

North of England Short Mat Bowling Association

Annual General Meeting Held on Zoom 17/10/2022

Attendance

Chairman: Arthur Jackson, Treasurer: Michael Shaw, Secretary: Andrew Bebbington, League Secretary: Bill Burn, Competition Secretary: Andy Miles. Derbyshire: Rachel Cooper. Durham: Trevor Burns, Alan McCallum & Jean Rhodes. Humberside: Kath Fussey & John Fussey, Staffordshire: John Skelding. Stockport: Clint Crowther & John Pajak, West Yorkshire: Timothy Pearson & Janet Pearson. North Yorkshire: Rod Dawson, Roger Green & Jill and Joseph Newsome.

1. Apologies for Absence. Vice Chairman: Graham Stubbs

2. Chairman's Opening Remarks.

A. Jackson

The chairman briefly summarised the reason for holding the EGM and invited comments before the vote was taken.

3. Proposal to Amend Championship Rules.

Kath Fussey read a statement on behalf of Humberside in support of the proposed amendments.

Roger Green (North Yorks) gave a detailed explanation of the rationale for the proposed amendments.

Copies of both submissions are attached.

Following some discussion two votes were taken:

1. To amend Rule 4 to read:

“The competition is open to any player in any of the NESMBA counties/areas who has been registered with the ESMBA by 30 November in the current season”.

This was carried 18 votes for. 1 vote against.

2. To delete existing rule 5.

This was carried 18 votes for. 1 vote against.

4. Close of meeting

Meeting closed 8.10 pm

Kath Fussey Statement (Humberside)

Humberside were given an extra team in the 4s and the team which qualified were from a relatively new club and they enjoyed the North England championships and this gave them the confidence to now play for the county this season which is what our bowls family is about promoting and encouraging the game.

Some qualifiers may have difficulty getting a game in the county as there are less games with West Yorkshire B team withdrawing and the finals are in January not March

We should not Bar players from this competition as it is separate from the county competition and it would become elitist

Most counties constitution will have a part about promoting the game of bowls which we should all do.



North Yorkshire Short Mat Bowling Association

Founded in 1991 www.nysmba.co

Affiliated to the E.S.M.B.A

As far as I can remember there has never been an EGM called by the NESMBA before so I would like to assure all of you that the request for this meeting was not made lightly. As the largest member county, the limitations imposed by the change to Championship Rule 5 at this year's AGM probably affects us most of all and in the interest of all our members we felt we had no option but to seek this EGM. Our county thanks Humberside and Staffordshire for supporting our request.

The proposal to change Rule 5 was put forward by the Executive Committee and one of the reasons given was that (quote) ***"Multiple complaints were received at this years Championships.....about people bowling who had taken no part in the season"***.

Before we discussed this at our counties last committee meeting on Sep 6, I spoke with Andy Miles to try to get more details about these objections. However, he was unwilling to say who had made the complaints or how many there had actually been. He did mention however that Danny Langdon was the subject of one of the complaints.

At this point, I should point out that Danny was just one of SEVEN of our players at B Castle this year who had not played in any county games. For us, this is not unusual and over the years we have had many non-county players who have made it through our qualifying competition. We also have had to draw on non-county players as substitutes if the original qualifiers have had to drop out. These players have all been able to enjoy the opportunity of taking part in the Northern Championships.

We just cannot understand why there are some of you who have now decided that this a problem. I think you must agree that we are entitled to hear from anyone who holds this opinion and to hear their reasons why such a restriction should now be imposed.

Although the change to Rule 5 was passed by a vote of 13-6, we wonder if those voting for the change realised that consequently this has actually resulted in turning the NESMBA into an elitist organisation only interested in the minority of its members who are selected for their county teams. Is this not an unfair and discriminatory point of view? There are over 2000

players affiliated to the NESMBA, but only about 350 are members of county teams. What about the other 1700 odd? Don't they count anymore? Are they to be treated as 2nd class members? Why should they be banned from trying to qualify for B Castle?

At this point I would like to refer to a letter we received from one of our club Secretaries, Dave Herbert, several weeks ago. Although not a regular county team member, Dave has been to BC on several occasions, including last year and he was runner up in the Fours in 2017. His words illustrate the point just made.

I have also passed an email from Jill Newsome to Andrew/Arthur which she has asked to be considered at this meeting which also expresses a similar view to Dave's.

(As Jill was presents she was able to make her presentation verbally)

Surely, we should all be following the first objective of the NESMBA constitution and (quote) "**Promote and foster the game of SMB amongst member areas**". We consider this rule change does not do that and in fact it could deter people from trying to qualify.

Although comparisons are not always relevant, we are now a more restrictive body than the ESMBA. Entry into their National Championships is NOT restricted to players in their inter-county competition. It is a completely OPEN competition.

OUR PROPOSALS

We are therefore putting 2 proposals in front of this meeting which are intended to put right what we see as an injustice and to simplify the whole issue.

