

## GENERAL MEETING – TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2008

---

The meeting convened at 8 p.m. with a moment of silence followed by the Serenity Prayer. Mike C. (Beverly Hills) read the Twelve Traditions. **THOSE MEMBERS PRESENT:** Amazing Grace, Anniversary, Aurora, Back to Basics (Richmond Hill), Beaches, Bellamy, Beverly Hills, Birds of a Feather, Bloorale, Bramalea Care & Share, Brampton New Life, Brampton Recovery, City Central, Credit Valley, East York, Erin Mills, Fellowship, Fifth Tradition (Scarborough), Friendly, Frontrunners, Glenholme, Golden Mile, Half Century, High Park, Hill, Keep It Simple (Scarborough), King City, Kingsway, Lakeshore, Leslie, Long Branch, Markland Wood, Maple, Miami Beach, Midtown, Markham Village, Mount Dennis, Mount Royal – York, Newmarket, North Toronto, Pine Hills, Port Credit, Primary Purpose, Prince Edward, Principles Before Personalities, Reaching Out, Rexdale United, Richmond Hill, Rox Glen Traditional, Royal York, Saturday Morning Disc., Rouge Valley Centenary, Shepherd, Silverbirch, St. Clements, Stepping Stones Disc., Sunday Scarborough, Sunnyside, Thornhill, Tuesday Night Disc., Twelfth Tradition, Twelve Steps, Unionville, Welcome, Westmoreland, Weston, Willowdale, Woodbine, Yorkville. **District Liaisons:** Districts 04, 14, 18, and 22. **Subcommittee Chairs:** Twelfth Step, Public Information, Newsletter/Website, Access Ability, ORC, Archivist.

---

There was a **MOTION to adopt Minutes of August 2008** moved by Maire O'B. (Leslie) and seconded by Bill J. (Friendly). **MOTION WAS CARRIED.**

---

Chairperson had no opening remarks.

**Collection of the 7<sup>th</sup> Tradition**, which totaled **\$197.36** after coffee expenses.

### **FINANCE REPORT: Gregg W. (Rox Glen Traditional), Finance Chairperson**

There was a quorum for the Finance meeting held on Sept.23; business was conducted as usual. Group donations are up significantly. Gratitude donations are down due to incomplete mailing lists from groups; no updated group lists were received this year. This has led to a deterioration of our member database. Please phone your updated group/member mailing information to Alexx at 234 (membership secretary). In regards to the Financial Statement: we are working ahead of our projected budget. The Operating Committee **is calling for resumes for 2 new Finance Committee members.** 5 years of continuous sobriety plus some business/accounting background is needed. This is a 2-year service commitment. Please forward resumes to the Operating Committee c/o 234. *Gregg entertained questions from Floor members.*

Bill R. (Bellamy) asked about how much money we have in our Prudent Reserve/investments, etc. Gregg replied that this request has not been overlooked; the figures requested will be reflected in our proposed 2009 Budget, which will be available soon.

Mike C. (Beverly Hills) asked about the old format of the Bar Graph that was requested previously. Gregg explained that the current format more accurately reports financial figures that are right out of our accounting program /system, and is more of a transparent recording mechanism.

Gerry M. (Fellowship) asked about group donation receipts (These are available to reps each month at the Reception table, if they are not mailed out beforehand).

Glen (East York) shared his thoughts on Gratitude; he will be bringing extra Gratitude envelopes back to his group for distribution.

---

There was a **MOTION to accept Finance Report** moved by Karl W. (Saturday Morning Disc.) and seconded by Mike C. (Beverly Hills). **MOTION WAS CARRIED.**

---

There was a **MOTION** moved by Maire O'B. (Leslie) and seconded by? [Tape *not clear*; *person was not at microphone*] that, with respect to the Notice of Motion on the Floor, that a **two-thirds majority be utilized for the vote**. **Discussion.** Harold Y. (Port Credit) mentioned that he didn't think we could change the Procedures & Guidelines on a simple vote here on the Floor, as the Motion implies a change to the Procedures. Other members agreed. **Discussion.** **MOTION WAS RESCINDED.**

---

Reg S. (Melrose), Operating Chair, commented: "Thank you; I stand corrected. I need to entertain a Motion to Suspend Regular Business, and this is the Motion I'm looking for; there will be no other Motions at this time."

