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| Novice Teams | C/F | Set 1 | Set 2 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TUCKEY <br> Jillian Tuckey - Rozanne Thomas - Denis Moody - Monty Dale | 0.5 | 37 | 27 | $\mathbf{6 4 . 5}$ |
| BALKIN <br> Kevin Balkin - Pauline Balkin - Hope Tomlinson - Barry Foster |  | 4 | 35 | $\mathbf{3 9}$ |

## THE FINALS

Following the completion of the Quarter Finals and Semi Finals today the Finals Today will be fought out between the Hirst and Noble Teams.

| Quarter Finals |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Team | C/F | Set 1 | Set 2 | Total |
| HIRST <br> Bill Hirst - Andrew Hirst - Howard Melbourne - Michelle Brunner - John Holland |  | 50 | 27 | 77 |
| HANS <br> Sartaj Hans - Hugh McGann - Michael Ware - Geo Tislevoll | 0.5 | 30 | 33 | 63.5 |
| Team | C/F | Set 1 | Set 2 | Total |
| NOBLE <br> Barry Noble - Ishmael Del'Monte - Ashley Bach - Martin Reid - Tom Jacob | 0.5 | 26 | 48 | 74.5 |
| TRAVIS <br> Barbara Travis - Fiona Brown - David Appleton - Peter Reynolds |  | 18 | 0 | 18 |


| Semi-Finals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Team | C/F | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | Set 4 | Total |
| HIRST <br> Bill Hirst - Andrew Hirst - Howard Melbourne - Michelle Brunner - John Holland |  | 16 | 30 | 15 | 11 | 72 |
| IMANUEL <br> Belly Imanuel - Tommy Rogi - Mahkota Ananda - Octavianus Wohon | 0.5 | 16 | 1 | 22 | 28 | 67.5 |
| Team | C/F | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | Set 4 | Total |
| NOBLE <br> Barry Noble - Ishmael Del'Monte - Ashley Bach - Martin Reid - Tom Jacob |  | 8 | 14 | 33 | 18 | 73 |
| NEILL <br> Bruce Neill - Richard Jedrychowski - Paul Lavings - Robert Krochmalik | 0.5 | 14 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 39.5 |

## COUNTING THE WAY THEY DO ELSEWHERE

Utilising the US system of counting number of tables in play per session, and assuming Saturday this year equals Saturday last year here is our year on year comparison for the past six Gold Coast Congresses - this year up 16.6\% on last year.

|  | Sat | Sun | Mon | Tue | Wed | Thu | Fri | Sat |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Day 1 | Day 2 | Day 3 | Day 4 | Day 5 | Day 6 | Day 7 | Day 8 | Total |
| 2006 | 81 | 578 | 574 | 1072 | 1557 | 1544 | 792 | 61 | 6259 |
| 2007 | 72 | 574 | 572 | 1096 | 1585 | 1576 | 490 | 239 | 6204 |
| 2008 | 83 | 598 | 594 | 1167 | 1684 | 1672 | 552 | 196 | 6546 |
| 2009 | 98 | 569 | 568 | 1096 | 1579 | 1568 | 488 | 169 | 6135 |
| 2010 | 622 | 620 | 310 | 1584 | 1515 | 1348 | 460 | 168 | 6627 |
| 2011 | 694 | 694 | 346 | 1744 | 1760 | 1744 | 579 | 168 | 7729 |

# THE GOLD COAST CONGRESS - A FURTHER RECOLLECTION 

Memories From a Past Era - Richard Grenside, CTD 1977 to 2003?
My first time at the congress was as a player in 1976, the venue was The Chevron Hotel, long since gone. It was at this tournament that I confirmed everybody's suspicion that my bridge prowess left a lot to be desired and thereafter, I took on the role of Chief Tournament Director from lan McKinnon who had decided to hang up his boots after a very successful time in this position.
1977 was an experience! Those in the 'Team’ included George Cuppaidge, Ivy Dahler, Jan Kirk, Reg Busch and Joan McPheat.

