Constitutional Amendment proposed by AGW (formerly AFGW) in opposition to Constitutional Amendment 1 from the GWI Board:

*That the following words be inserted as clause 12 of Article X (Financial Resources and Dues): Changes to the purposes or use of restricted funds require the approval of a two-thirds majority vote of the General Assembly.*

**Statement in Support**

*Common usage describes a restricted fund as having two essential features: 1: A **restricted fund** is a reserve of money that can only be used for specific purposes and 2: **Restricted funds** provide reassurance to donors that their contributions are used in a manner they have chosen.*

*In its past practice IFUW/GWI has relied on the specification of particular purposes for Fellowships, Bina Roy and Hegg Hoffet and the soliciting of donations to further those purposes as defining them as restricted funds and they have been recognised as specific entities in the accounting procedures. It is imperative GWI continues to do so.*

*The proposed constitutional amendment 1 from the Board, while accepting that Fellowships, Hegg Hoffet and Bina Roy are “restricted funds” effectively undermines any meaningful definition of that term by ignoring the crucial word “only” proposing that they can be used for other purposes.*

*The proposal totally fails to recognise the significance of the second point cited above –that these funds were set up by the vote of the membership and come from gifts, donations, bequests and fundraising efforts from members. Acceptance of these funds by GWI can and should be regarded as an implied contract with the membership that the funds will be used only for the purposes described. The funds do not belong to the Board or the Finance Committee –they belong to the membership and any change in their purpose and use must require the consent of the membership, which can only be given through a vote of the General Assembly.*

*That this principle was not respected during the triennium 2013-16 was regrettable but may perhaps in the circumstance be accepted silently. Such silence must not, however, be translated into authorisation to carry mistaken practice into the future.*