---

**MOTION to Suspend Regular Business re: Notice of Motion** moved by Greg H. (Hill) and seconded by Gord B. (Port Credit). **MOTION WAS CARRIED.**

---

**Reg then asked Wes B. (Long Branch) to facilitate the next part of the meeting:** "I've been asked to come and be the Moderator for the Motion that was brought to the Floor in April. We are all here for the same reason, and that's to do what's best for AA in the Greater Toronto Intergroup Area. We may have different opinions, and yet we can disagree without being disagreeable. It's been said there's a couple of things AA hates; one is change, and the other is keeping things the same. I am here to be your moderator only; my goal is to see that everyone who wishes to speak on this matter will be heard, and in an orderly fashion. The first thing we need to know is who votes; only Intergroup reps, or in their absence, the Alternate [rep] for that group...I would respectfully ask that the following guidelines please be observed: a) For the audience: due attention and consideration should be given to all speakers; b) please do not comment out loud when someone is speaking; c) make a note of what you'd like to say, and take a turn at the microphone; d) for those who wish to speak, **use the microphone**; e) all comments should be directed to the Chair; no crosstalk, please; f) limit comments or questions to 2 minutes, we will use a timer as a guide. Please identify yourself by name and by group; g) please do not come to the microphone a second time until everyone who wishes to speak on the matter has had their turn; h) if the aisle is too congested, I will ask those to give their name and group to Fran (recording secretary); she will give me the list and I will call upon those people in order; i) if making an amendment to the Motion, please have it in writing and submit to Alexx (recording secretary); j) if the amendment only changes the wording or the layout it does not need to be send out to the groups; only if the *intent of the Motion is changed*; k) if anyone wishes to call the question, it must be done in rotation from the microphone. This happens when someone who has a vote thinks that the debate has gone on long enough, or if we're hearing the same things over and over. This needs a seconder from the voting audience, and then the Floor will vote to stop the debate and go to an immediate vote on the Motion or to continue the debate; l) a show of hands and count will be called for a simple majority only."

Wes continued: "The Motion that is on the Floor as I understand it is not a change to the Procedures; it is to determine whether the Motion is of a good enough quality to go back to the groups for a Referendum, given the expense and effort needed. A simple majority only is necessary." *Wes then quoted from the P & G, Section 11.3 (Page 12) with regards to the areas of procedure and conduct for the voting process.* "We need to be cleaned up and out of this room by 10 p.m.; if we are not finished by 9:40, I will entertain a Motion to Suspend Completion of the Motion we are discussing until next month." **Wes asked if there were any questions on these items; these were answered accordingly.**

Gord H. (Bloomdale): "I'd like to point out that those changes make reference to actual procedural changes in the Operating Procedures...what we're talking about tonight is a general Motion...this Motion itself does not follow the Operating Procedures as laid out by Toronto Intergroup."

Maire O'B. (Leslie) asked if anyone could have a voice at the microphone (other than voting members). Wes answered that he would allow anyone to have a voice if they wish to. Wes then took a show of hands from the Floor on this item; the Floor decided that only reps or alternates (voting members) could have a voice at the mike.

Wes then **read the Notice of Motion** as presented in April 2008:

## **NOTICE OF MOTION FOR THE RESTRUCTURING OF GTA INTERGROUP, APRIL 2008**

Whereas the existing structures of the Operating Committee and of the Subcommittees of Greater Toronto Area Intergroup (GTAI) are experiencing chronic and acute difficulties in recruiting volunteers to effectively fill the various functions of these two bodies, and:

Whereas many of the functions of the Subcommittees of Greater Toronto Area Intergroup are duplicated in the General Service structure of Alcoholics Anonymous as fulfilled by Eastern Ontario International Area 83 of the General Service structure:

Therefore, it is moved that the existing structures of GTAI Operating Committee and the subcommittees be simplified by combining both into a unified body. This unified body would be known as the Executive Committee. It would include all the duties and responsibilities currently mandated to the existing sub committees and the existing Operating Committee.

This proposed Executive Committee would be composed of 8 members and a chairperson (nine in all). The various subcommittee functions would be assigned to members of the Executive Committee, eliminating the need for additional subcommittee Chairpersons and/or liaisons from the Operating Committee.