Back in these dark ages, scoring was done by hand and boards shuffled and dealt in the Teams, written bidding was in its infancy and, with Benson \& Hedges as the major sponsor, smoking was part and parcel of the congress. Everybody smoked, if only to see the smiles of the B \& H hostesses who roamed the room offering up their wares to all and sundry!
The most prestigious event was the men versus the women swimming race in the hotel pool. Unknown to the women, the men had a flying fish who astounded everybody by taking out the gold medal - Bobby Richman, who would have thought?
The barometer final of the pairs was displayed on a large board with elastic bands that showed the scores relative to zero while the matchpoints were calculated with +12 as a top, zero as average and -12 as a bottom. The aim being to stay positive. This form of scoring was new to me as both CTD and Chief Scorer, however after a couple of rounds it became second nature and was very easy to cross check as zero was the balancing figure.
The Pairs table numbers were in the seventies whilst the teams reach the dizzy heights of eighty plus. Who would have thought that in 2011 the table numbers would be around 430.
The main players were the great partnership of Tim Seres and Mary McMahon who dominated the prize list year after year. Their seating position of North/South at table one was a tradition which continued for the next 20+ years.
My other foible was to give Team number 4 slot to Alan Walsh, Val Cummings, Wally Scott and Liz Havas as this foursome was always amongst the leaders winning the event in 1981, 1983 and 1986.

The teams were scored by a card system, noting opponents, match result and running total for each team. At the conclusion of each round the cards were ranked and pairings for the next round made ensuring that teams has not previously met.
The Teams final was on Bridgerama, a large contraption with light bulbs that turned on and off to show the cards played. Talk about the ark, this piece of machinery would be a museum piece today.
The final event was The Chevron Cup which, in spite of changing venues, kept its name into the 2000's. Rumour has it that one of the conditions of entry was that you played with the person you slept with the night before. Totally untrue of course but it made for some interesting observations!
Tickets to the final dinner dance have always been eagerly sought and, as is likely in 2011, the QBA puts on a great night. For those here for the first time I recommend you book early, as tickets do sell out.

1978 (or was 1979) the Queensland electricity workers decided to go on strike and ban the use of all electrical appliances including lifts, air conditioning and lighting. As most of the interstate players stayed at either Waterways or Condor Apartments, the walk up and down 15-25 flights of stairs was arduous to say the least. Playing times were changes to daylight hours and all doors were left open to try to get an airflow to cool the venue down. Half way through the tournament, one of the union officials came to inspect electricity usage and I (jokingly) invited him to address the players!
By 1980 the numbers reach the magical 100 mark. With the Chevron Hotel having passed its sell by date and scheduled for demolition, a move to another venue was necessary.
Computer scoring was in its infancy and all credit must go to Joan McPheat who pioneered the use of computers to run the events. Whilst players today would consider the output archaic, the advance in player benefits were immeasurable with the TD staff relieved of the pressure of scoring by hand.

Dealing machines were a decade away and all duplicated boards were dealt by hand. Even in those days, when you consider the requirement of the two sessions of Pairs Qualifying, three sessions of barometer finals, the physical number of duplicated boards ran into the thousands. Duplicated boards for the teams did not
occur until the late 90's when dealing machines came into use. In 2011, the number of duplicated boards will exceed twenty five thousand.

When you consider that the Gold Coast Congress is the largest bridge event in the Southern hemisphere and one of the largest in the world, it outperforms many of the major events around the world who still shuffle and deal boards in both Pairs and Teams events.

## TEAMS DAY 3, MATCH 9 <br> John Carruthers

With qualification for the top six places up for grabs, I decided to watch the Neill v. Hans teams in Match 9. They were running second and fourth, respectively, at the time. The top two teams after 12 matches go directly to the semi-finals, whilst third through sixth play quarterfinals, the third-place team choosing its opponent.

| Dealer: North <br> Vul: None Brd 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 104 \\ & \vee K Q \end{aligned}$ |  | West <br> Jedrychowski | North Hans | East <br> Neill | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - AK 85 |  |  | 1NT 2V[1] |  | 3 Y [2] |  |
|  | \& A 10974 |  | Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4 |  |
| ヘ9762 |  | A A 5 | Pass | 4 | Pass | 5\% |  |
| $\checkmark 973$ |  | - J 8642 | Pass | 5 | Pass |  | // |
| -1097 |  | - J | West | North | East | South |  |
| \& 862 |  | ¢ K Q J 53 | - | 4 | - | 4 | NT |
|  | AKQJ83 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 105 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - Q 6432 | 1. Hearts + minor | - | 6 | - | 6 | - |
|  | \& --- | 2. Stayman | - |  | - | 2 |  |

