,918

NOTE: All values are stated in Canadian currency at rates effective on August 15, 1993.

CONADIAN - STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER 1, 1991 to August 15, 1993

REVENUE

Memberships	157,908
Advertising	305
Dealers	4,269
Interest	2,112
Other	227
TOTAL	164,821

EXPENSES

Administrative Division

Amenities	598
Equipment	2,821
Fees	40
Maintenance	625
Merchandise	1,590
Pre-Con	1,816
Printing, Postage, Supplies	1,131
PO Box Rental	506
Registration	441
Rent (Office)	7,140
Software	147
Taxes Withheld -- US	88
Telephone	1,057
Travel	214
TOTAL	18,214

Board of Director Division

Travel	315
TOTAL	315

Chairman Division

Miscellaneous	208
Travel	4,060

TOTAL	4,268
-------	-------

Extravaganza Division

Travel	544
--------	-----

Hugo Awards	1,030
-------------	-------

Hugo Nominees	690
---------------	-----

TOTAL	2,264
-------	-------

Facilities Division

Travel	608
--------	-----

TOTAL	608
-------	-----

Finance Division

Service Charges	814
-----------------	-----

TOTAL	814
-------	-----

Publication Division

Equipment	2,000
-----------	-------

E-Mail	160
--------	-----

Miscellaneous	164
---------------	-----

Postage/Office Supplies	225
-------------------------	-----

PR 0	2,525
------	-------

PR 1	1,696
------	-------

PR 2	1,457
------	-------

Telephone	109
-----------	-----

Transport	100
-----------	-----

TOTAL	8,946
-------	-------

Service Division	
Travel	315
TOTAL	315
WSFS Division	
Travel	419
TOTAL	419
TOTAL EXPENSES	26,183
EXCESS REVENUE OVER EXPENSES 128,638	

NOTE: All values are stated in Canadian currency at rates effective on August 15, 1993.

5. Financial Report by Intersection

Intersection - unaudited statement of Account as of 30th June 1993

	GBP Accounts	US\$ Account
Income		
Memberships	29,745.92	85,778.02
Passalong	367.00	
Total	30,112.92	85,778.02
Expense		
Advertising	-40.00	
Agents	-58.48	
Art Boards	-1,677.39	
Bank Charges	-161.55	
Email	-88.13	
Hugo rockets	-734.00	
Legal and Tax fees	-620.00	-390.00
Office Equipment	-2,618.07	-1,923.84
Phone	-235.87	-194.25
Postage	-123.99	-819.86
Publications/Printing	-1,653.19	
Refunds/Bad cheques	-400.66	-24.00

Supplies and Stationery	-139.95	
Total	-6,758.14	-5,145.09
Balance	23,354.78	80,632.93
Comprising :		
Cash in bank (30/June/1993)	24,288.34	82,978.02
Transactions in progress	933.56	2,345.09

6. Presentation by, and Question Time for, Conadian

Linda Ross-Mansfield gave a very brief introduction. Please send information to the artists about how to get art across the border? It will be in the packets. When is the membership sales table open? Today until 6. How available are flights on Monday night, since some people need to be home by sundown Monday? We are getting contracts with Air Canada for a connection with Continental; KLM is tied in with Northwest. It's up to the airlines to decide how many planes to put on; letters of request might convince them to put on more or bigger planes. Is a passport necessary? Not for American citizens, but some sort of picture ID is required. Green card is required for resident aliens. The airlines may require passports, even though Customs does not. A list of preregistered members will also be provided to Customs to speed things up. What is the visa situation for non-Americans? Not aware of any requirement; check your Canadian consulate. For European and Commonwealth countries, only a passport is required; for most Asian countries you need a passport and a return ticket.

7. Presentation by, and Question Time for, Intersection

Tim Illingworth: We put a lot of effort into the bid, then basically fell over for 6-8 months, but are now getting back on track. Will the hotels be far from the convention facilities? Basically about as far away as this convention; the main hotels are about 1km away from the convention center. Since the NASFiC will be held earlier in the year, will it be possible for the NASFiC to hold site selection balloting? No. Please compare the weather we've had to the weather you expect. (Missed answer.) How about transportation from other European cities? (Missed answer.) What airlines have direct flights to Glasgow, and how's the independence movement? Northwest, Continental, and American do, and I haven't seen any barbed wire at the border recently. How good is the bar in the main hotel? (waving hands) You don't want to go there at all... What are your plans if the English Army invades? The English Army is composed mainly of Scots. What's in a haggis? That, you really don't want to know... have the appropriate breweries been notified? Yes. If you take the railroad from London, how long does it take/cost? 400 miles, 5 hours, about \$60-80 depending on how far in advance you book. Pub hours? Scotland got rid of the restrictions before England did... Are the citizens of Scotland subject to the constant soap opera of the Royal Family? Only if you want to be... Must the

