

Cape

Housing Policy

By Nick de Jager

At the AGM of the Cape Bar, held on Thursday, 18 April 2013, a new housing policy was adopted. The importance of an appropriate and effective housing policy derives principally from the fact that all members of the Bar are required to keep chambers, but also in view of the facts that all chambers are centrally administered and allocated; the appropriate allocation of chambers is an effective means of stimulating and supporting race and gender transformation at the Bar; transformation of the Bar requires further and constant

attention; and allocations can play an important role in assisting new members to establish sustainable practices.

The Cape Bar's previous housing policy had, as its primary criterion, seniority, subject to a transformation exception. That is, while housing allocations would principally be determined by seniority, the Housing Committee was vested with a discretion to override seniority in cases where the transformation objectives of the Bar could be promoted.

The process of revising the housing policy was a consultative one, in which feedback and suggestions were invited and received from individual members and from committees and interest groups. A considerable amount of 'fact-finding' and analysis was also undertaken, to understand how members are spread (with regard to

factors such as gender, race, seniority and so forth) across the seven buildings under the Cape Bar's control. In the light of the foregoing, and the transformation imperatives of the Cape Bar, it was felt that the housing policy should be revised, both procedurally and substantively.

The new housing policy elevates transformation to a substantive criterion in its own right, and seniority, instead of being the primary criterion, is considered on an equal footing together with other criteria, including the cohesion of the Bar, the financial implications of the allocation of chambers to a particular member and the views of the members on the floor concerned. On a final note, the continued existence of so-called 'suites' is retained, and provision is made for the sharing of chambers. **A**

Cricket at the Cape Bar – 2012/2013 Season Review*

By LJ Smit

The 2012/2013 cricket season at the Cape Bar was relatively short in that it saw only two friendly matches. The match against the Navy did not materialise, not for lack of effort to arrange it on our part, and our proposed tour up north to play the Johannesburg and Pretoria Bar sides was hamstrung due to our players' lack of availability.

The first match of the season took place on 2 December 2012 when the Bar Cricketers took on Western Province Cricket Club (WPCC) in our annual match.

The match was played at the Vineyard Oval in Claremont, in a howling north-wester. WPCC graciously gave us the toss and since Attie Heyns and Roy Gordon were all fired up to bowl we put our opponents in to bat first. Unfortunately for us, our opponents had decided to make ample use of the cricketing talents that formed part of their club's junior brigade and they batted aggressively from the outset, scoring around 20 runs from the first two overs. Things did not get much better when Curtis Fourie came to the crease and proceeded to score a well-crafted and unbeaten century. Our bowlers however picked themselves up and with good attacking bowling from Attie Heyns (2 for 37 off 6 overs) and Ross Garland (1 for 31 off 6 overs) we managed to restrict WPCC to a score of 203.



Cape Bar team that played ENS. Back row from left to right: Nolan Faber, LJ Smit, Anwar Albertus, Peter Coston, Rob Acton, Jan Buurman, Judge Lee Bozalek, Dave Melunsky. Front row from left to right: Joel Krige (Captain), Roy Gordon. Absent from picture – Darryl Cook.

Although our chase started slowly, as we scored only around 20 runs off the first 10 overs, we slowly improved and we reached 60 runs by drinks. Jan Buuman played delicately and patiently and proceeded to top score with 41 runs. After drinks Peter Coston surprised all by letting loose with some lofty attacking strokes to get us back into the game but we still regularly lost wickets. However our hope was kindled and we were still in the game

when we got it down to requiring 36 runs of 24 balls. But still it was not to be when we were eventually bowled out for 183, just 20 runs short with 10 balls to go. We chided ourselves that we started our run chase to slow during the first ten overs but we still put in a valiant effort, albeit that we left too much for too late.

Despite the hard-fought match and after the last ball had been bowled, the teams sat down, in the spirit of the game, enjoyed

* This report is largely derived from the match reports authored by Joel Krige.