4V was a cue bid agreeing diamonds and Hugh McGann took the push to the very good slam. This won them a surprise 13 IMPs when Paul Lavings-Robert Krochmalik at the other table had a bidding mix up to rest in part-score.

| Dealer: East | AKJ5 2 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\checkmark 4$ |  | Jedrychowski | Hans | Neill | McGann |
| Brd 2 | -J9873 |  |  |  | Pass | 1\% |
|  | \& A 102 |  | Pass | 2\% | Pass | $2 \vee$ |
| ^1098 |  | ^ Q 6 | Pass | 4^ | All Pass |  |
| $\bullet 762$ |  | - J 109 |  |  |  |  |
| - A 54 |  | -1062 | Ware | Lavings | Tislevoll | Krochmalik |
| \&9873 |  | \&KQJ65 |  |  | Pass | 148 |
|  | A A 743 |  | Pass | 1A | 24. | $4 \%$ |
|  | - AKQ853 |  | Pass | 4* | All Pass |  |
|  | - KQ |  |  |  |  |  |

This time, both sides avoided the rather poor six-spade contract reached at many other tables. Sartaj Hans made 12 tricks by dropping the spade queen offside doubleton - Hans 14-Neill 0
After winning five more IMPs for extra undertricks, Hans led 19-0 when...


Bruce Neill must have come close to a record by holding six stoppers in the enemy suit. In a stronf-club-based system, a one-diamond opener often has clubs, so Hugh McGann unerringly led a fourth-best club. Bruce Neill was thus faced with an almost-impossible problem. He needed to retain the club ace as an entry to hand for
the long diamonds, so he put up dummy's queen of clubs at trick one. When this was covered by the king, he had no chance even though the defence went a bit astray, allowing declarer access to the diamonds, but still, it was still plus 50 .

At the other table, it was well judged, if a bit lucky to declare three no-trump from West. The only way to beat it was for North to lead the club king or a high spade and shift to the club king, to knock out the entry to the diamonds. The defence still must be accurate, winning the first diamond and not allowing declarer to enter dummy with the spade ten. It was all a bit double dummy and when Lavings-Krochmalik did not find the defence it was another 10 IMPs to Hans, now leading 29-0.

Board 6 was a routine push in three no-trump. On Board 7 Hans-McGann pushed Neill-Jedrychowski a trick higher than their counterparts to win another 3 IMPs for an extra undertrick. Then...

| Dealer: West | A AK54 |  | West <br> Jedrychowski | North <br> Hans | East <br> Neill | South <br> McGann |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | -K 85 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 8 | -1073 |  | Pass | $1 \diamond[1]$ | Pass | 119 |
|  | \& J 107 |  | Pass | 2A | Pass | Pass |
| A 1083 |  | A 6 | Pass |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 1097$ |  | - AQ6 3 | [1] Playing Strong Club Could be short |  |  |  |
| - A 985 |  | -KJ642 |  |  |  |  |
| \& AK 8 |  | \& 543 | Ware | Lavings | Tislevoll | Krochmalik |
|  | AQJ972 |  | 1* | Pass | 10 | Pass |
|  | -J42 |  | 1NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ [1] | Pass |
|  | - Q |  | 30 | Pass | 4 | All Pass |
|  | \& Q 962 |  | [1] Inv inte | ded as | interpret |  |

Observe the contrast in styles: with neither side vulnerable, Jedrychowski as West passed his three-quicktrick, four-triple-three, nine-loser, 11-HCP hand, whereas Michael Ware opened the bidding. Sartaj Hans opened his similar, but not even as good hand as North. The net result was that the Neill team never got into the auction at either table!

