

21/4/90

Conference & Elections Committee Report

*Rejected*

Re Para 7 Motions The CEC's decision not to accept the NCROPA's properly submitted motion is quite outrageous. I do not accept the reasons given by the CEC for its rejection in any way. THE motion is fully "self-standing" and "fully understandable in its own right". The legal advice referred to in the motion is clearly defined within the wording of the motion, which is that Motion 24 on the Agenda of last year's AGM was ultra vires the NCCL's CONSTITUTION AND Rules. Nothing could be clearer than that.

*And* If this is the test - "self-standing" and "fully understandable in its own right" - the ~~CEC~~ have applied, why has it not then rejected motion 4? I'm sure the vast majority of the membership have absolutely no idea of what the Schengen and Trevi processes are?

Motion 9 doesn't make clear who Carole Richardson, Patrick Armstrong, Paul Hill and Gerald Conlon are, what they were convicted of or what they have been released from. To those who don't know, this motion is not "Self-standing" and "understandable in its own right". Why has the CEC accepted it?

In motion 17 some might not know what is meant by "the South African BOSS", yet it has not been rejected.

*Some* And also in the interests of consistency, why has the CEC also accepted Emergency Motion 1 which refers to "the implications of the Le Vay Report for the administration of justice in magistrates courts". I know nothing about this report and I'll bet few here do either. It certainly isn't "fully understandable IN ITS OWN RIGHT". Why then has it too not been rejected, as the NCROPA's has been?

Furthermore in ~~the~~ <sup>its</sup> report, the cec has <sup>not</sup> given ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> NCROPA's submitted motion in full, because it also ~~included the wording in full of that last year's motion 24.~~ included the wording in full of that last year's motion 24. The CEC HAS ~~not~~ DISHONESTLY OMITTED IT. ~~They~~ <sup>It</sup> has also left out another reason ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> gave for refusing the NCROPA motion. Let me quote from the letter NCROPA received from the CEC's Chair dated 15th December DECEMBER. He wrote:-

"Your motion, however, refers ... etc.... to ..... your motion" The clear and arrogant inference of the CEC is that you, the members, of this meeting here present, would not be competent to understand the <sup>NCROPA</sup> motion and decide whether or not you wished to support it. You are not, apparently, even competent to debate it in this supposedly democratic forum, the forum of an organisation purportedly dedicated to openness, freedom and liberty. That reason, which is so outrageously insulting to yourselves and which the CEC <sup>has</sup> ~~has~~ ALSO conveniently omitted from their report, is furthermore totally irrelevant to the valid acceptability or otherwise by the CEC of this or, indeed, any motion submitted to it to be put before the AGM - even if it does think all NCCL's members are a bunch of imbeciles. My view is that <sup>the CEC's</sup> ~~the~~ rejection of the NCROPA's motion

is a hugely biased decision deliberately intended to prevent this fundamental issue from being discussed and I ask this AGM to reverse it and thus allow the NCROPA motion to be fairly and properly aired.

Re Para 8 - AMENDMENTS

Sub para 8.3 - As I've <sup>just</sup> pointed out the CEC has quite unjustifiably refused the NCROPA's properly submitted motion, but here admits that its amendment to motion 14 "makes the same point". Why has the CEC therefore allowed this amendment when it refused the NCROPA's own motion which was, of course, tabled way back in December last year, long before it could possibly even know about motion 14? What sort of logic is that?

Sub para 8.4 - The CEC maintains that the amendments tabled by the NCROPA to motions 11 and 20 were "wrecking motions". Motion 11 should never have been accepted because it refers to an NCCL policy which doesn't legally exist, i.e. based on the monstrously authoritarian claptrap incorporated in last year's AGM motion, motion 24, which, as I've already been desperately trying to hammer home <sup>and as on campus have confirmed</sup>, was ultra vires the NCCL's Constitution and Rules.

Motion 20 should also never have been accepted because (a) it is not a simple motion but a constitutional amendment, which would, incidentally overturn a constitutional amendment properly made at last year's AGM and subsequently voted for by the membership as a whole, as the rules require. - and (b) it duplicates Motion 3.

However, notwithstanding that these motions 11 and 20 are quite out-of-order, since when has the criterion that a wrecking amendment is not allowed been applied to NCCL's AGMs? At the 1988 AGM at Buxton the NCROPA tabled a motion (motion 16) adversely criticising the NCCL's administration. The then Executive Committee put down an amendment, which the then CEC happily accepted, substituting congratulations for this adverse criticism - a wrecking amendment if ever there was one. When one member, Mark ? challenged the acceptance of such an amendment he was told to shut up and sit down. So please don't let's have any self-righteous talk from the CEC of that kind.