It is further moved to increase the tenure of Executive Committee members from the rotated 18 months (i.e. 3 x 6 months) to 2 one year segments that can be repeated once to a maximum of 3 continuous years. This would be followed by 2 years abstinence from participation on the Executive Committee. New members would be elected yearly to replace members who have completed 2 years service and have declined to stand for a 3<sup>rd</sup> year in office. An election will be held in the month following a resignation of a member before completion of his or her term. In this case the newly elected member will complete the remaining time of the resigning member and have the right to run for re-election and to then serve the allowable term of a newly elected member of the committee.

It is further moved that the sobriety requirement for membership on the Executive Committee be set at a minimum of 2 years of continuous sobriety.

It is further moved that members of this Executive Committee be elected by the voting members of the Intergroup Floor from the total membership of Alcoholics Anonymous in the Greater Toronto Area including serving Intergroup Reps and/or Alternate Reps.

It is further moved that: At the time of the initial adoption of this new Executive Committee, 5 members from the current Operating Committee should be retained for one year. One of these five retained Operating Committee members would be elected, by the Committee as the first Chairperson of the new Executive Committee for one year. Another would be elected as Vice Chair of the new Executive Committee. The Vice Chairperson would become Chairperson the following year for a period of one year.

Subsequent years would see the retirement of those members who have served 2 years on the Executive Committee. Those wishing to serve a further, and allowable, 3<sup>rd</sup> year would stand for election along with the required number of new candidates needed to attain the full complement of nine members, including the Chairperson.

It is further moved that this Executive Committee shall, with the approval of the Intergroup Floor, have authority in the following areas:

- 1) Finance: The Finance Committee would follow the existing description of the Finance Committee's role and requirements as currently contained in the Procedures and Guidelines with the following exceptions: 1) The Chair of the Finance Committee will be a member of the Executive Committee. 2) The role of Executive Secretary will be eliminated.

The Chair of the Executive Committee, the Vice Chair and the Chair of the Finance Committee will serve as the Executive Signing Officers for GTA Intergroup. Two signatures will be required on all cheques.

- 2) Office Administration and Management of Staff: This committee, in conjunction with the Executive Committee and as ratified by the GTAI floor, would be responsible for the creation of an Office Manager position.

The Office Manager's job description and employment contract would include those responsibilities currently assigned to the Executive Secretary in the Procedures & Guidelines and in the job descriptions currently available with the following exception: The Office Manager would have a reporting relationship to the Finance Committee and to the Executive Committee but would no longer be included as a Voting Member of the Finance Committee.

The hiring of the Office Manager and all other staff will be the responsibility of the Executive Committee and its agents; the Chair of the Office Administration Committee and the Chair of the Finance Committee. Their decisions will then be presented to the GTAI floor for ratification.

This position, Office Manager, will be reviewed annually. Renewal of the contract will be dependent on the results of this review.

3) Secretary: Responsible for minutes of the Executive Committee and its sub committees.

4) Literature: To work with office staff on updates of meeting books and other printed material.

5) Special Events such as Info AA, Winter Season Open House and other planned special events for the purpose of raising awareness and/or fund raising.

6) Communications: Responsible for maintaining the Web Site and Better Times and local request for information on A.A. (e.g. the press etc.)

7) Carrying the Message: (12 Step Committee) Responsible for Phone Greeters Schedules and training and for updating 12 step greeter lists.

8) Institutional Service: (i.e. Treatment Facilities & Correctional Facilities)

**Note:** The Ontario Regional Conference has always operated independently of GTA Intergroup, although it reports to the GTA Intergroup floor on a regular basis.

**Additional Notes:**

It is understood that the Executive Committee members responsible for these subcommittees can, and should, recruit members from the Intergroup floor or from the AA membership at large for assistance in the duties of the subcommittees. Activities and service responsibilities should be shared as widely as possible.

It is also moved that the following components shall be the responsibility of this newly formed Executive Committee with ratifying approval from the floor of GTA Intergroup.

A) Create a policy that lays out the conditions and mechanisms for the removal of Executive Committee members (i.e. for. non performance of duties, being disruptive, refusing to resign etc.)