At the first table, McGann made two spades for plus 110 when nothing untoward happened. At the second table, the lucky lie of the cards meant that four hearts was also cold! On spade leads, declarer could ruff the second spade and cross to dummy with a club to run the $\boldsymbol{\vee 1 0}$ to South. Then he discarded his club loser on the third spade and could ruff the next spade in dummy and repeat the heart finesse. There was one more precaution he needed to take. Can you see it? After drawing trumps, when you lead a diamond to the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$, yu must unblock the $\vee 8$ and $\downarrow 9$ under the king and jack to allow you to cash the $\downarrow 6-4$. Another 11 IMPs to Hans, now leading 43-0. The Neill team finally got on the scoreboard on Board 9:

| Dealer: North | AK982 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark$ J 96 |  | Jedrychowski | Hans | Neill | McGann |
| Brd 9 | -1084 |  |  | Pass | 1* | 1NT |
|  | \& 1062 |  | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| A Q 104 |  | A J 5 |  |  |  |  |
| - K 1053 |  | - A 874 | Ware | Lavings | Tislevoll | Krochmalik |
| - 96 |  | - A Q J 75 |  | Pass | 1* | 1NT |
| *A953 |  | - 74 | Double | Pass | Pass | Pass |
|  | A A 763 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | -K32 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \& K Q J 8 |  |  |  |  |  |

Again Jedrychowski was conservative, passing McGann's one no-trump overcall, whereas the Ware-Tislevoll style is hyper-aggressive and Michael Ware doubled Robert Krochmalik on the same auction. The defence can take seven tricks against one no-trump, but neither West led his partner's suit, so the declarers made plus 90 and plus 180 respectively. That was 3 IMPs to Neill, 43-3 down.
On Board 10, Neill won 2 IMPs for extra overtricks in a routine three notrump, now behind 43-5.
On Board 11, the aggressive style of the Hans team again proved superior to the conservative style of the Neill team when they were allowed to play two hearts at one table and three diamonds at the other, both making plus 110 to bring in another 6 IMPs. Hans 49-Neill 5 . Board 12 featured yet more aggressive bidding from the Hans team:

| Dealer: West | A J 2 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\checkmark 1087$ |  | Jedrychowski | Hans | Neill | McGann |
| Brd 12 | - A 10932 |  | 1NT | Pass | Pass | 2\&[1] |
|  | \& 875 |  | Pass | $2 V$ | Pass | Pass |
| A Q 643 |  | A 875 | Pass |  |  |  |
| - K Q 9 |  | - J 63 | [1] Both Maj | ajors |  |  |
| -KQ54 |  | - J 76 |  |  |  |  |
| \& A 6 |  | \& Q 432 | Ware | Lavings | Tislevoll | Krochmalik |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A AK } 109 \\ & \vee \text { A } 52 \end{aligned}$ |  | 1NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |
|  | -8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \& K J 109 |  |  |  |  |  |

Hans made two hearts, playing safely by allowing East-West to score three trump winners, plus 110.
At the other table, Ware was allowed to declare 1 NT and made it with the unlucky (for the defence) $\$ 10$ lead and both high spade honours onside. That was 5 further IMPs to Hans, leading 54-5 now.

Board 13 was a routine four-spade contract with 11 tricks and no chance to make fewer or more. Board 14 was rather more exciting...

| Dealer: East | $\text { A } 964$ |  | West Jedrychowski | North Hans | East <br> Neill | South McGann |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 14 | - KQ |  |  |  | Pass | 1**[1] |
|  | \& 1064 |  | $4 \%$ | Pass | 5\% | 5 |
| A Q |  | AJ8752 | Pass! | Pass | Pass |  |
| $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$ |  | - J10832 | [1] Strong Artificial and Forcing |  |  |  |
| \& AK Q 832 |  | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \& J 75 | Ware | Lavings | Tislevoll | Krochmalik |
|  | A AK103 |  |  |  | Pass | $1 *$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ AQ |  | 2* | Pass | Pass | 24 |
|  | -AJ10765 |  | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

At this table, Richard Jedrychowski and Bruce Neill bid aggressively to five clubs before Hugh McGann had had a chance to describe his hand. He tried five diamonds and everyone was content with that. Jedrychowski led two high clubs to force declarer. McGann ruffed the second club and cashed a high spade, noting the fall of the queen. When he led a diamond to dummy next and Bruce Neill (East) showed out, McGann knew that West was either $2=0=5=6$ or $1=1=5=6$.