Our proposed change to Rule 4 would make it clear that **any** registered player in **any** of the NESMBA member areas can enter the Championships – nobody will be banned. (It will obviously remain up to each area how they select their own entrants.) This change makes the restrictions imposed by Rule 5 unnecessary, so we are also proposing that this Rule is deleted entirely.

Finally, although we recognise that the original change was passed democratically by a majority vote at the AGM, this meeting now has the opportunity to think again, support our proposals and remove this unfair restriction.

Letter from Dave Herbert to NYSMBA Management Committee (3/9/22)
(Only the highlighted para, were read out)

Having recently been made aware of the NESMBA decision that only players who have played 2 matches (4 games) for one of the County teams will be allowed to enter the Northern Championships, I feel I must put forward my personal view.

Having played Short Mat since 2010, one of the highlights of each season was the prospect of playing in the Northern Championships at Barnard Castle if I qualified via our own Championships. This opportunity has now been taken away from me unless I and fellow club members opt to play in the County teams.

Last season I played for NY on a couple of occasions, but this was just to help out when all 3 teams were playing on the same day. However, some of the players I usually enter the NY qualifiers with, in the Pairs, Triples and Fours do not wish to play in the County teams, so even if we did well and qualifiers we could not play in Northern Championships. We would still be allowed to play in the Nationals, which seems a little odd.

All players pay their NYSMBA membership fees which includes a portion going to the ESMBA and I presume some to the NESMBA. If the NESMBA is going to ban players from entering the Northern Championships who do not play for their County teams, I feel they are discriminating against the majority of NY members and also members from other areas who do not play in their area's teams.

All NY members (684 according to the last AGM) are affiliated to the NESMBA but only approximately 80 County players would be eligible for the Northern Championships, so my question would be why are the NESMBA discriminating against the other 600 plus members, can the NYSMBA do anything about the situation, and do the members affected need to be members of the NESMBA as they are getting no benefit from it

Email from Jill Newsome 16/10/22

As you are aware, Joseph and I are away and are unsure of whether we we will be able to get into the EGM tomorrow evening.

However, I would like to make representation to the attendees so would be grateful if you could forward this to the NESMBA secretary for consideration by those present.

I would like everyone to consider the position of those players who, for no fault of their own are unable to take up places in the county team so are not able to play in the NESMBA league Championships. Fortunately, my son David, a former NESMBA singles winner and someone who has featured in many finals since and who absolutely loves the individual Championship finals, has already played in one league county match - but this could have been a very different story.

His normal working week is Sunday to Friday which means he can only play on a Saturday; he cannot take holiday in term times and the staffing levels do not allow for shift swapping. North Yorkshire did try to fix matches for Saturdays but it would seem other counties are unable to play on Saturdays. David cannot now play another county game until he breaks for Christmas. The new ruling would not only make it difficult for Dave to fulfil requirements, but it also means that those of us who wish to play with him are also penalised - why should we have to play with other people when we want to play with our son/brother/husband/friend just because he is seemingly being sacrificed for an unreasonable rule? This is of course, merely an illustration of how it affects one member/family/club but there are numerous similar instances I'm sure across all our clubs.

We also have sympathy for those members who do play league county matches but who wish to involve their club members in their county championship bid. This will only lead to a decrease in entries across all the counties who do actually play for their place at the finals. If we had to choose our finals representatives, we feel this could only be divisive and detrimental to short Mat bowls not only in our county but across the north.

The main question is - what is achieved by the new rule? It simply goes against the ethos of our association, which is to promote, not discourage, people from taking part in short mat.

NORTHERN ENGLAND SHORT MAT BOWLING ASSOCIATION

INDIVIDUAL CHAMPIONSHIP RULES

Rules as amended 17 October 2022 shown in red

.....

1. In all disciplines skips will only be allowed to visit the head once per end (staying at the head will count as 1 visit) apart from the Fours when NO visits will be allowed.
2. In all disciplines only the skip and one other team member will be allowed on the mat at one time to discuss play.
3. If the jack is knocked off the side of the mat the non-defaulting side will be awarded two shots and the end considered complete. However, if the above happens on the last end the non-defaulting side will have the choice of re-playing the end.
4. The competition is open to any player in any of the NESMBA counties/areas who has been registered with the ESMBA by 30 November in the current season.
5. Substitutes may be submitted prior to the competition, provided the NESMBA Competition Secretary has been notified either in writing or by telephone - before the competition commences.
6. Once a substitute has played, the original player(s) may take no further part in the event (discipline). However, if a substitute has not yet played then the original player(s) may return to play.
7. A substituted player or one who has already played in the event cannot subsequently act as a substitute in the same event.
8. Substitutes may be made during the actual competition (due to illness etc.) so long as the player substituting has not played in that discipline already.

The Association shall play to the Laws of the Game as laid down by the ESMBA unless varied in the above Rules.

NOTE THAT ALL RULES ARE SUBJECT TO REVISION BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SHOULD THE NEED ARISE OR BY PROPOSAL TO AN AGM.

Ref: NESMBA INDIVIDUAL CHAMPIONSHIP RULES 15