B) Create a grievance policy/procedure for complaints against any aspect of GTA Intergroup. Such complaints would then go to the Executive Committee for consideration.

---

As per protocol, Wes invited the person who presented the Motion, Doug R. (St. Clements) to approach the mike first: "I am here to represent group conscience on to levels: for the ad hoc committee, and my own group. I have very little to say at this point." ***This being done, voting members approached the mike for discussion of the Motion.***

Maire O'B. (Leslie): "The Leslie Group's voting against this Motion for a couple of reasons. One: It's based on a fundamentally flawed understanding of how the service structure operates in the GTA. The Operating Procedures do have outlines for the subcommittees. The Districts...the 9 districts in the GTA have been responsible for Corrections, Treatment, Public Information, Cooperation with the Professional Community, Self-Support and Grapevine, and more recently, Archives...over the past 20 years and ever since the Areas came of age – and districts follow suit in the late 1980's. This is borne by the Minutes of the Ontario General Service Committee, the provincial Committee and the Ontario Delegates Committee, [minutes] that are in the archives. The subcommittees are in fact a body of elected district reps with the responsibility for their prospective functions they are encouraged to do. Meeting once a month is an endeavour to cooperate, coordinate, and assist each other in carrying the message to the alcoholic who still suffers. The Chair has been appointed by the Operating Committee based largely on

recommendation of the subcommittee persons, and generally comes from that committee. Divesting itself of the pseudo-responsibility for this would be supported by us, as it is following an established practice for the last 20 years...we support that aspect, but not the Motion in general. There is an internal inconsistency and confusion in this Motion about the Executive Committee. It notes that there's chronic and acute difficulties to be resolved in the unification of the responsibilities of the subcommittees and the Operating Committee into one Executive Committee, that would need to recruit volunteers to [tape unclear] of subcommittees. The subcommittee functions have and continue to be well-performed by the Districts and in fact constitute the current committees. Though one of the key responsibilities of the Operating Committee members is to sit as liaisons to the subcommittees, it is a rarity, which is one of the reasons why we have moved to Chairs providing reports to this body. Though in principle we support the extension of the term of the Operating Committee, the description of the tenure and the method of election of this new Executive Committee is, to say the least, very confusing. For it to serve as a procedure for the very profound change in how we elect and determine our trusted servants to serve, it must be crystal-clear. The various subcommittees, as it promotes Executive Committee as they appear, are far-reaching. Far too much responsibility is being delegated to persons elected...there's no real accountability to the membership at large; we see this really as a breach in the Traditions. It's incorrect on the responsibilities of the Ontario Regional Conference. Up until about 1989, from the ORC's inception, Intergroup had joint responsibility for this with the Ontario General Service Committee which was Delegates from across Ontario and the GSRs which then reduced itself to the Ontario Provincial Committee when the Areas came of age...the ORC became – and the Minutes bear this out – became the sole responsibility of the GTA Intergroup. Activities in the Intergroup should focus where the core strength is: answer the phones, distribute the literature, and take care of Better Times and the Website, and have responsibility for Archives. Keeping it this simple, there would be no need for such an overriding executive committee...*Wes had to stop Maire as she had gone over the 2-minute time limit (Wes had forgot to turn on the timer, and apologized)...*”

Karl W. (Saturday Morning Disc.): Our group feels that this Motion is too much under one umbrella. Ideally, it would be withdrawn and broken down into smaller segments in the spirit of ‘Keep It Simple’. Our intention is to abstain on that basis.

Glen (East York): We had a member of the ad hoc committee attend our business meeting last month. I really required clarification [on the Motion]; I wasn't in a position where I could explain to my group what was going on, as I am fairly new to Intergroup. I was grateful and it was very helpful. I and my group got the clarification that was needed, and it was appreciated. There's no question that the Motion is a little more complicated than it needs to be; I like the concept of ‘Keep It Simple’. I obtained a unanimous vote from my business meeting to support this Motion in some form to go to Referendum.

Mike C. (Beverly Hills): This Motion makes more than 18 changes...it's laid out to make 18 changes. Some of the changes are good; some are bad. So, the Beverly Hills Group is going to vote no. About the Referendum: the last time the Procedures were changed...no of the groups were asked about the Referendum. Therefore, I don't think that a Referendum is trustworthy.