If West is $2=0=5=6$, declarer needs him to hold the queen-jack doubleton of spades. In that case, he could draw trumps, cash the other high spade dropping the jack, travel to dummy with the spade nine and take the then-marked heart finesse for an overtrick. If West is $1=1=5=6$, declarer cannot make his contract, since East guards the spades and will keep his third club for the setting trick.
When McGann drew a second trump and took a heart finesse, Jedrychowski won and played another club, claiming down four! Minus 200 North-South. At the other table, Krochmalik made two natural bids and bought the hand at two spades, going three off on repeated forces and accepting the heart finesse when it was offered. Still, he won 2 IMPs to make the final score Hans 54-Neill 7. That was 25-4 in Victory Points, moving Hans in second place and dropping Neill to seventh.

Nevertheless, at the end of the day, the Neill team had recovered well enough to finish second in the standings, earning a berth in the semi-finals, while Hans finished third, earning a spot in the quarterfinals and earning the right to choose their opponent.
Interestingly, Hugh McGann's fiancée, Fiona Brown, also made the quarterfinals, as part of the Travis team. Rumour had it that the wedding would be called off if Hans picked Travis for their opponents, so in order to keep marital harmony intact, the Hans team chose to play the Hirst team instead. Travis would play Noble while Imanuel and Neill eagerly awaited the winners of those matches for their semi-final opponents. Immanuel, having finished first will choose their opponent from the winners.

| Dealer: South | A 1053 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark$ AQ 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 27 | - AJ653 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tms Qual Match 4 | \& 107 |  |  |  |  |  |
| A A J 7 |  | A K Q 964 |  |  |  |  |
| -K973 |  | $\checkmark 82$ |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 10 |  | -K82 | West | North | East | South |
| 9J532 |  | * Q 64 | - | 1 | - | 1 NT |
|  | A 82 |  | 1 | - | 1 | A |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 1064 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 V |
|  | -974 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 |
|  | * AK 98 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 \% |

Michael Courtney gave me a deal yesterday (better late than never, Michael!) where he thought that the right play while, obvious, might easily be missed at the table. Let's see whether you agree; to make matters a little harder for you, I won't tell you who has the tough play.
You can look at all four hands, and admire the simple brutality of the auction; 1* (Precision, no four-card major) from North in third seat, 2A from Courtney, All Pass.

As South you decide not to lead a top club - partner can hardly be ruffing on this auction, and even if he is the trick may come back. Instead you lead a trump. This goes to the ten and king, and declarer leads a diamond to the queen and ace. Back comes the club ten. You win, and....
At this moment you should pause to count; your only practical chance to set the hand is to take three club tricks and one diamond, thus two tricks in the majors. Declarer cannot have six trumps or he would not risk the club ruff, so the full deal is surely very like the actual hand. You must shift to a heart to let partner win and go back to clubs so you can give him the ruff. If you take the ruff at once you never score the second heart trick.
Well done Alex Czapnik for making the play. For today's "guesstimate" you might care to predict how many pairs played $2 \uparrow$ going down one trick, in the context of that contract being declared about 100 times.
24 was defeated 36 times, and it made +11064 times. $3 \uparrow$ was defeated only one trick an additional 40 times, so the defenders got it right about one time in four. (And please don't ask me whether I was one of the ones who got it right!)

## ROUNDUP - EXERCISING THE MIND

Barry Rigal

| Dealer: North | ^Q1094 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\bullet$ Q |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 1 | - A Q 64 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tms Qual Mat | \& J 932 |  |  |  |  |  |
| A A 632 |  | A K J 5 |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 72$ |  | $\checkmark$ AK 104 |  |  |  |  |
| -10932 |  | -K7 | West | North | East | South |
| \& 1064 |  | \& A Q 85 | 2 | - | 2 | - NT |
|  | A 87 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - a |
|  | - J 98653 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - $\downarrow$ |
|  | - J 85 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | \& K 7 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - $\%$ |

E/W generally reached 3NT on these cards unless North elected to open in first chair - an action one could understand, if not condone. We can see from Deep Finesse that 3NT is not technically makeable, but nonetheless the contract was brought home at several tables. Let's look at two of them, and then work out what is the result on best play.

