

Minutes of the Business Meeting
The Rusty Anchor, Boothbay, Maine, 6 May 1978

President Barbara Welsh called the meeting to a semblance of order at about 1215. Appropriate expressions of gratitude were rendered to the Bigelow Laboratory and the staff of the Rusty Anchor. The reports of the Secretary and Treasurer were read and accepted.

Barbara Welsh reported on the ERF Governing Board meeting, and on the imminent formation of a west coast Estuarine Research Society.

Bob Radulski reported on the status of Estuaries, and pleaded for subscribers. He noted that there were now 900 subscribers, and that 500 more were needed for Estuaries to break even. The time from acceptance until publication of a manuscript is now about one year, but this could be shortened to six months if more subscriptions were sold and the number of pages per year were increased.

Barbara Welsh stated that AERS had voted against making subscriptions to Estuaries a part of the dues package, but had made a small grant from their treasury, and had added \$2.50 to registration fees, to help support the journal.

Bob noted that about \$12,000 was needed, so AERS contribution was minor, and then made yet another pitch for subscriptions. He also pointed out, in response to queries, that the selling of advertising was too expensive for the returns, and that over 60% of all authors now pay optional page charges of \$30 per page.

Doug Tolderlund averred that a 10% surcharge on the bar bill would be a substantial aid. Pat Hughes suggested, for discussion only, that NEERS make subscriptions mandatory. There was little support for this position.

Mike Mazurkiewicz expressed joy at the new look of the ERF Newsletter, which praise was blushinglly acknowledged by Bob Radulski, Editor.

Mike Dadswell commented on Canadian estuarine activities, and bemoaned the lack of a Canadian estuarine research organization. His tentative offer of the St. Andrews lab as possible host for the spring 1979 meeting was accepted.

No firm commitment to host the fall 1978 meeting was forthcoming, but Jay Moore offered to coordinate things at MBL should we wish to go there. The decision was left in the hands of the executive committee.

Dave Dean proposed that the constitution be amended so that someone other than the President could conduct a meeting, should the President be unable to do so. Barbara charged the executive committee with this stint also.

Bernie McAlice read a letter he had written to Mike Castagna, ERF President, protesting the Governing Board's support of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. A copy of the letter is appended to these minutes. Barbara Welsh made an eloquent defense of the Governing Board's action, pointing out in particular that it had been taken under the aegis of the education mandate in the ERF constitution. She stated that the decision had been reached after much soul searching, and that even if the NEERS membership disapproved of the action it would be inappropriate for us to break with ERF because of this.

A lengthy discussion followed. During the debate, discussants largely avoided taking positions on the value of, or the need for, the particular amendment to the U.S. Constitution, but adhered to consideration of the Governing Board's decision in terms of proper construction of the constitutions of ERF and NEERS. The sense of the discourse was clearly that ERF and NEERS should not take official positions on political questions. It was equally clear that there was some lack of unanimity on the propriety of the Governing Board's action in the issue at hand. The 60 members present were about evenly divided between those supporting and those condemning that action. Argument was finally terminated by an ovation expressing the confidence of the membership in President Welsh and in our other spokesmen at ERF, John Tietjen and Bob Radulski.

Our representatives to ERF were charged to ask the Governing Board to establish clear guidelines for any future actions which might be construed as political.

The meeting was adjourned at 1315, sine die and sine deo.

Respectfully submitted,



Bernard J. McAlice
Secretary

Mr. Michael Castagna
May 1, 1978
page 2

The ERF Governing Board is being a body competent to speak on questions of constitutional law.

I regard the recent action of the Board as an unbecomingly
abuse of the authority vested in it by the constitution. If the Board
attempts to be used in the past or future to control the
affairs of the national scientific society at large, I believe
that those who wish to make financial contributions to such
purposes, including at the ERFNE business meeting on Saturday
Mr. Michael Castagna, President
Estuarine Research Federation
Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences
Wackapreague, Virginia 23480

1 May 1978

Dear Mike:

I think that your open letter to ERF members in the recent
Newsletter, explaining the Governing Board's action on the so-called
Equal Rights Amendment, was a well-reasoned attempt to control a
situation having great potential danger for ERF. The Purpose of
Organization as set forth in the ERF Constitution and By-Laws is very
clear:

"Said organization is organized as a non-profit society and shall
be operated exclusively for educational purposes and limited to those
purposes. The objects shall be to promote research in estuarine and
coastal waters, to promote communication between members of affiliated
societies (newsletters, journals), to conduct biennial meetings and
to be available as a source of advice in matters concerning estuaries
and the coastal zone."

The Constitution of NEERS is also clear:

"The purpose of this organization shall be to bring together persons
actively engaged in research on estuarine and coastal problems for
informal discussion. Said organization ... shall be operated exclusively
for educational purposes."

The desirability of passage of the ERA is a political and legal
problems. Those favoring its defeat felt that the rights of women are
adequately protected by the U.S. Constitution as it now exists, and
as it is now construed, ~~and would hardly~~ those favoring passage disagree,
and desire a clear constitutional statement of female equality. There
is no way in which support of or opposition to this amendment can be
construed as falling within the educational purposes of either ERF or
NEERS. Even if it were so construed, one would hardly characterize

Mr. Michael Castagna
May 1, 1978
page 2

the ERF Governing Board as being a body competent to speak on questions of constitutional law.

I regard the recent action of the Board as an unconscionable abuse of the authority vested in it by the membership. If ERF dues are going to be used in the pursuit of partisan political goals, members of the regional societies should at least have a choice of whether or not they wish to make financial contributions to such pursuit. Accordingly, at the NEERS business meeting on Saturday, 6 May 1978, I shall propose an amendment to the Constitution of NEERS making membership in ERF optional, and not a requirement for membership in NEERS.

I take this action reluctantly, not from any desire to embarrass ERF, but simply to preserve the constitutional integrity and scientific purpose of NEERS.

I think that your recent letter to ERF members in the recent newsletter, explaining the Governing Board's action on the so-called Equal Rights Amendment, was a well-reasoned attempt to control a situation having great potential benefit for ERF. The Purpose of Organization was set forth in the ERF Constitution. The Board is very

Best regards,

Bernard J. McAlice

BJM/11

cc: Barbara Welsh

"This organization is organized as a non-profit society and shall actively for educational purposes and shall have the following purposes: The objects shall be to promote research in chemistry and related matters, to provide communication between members of affiliated societies (institutions, journals), to conduct biennial meetings and to be available as a source of advice in matters concerning education and related areas."

The Constitution of NEERS is also clear:

"The purpose of this organization shall be to bring together persons actively engaged in research on a routine and normal problem for internal discussion. Said organization ... shall be operated exclusively for educational purposes."

The desirability of passage of the ERA is a political and legal problem. Those favoring the draft feel that the rights of women are adequately protected by the U.S. Constitution as it now exists, and as it is now construed. Those favoring passage disagree, and desire a clear constitutional statement of female equality. There is no way in which support of or opposition to this amendment can be construed as falling within the educational purposes of either ERF or NEERS. Even if it were so construed, one would hardly characterize