Gord B. (Port Credit): I brought this Motion to my group. They are in favour of it. Port Credit is not a group for change, but this year they would like to see it take place.

Rene T. (Silverbirch): My group recognizes that a lot of thought and a lot of work went in to this, and there are a lot of very positive points. However, we too also agree that it needs to be broken down and made simpler as there were a couple of issues in that Motion...and that's what we would like to see happen.

Glen B. (Back to Basics): My group feels that we've looked at this for over two years, and there was a lot of ‘fact-finding’ work done. This was done by serious people, and everyone [involved] had a chance to put their two cents

in. My group feels that Intergroup should know what needs to happen so they can be more effective. Therefore, they will proceed with the only change with the term 'Executive Committee' be changed.

Carol (Tuesday Night Disc.): My group has decided to vote no to the Motion, because they feel it is too complicated. My group also said that they would like to thank the ad hoc committee, because they have certainly put a lot of work and a lot of effort into this. But, it is the understanding of our group that the ad hoc committee is put in place as a fact-finding mission. Once they get those facts, they are to present them to the Intergroup Floor to decide what to do with it. Our group would like to mention that if this vote is carried out tonight to be 'no', that the ad hoc committee be thanked for their work, and that perhaps we look at the things that are beneficial...our group feels Intergroup should be responsible for things like communication, the phones, and the basic things.

Christine (Anniversary): We will vote yes. This wasn't the case when we first started out. The initial responses were that it was confusing...when our group invested the time to understand how much fact-finding was done through member surveys, etc. They realized that it was the support of the GTAI Floor that asked for an ad hoc committee be formed to create something as a solution to those facts they found. What they learned was that the essence of this Motion was about returning us to a simpler form of Literature, communications, and answering phones...it gave them comfort in knowing that the essence of this Motion is something to say yes to...returning us to a simpler format.

Gord H. (Bloordale): This Motion does in fact not comply with the GTAI Operating Procedures, under Section 11. What we just heard there is incorrect from the ad hoc committee; it's incorrect information. What the Procedures say is that the actual Motion to change Procedures involves a three-month waiting period for the groups to look at it. We're looking at this Motion, and that's not the case. It talks about actual changes; that if this is approved tonight, that the actual changes are going to be sent out to the groups within 10 days. That's not what it says here [P & G]. It says that it has to wait three months, or in the case of December or the summer, five months. Check the Procedures under Section 11. My group voted no on this. It's a very complex Motion. It's based on a lot of misinformation. I've been around General Service and Intergroup about 18 years...our group is voting no to the Motion.

Ken L. (Erin Mills): I brought this Motion to my group...they felt that something definitely had to be done to make Intergroup more efficient. They expressed to me problems with ordering medallions, 12 Step Calls, etc...

Ken asked whether GSO had the same office structure that is proposed here; Wes answered: No - that's not really correct. You'll find that graph you're looking at [current structure versus proposed structure, given out last month] is terribly flawed.

Greg H. (Hill): Our previous speaker alluded to the history of Intergroup. Well, I'd like to suggest that Intergroup is showing its age; it's showing its age with the anachronistic mechanism that it has. Just make a change and do anything. I see this Motion as a positive change, and my group will be voting in favour of this Motion. And it is only a Motion, so that we can have a vote; that's what's important. I really find it interesting that everyone talks about keeping it simple when all you should do is look at our policies and procedures [document] – there are nothing simple about this! So, I think we should vote in favour of this Motion, take it to the groups and let's see what happens.

Nino (Stepping Stones): On behalf of my group, I'm asked to come here today and really express how important service is; it really is an integral part of AA. We feel that the spirit of service is dying slowly. If this Motion is what it takes to rekindle the spirit, we are fully behind it. We believe that the spirit of AA should prevail. We are fully in support of this Motion.