BritRail pass be purchased out-of-country? Yes. There's a lot more smoking in Europe; will there be places to breathe there? Smoking is a dying habit in Britain; there were some problems in Jersey with its low ceilings, but the SECC's ceilings are high; smaller spaces will be non-smoking. What are the liquor laws in Glasgow, esp. with respect to bid parties? No restrictions apply to private parties; public bars are licensed (open 11-11 except Sunday). The laws regarding alcohol apply mostly to public places; the convention is considered "private" space. Given the problems at Helicon, what are you doing about corkage? We expect the official party hotel to be popular, so we will play them off against each other. Corkage is unlikely to be waived, but might be lowered. What is the minimum drinking age? 18, 16 with a meal. How about curb cuts, etc.? Not legally required, but curb cuts are going in as streets are rebuilt. The SECC is completely flat. If you serve alcohol to someone who's drunk, is the server liable? The laws don't apply with the same rigidity; there's more assumption of individual responsibility. What's the situation with regard to unions? The contract is similar to here: anything requiring tools must be done by a union member. Since there are no smoking rules like here, will there be smoking and non-smoking con suites? We won't have a con suite, but we will try to have a non-smoking bar. Can the non-smoking bar also be non-karaoke? If you can figure out a way of peace-bonding filkers...

8. Presentation by 1997 Candidates

Michelle Zellich from St. Louis and Fred Duarte plus several other representatives from San Antonio were present. St. Louis won the toss and presented first.

St. Louis can have the whole convention in one facility: 100,000 square feet for the Masquerade with pitched seating, 100 function rooms, etc. The hotels will be used for only sleeping and parties. The farthest hotel is only 4.5 blocks away; the whole downtown is 1 mile across. Is the con suite in the convention center? Yes, we have the convention center 24 hours a day from Wednesday to Tuesday. How far is the con from the river? It's 4 blocks past the Arch, which is 60 feet above flood stage. Is the whole center built at this point? All but the football stadium. How about unions? Hucksters can set themselves up, and we have a Teamster on the committee. Liquor laws? Must be 21 to drink; bars close at 1 or 3 AM; private parties are unregulated. Microbreweries? One so far, another on the way. Smoking laws? No-smoking areas are required; laws are getting more restrictive; the con will probably be all non-smoking.

San Antonio introduced the 11-member bid committee and described the main hotels (2 Marriotts with a mall between them, plus a Hilton and several cheaper hotels), the convention center (including arena), and the many things to do in San Antonio (IMAX theatre, 2 theme parks, the Alamo, Ripley's wax museum, zoo, etc.) What about smoking and drinking? Smoking only in designated areas, drinking must be 21 years old and there's no hard liquor at grocery stores, liquor stores close at 9 and grocery stores at 12 (2 on Fri-Sat); there is a

microbrewery about 1 hour away and there will be 5-6 brewpubs. How far is the Hemisphere (arena in the convention center) from everything else? Across the street from the smaller of the 2 main hotels.

I. Robert Sacks moved to adjourn "without day" (sine die).

J. IV. Closing Remarks by Chair

K. We came into this meeting with 2 main purposes besides the usual stuff: to go through it efficiently and make it as open as possible. We've spent a lot of time talking about very little, and newcomers would be turned off to the extent that they never want to come back again (this includes members of the podium staff). Today was better than yesterday, but it was a flash-bang: a lot of noise, a lot of smoke, but no real effect. We are adjourned.

L. Minutes prepared by David Levine 1993 WSFS Business Meeting Secretary, with comments and additions by John Lorentz, Chairman, and Kevin Standlee, Parliamentarian. Distributed to all attendees by ConFrancisco, 712 Bancroft Rd, Ste 1993, Walnut Creek CA 94598. Permission is hereby granted to freely redistribute these minutes to all interested persons. Address e-mail inquires to Kevin Standlee at k.standlee@genie.geis.com.

M. Footnotes

N. -----

O. * This is legal under Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised; had the motion with the blank passed, it would have been necessary to vote on filling the blank again. In the opinion of the Parliamentarian, based on the results of the first attempt to fill it, it would have been necessary to vote by preferential ballot in order to fill the blank.-KS

P. ** The appointment of a chair is considered "instructions from the Society," so a committee could not elect a different chair if one was appointed by the Society. (One assumes that if the chair were to become vacant due to death or resignation, the committee would then fill the empty position, inasmuch as the Society isn't likely to have provided for such a situation.)-KS

Q. **** Note from the Parliamentarian: Mr. Rue's comment is not correct. NASFiC selection procedures are part of the Constitution, not the Standing Rules. The Constitution cannot generally be overridden by the Business Meeting; if this amendment is ratified, NASFiC selection would generally be taken out of the Business Meeting's hands. The only exception to this would be if there was a tie. While the Constitution is vague about such a situation, it seems likely that the site selection would devolve on the Business Meeting should there be a tie.-KS

R. _____

S. *Pat McMurray* pat@cooky.demon.co.uk

Last Update: January 2000