Bill R. (Bellamy): Firstly, the Bellamy Group is against this Motion for reasons that have already been mentioned. The concept behind it appears to be flawed; the assumption that there's duplication...the mention at the end of additional notes, where they mention about recruiting members from the Intergroup Floor to assist in these subcommittees...it's already been said that that the so-called subcommittees are staffed by representatives from the districts (usually district chairs)...what's confusing I think is the very word 'subcommittee' which implies that it's fully a function of Intergroup, when in fact these are really liaison committees. I feel that there's a misunderstanding of that in this [Motion], and I'm concerned because I'm hearing yes votes here. We have to remember that, if we vote on this tonight, and it goes back to the groups...it's not a talking point; it's not a discussion paper, it's an actual Motion to change fundamentally the structure of Intergroup, so this is not just something we can entertain lightly. I'm concerned that's there's no mention of references to the Procedures themselves...we all find this a difficult document to get through...we feel that if it's this difficult to get through, then it's probably not a good way to start restructuring Intergroup.

---

**MOTION to Call the Question [end the debate] moved by Ray (Brampton New Life) seconded by? [Tape not clear] For: 46. Against: 6. MOTION WAS CARRIED.**

---

**Wes instructed the Floor that we will go to a vote on the Motion. This requires a simple majority. The Floor agreed this was to be done by a show of hands.**

**Voting for the Motion: 46. Voting against the Motion: 15. MOTION WAS CARRIED.**

---

Wes: **We in AA have a thing called the 'Voice of the Minority'**. AA is always protected by the Voice of the Minority. Unless the vote was unanimous, the chairperson will ask if anybody wishes to 'Speak to the Minority'. To be able to do this, you must have voted with the minority on the Motion. If after the Minority has spoken, someone from the Majority side wishes to change their vote, he or she may make a motion to reconsider. If this is seconded and passed by 2/3rds majority, discussion is started again on the original Motion.

**Wes then asked if anyone would like to speak to the minority.**

Maire O'B. (Leslie): I would just like to encourage everybody who voted for this Motion to take it quite seriously and study paragraphs, etc. Acquaint yourselves with what's in that Motion. Acquaint yourselves with the structure of Intergroup and the structure of the Districts. Talk to your GSRs. I agree that there needs to be many changes...to complicate further what we know, I say please: take it upon yourselves to study what you think you want to do with our structure for the future. My children and my grandchildren need this structure, and the way you voted for it to possible come through could endanger the very structure of GTA Intergroup.

Wes then asked if the Floor would like to give the opportunity for other minority voices to speak; the Floor agreed.

Kevin M. (North Toronto): Earlier this evening, somebody made a comment to the effect of 'the spirit of service is dying'. What we have had at Intergroup for years is a problem which is emphasized in an old movie called 'Cool Hand Luke', which is we have a failure to communicate. That's been the problem all along. I got castigated over the years for putting TV spots on air for AA; I got castigated for starting the website; but you know what? Both of those things saved lives. Now the problem also is that the majority of the social fabric problems we are facing are that it is more 'stressed' in the 416 area. Therefore, the demands of an organization such as Intergroup servicing the

downtown core are far greater than those in the districts. Also, unfortunately, the districts through 'politics' export their problems to the 416 area. That therefore increases the stress...quite frankly; you don't want to throw out the baby with the bathwater. If it's working, keep it. The problem is getting people, and that is attraction.

Gord H. (Bloordale): I reiterate what Maire says. The people that voted for it: look carefully at what you've done. We even cut short something that was very important by calling the question. That shouldn't have happened. It wouldn't happen in other areas of AA. The misinformation I hear about the structure is astounding. I've been involved in the structure of AA for many years, and there seems to be a lot of misinformation. I find it amazing that this Motion went through. I would like to ask what – I guess this is for the committee – what is being sent out to the groups for the referendum? Look at it closely.

Mike C. (Beverly Hills): The last time the Operating Procedures were changed, I didn't and my group didn't get a Referendum. I'd like to know when the referendum vote will be sent out, and is it going to go out to all the groups in the GTA? Because this small representation [Intergroup Floor] certainly doesn't make up or count as the entire groups of the GTA.

Carol (Tuesday Night Disc.): Two questions: do we have a total of how many groups were here tonight? (Yes). Also, my group understands now that this has been voted on, that's it's going to go through to a Referendum, so the ad hoc committee is finished now, right? (Yes).

Wes: **Is there anyone who voted in the Majority wish to change their vote?** If so, then I will read you what we have to do: If after the Motion, the Minority has spoken, and if someone for the majority side wishes to change their vote, he/she may make a Motion to Reconsider. I see no one coming towards the microphone, **then, ladies and gentleman, the vote stands as it is.** My time here is over. Thank you.

Wes read the part of the Procedures that pertains to the Referendum process (Page 12, Section 11.3).

Reg thanked Wes for all his help at this meeting.

Lynn B. (City Central), ad hoc Chair: What's going to be sent out [to the groups] is the Motion you heard earlier, with two attachments to it, and a copy of the Procedures and Guidelines as it is now, and a copy of it as to what it would look like with the proposed changes.

Maire O'B. (Leslie): We voted to circulate this [the Motion], not this with attachments...

Bonnie (Newmarket): I'm not saying that I am correct, but my understanding of how this is read in the P & G is that what we are voting on is the Motion to Amend, and what needs to go out in two weeks to our groups is the actual proposed amendments that the Motion indicates. *Bonnie then cited section 11.2 of the P & G.*

Wes clarified: It says: *"If the Motion receives a simple majority, it [the Motion] will be forwarded to the groups to be decided by Referendum."* I think there's a line that everyone can walk. I think it's correct that adding something else to the actual Motion is incorrect, *but sending out more information* would be allowable. That is my *opinion*. It says, *"All proposed amendments to these procedures will be sent..."* [Tape change]...no one has made an amendment yet. My thinking would be it would be acceptable to send out this Motion as is, and then send another piece of paper showing the new wording or what the new wording of the Procedures would be. We are not talking about Guidelines first of all. [What would be sent out is] the new actual wording of the Procedures with this Motion to the groups. I don't know how to clarify it any more than that. It would be sent out to the groups within two weeks...I would guess that all groups that have an address listed at Intergroup would receive these...but that's for the amendments to the Procedures. So, everything that cannot fit on to the Schedule A [form] will have to be attached to Schedule A [in the P & G; it's one piece of paper].

Ray (Brampton New Life): I cannot for the life of me understand why somebody wouldn't want to see the present structure and the new structure attached to this. If it requires an amendment, so be it. We'll spend the night making amendments, I don't really care.

Gord H. (Bloordale): Wes, you've been on the Area Committee, so you will be familiar with this. If you look at the Procedures and they're talking about amendments to the Procedures, if you read Section 11, you passed a Motion here. This is supposedly the Motion that goes out for the Referendum. That's all. This in no way makes reference to the Operating Procedures. The Motion that should go out for a Referendum is the actual changes to the Operating Procedures. It's not part of the Motion. It can't go out; it's not part of the Motion. It doesn't follow the Intergroup Operating Procedures.

Fran (recording secretary): For those of you that we don't have e-mail addresses please e-mail us at [office@aatoronto.org](mailto:office@aatoronto.org) or [alex@aaatoronto.org](mailto:alex@aaatoronto.org). We want to make sure we have your e-mail addresses, or, if you want us to mail it to you, please call the office 416-487-5591.

Mike C. (Beverly Hills): All of the meetings that are listed in the Meeting Directory...they're not going to be contacted?

Wes: All the listings in the book are not groups. There are meetings, and there are groups. If you've been around AA, you'll know that there's a big difference. If Intergroup has their address (e-mail or mailing address) -- yes. If they don't, they can't.

Kevin M. (North Toronto): From the viewpoint of logic, Maire's right, Gord's right, and you're right. The original 3 pages [of the Motion] should go out...like shareholders in corporate situations, you could put an addendum memorandum afterward.

Wes: My understanding was it was just more information that went out with it. My understanding is that you can send more information out with it...but, perhaps you're right, it need only be this Motion on those 3 pages and any other information you want to send out as well as other pages.

---

Bill R. (Bellamy): Give that we've just voted to...I was against this, given that we voted to pass this, and already we're in trouble with this, I propose **a MOTION to rescind the previous vote**. Maire O'B. (Leslie) seconded the Motion. There was no discussion on this Motion. *Wes called for a show of hands. MOTION FAILED.*

---

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned with the Lord's Prayer.

**NEXT GENERAL MEETING: Tuesday, October 28 at 8 p.m. at Glebe Rd. United. ELECTIONS for the Operating Committee will held at this meeting.**