Michael Courtney declared 3NT as East after a Multi auction with a strong 2NT rebid followed by Stayman, and received a diamond lead. He won the king at the second trick and led a low club from hand. The defenders took the king and shifted to spades. Declarer ran the spade and club winners, on which South made the serious mistake of discarding his diamond, so Courtney could count him out for a 2-6-3-2 pattern. His only chance was to find North with a singleton heart honour: this was the position. Declarer needs three more tricks


At this point Courtney can win the VA and now has to be careful. He must unblock the $\mathbf{V 7}$ from dummy, planning to endplay South with the $\vee 4$. If he doesn't, South will duck the $\$ 4$ to dummy's seven, end-playing the board to concede the last three tricks to North! Of course Michael found the play.
When Bruce Neil declared 3NT on a less revealing auction South led a spade, one of the winning defences here. Neill won cheaply and played three rounds of spades, then led a heart to the queen and king. Now he led a low club from hand. South won the king and played back a club to the ten, jack and ace. At this point Neill could see no legitimate line for the contract unless the queen-jack of hearts were falling, so he played for a defensive error, by leading the $\downarrow$ Krom hand. North won, and obliged by cashing the fourth spade on which East and South pitched hearts, then exiting with a club. This was the position:


Neill finessed in clubs, as South pitched a heart, then cashed his last club winner, pitching dummy's small diamond. What was South to discard? If he pitched a heart declarer would have two heart winners, so he came down to the bare $\quad J$, and now in the three-card ending Neill exited with a diamond. Id North overtook his partner's $\checkmark J$ he would have to give dummy the last two tricks, if South was left to hold the lead he would have to lead a heart into declarer's tenace.

So let's look at the double-dummy best play and defence. There are many ways to set the hand - a spade lead is as easy as any, and the defenders can then lead spades at every turn and cut declarer's communications with dummy. What doesn't work (somewhat surprisingly) is a low diamond lead. Declarer can win the second diamond lead and cash the VA and then lead a low club from hand. Assume South wins and cashes the $\quad J$ (declarer pitching a heart from hand) then gets off play with a second club. Declarer now has only one resource in this ending:

|  | A Q 1094 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | - Q |  |
|  | \& 93 |  |
| A A 632 |  | A K J 5 |
| $\checkmark 7$ |  | - K 10 |
| -10 |  | --- |
| \& 6 |  | \& Q 8 |
|  | A 87 |  |
|  | - J 9865 |  |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | \& --- |  |

He must find the masterstroke of leading the $\vee 10$ from hand! South wins and exits with a heart (or else declarer can easily take the spade and club finesses, and North is triple-squeezed.
Incidentally the lead of the $\varangle 8$ does work at trick one. Declarer must cover or North ducks altogether, and that allows South subsequently to unblock his $\forall J$ under the king and create a finesse position in the suit.

## ROUNDUP - THE HAPPIEST GILLIONAIRE

## Barry Rigal

Gulzar Bilal would not be a name known to a wide audience; he has come over from Pakistan for the tournament and Peter was happy to give the bulletin a sampling of his declarer play achievements.

| Dealer: North Vul: N-S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AQ } 92 \\ & \vee J 103 \end{aligned}$ |  | West Bilal | North | East Gill | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 21 | -KQJ 8 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
|  | ¢J 107 |  | 19 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| AK5 |  | A 107 | 39 | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |
| - 86542 |  | $\bullet$ Q 7 |  |  |  |  |
| - A 2 |  | - 7543 | West | North | East | South |
| \& K Q 3 |  | \& A 9652 | 2 | - | 2 | - NT |
|  | A AJ8643 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 9 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - $V$ |
|  | -1096 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 * |
|  | - 84 |  | 4 | - | 4 |  |

3 was non-forcing, but East had seen his partner play the cards before. The $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ was led and smoothly ducked. The $\nabla J$ switch also was smoothly ducked. Next came the $\nabla 3$ to the queen and king and Bilal had to win this, or else South would cash AA. Bilal won VA and played another heart to North, who continued diamonds, ignoring his partner's discard and seduced by the duck of the first trick. Declarer cashed all his trumps, then ran the clubs for +420 .

The key to the hand, once VK is offside with four losers, is to lose tricks as early as possible, to disguise what is about to happen.

| Dealer: North | ヘ 863 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 10987$ |  | Bilal | Hans | Gill | McGann |
| Brd 9 | -K87 |  |  | Pass | Pass | 1 * |
|  | \& 753 |  | Double | Pass | 2* | Pass |
| A A 75 |  | AKQJ4 | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |  |
| - Q 52 |  | - ${ }^{\text {¢ }} 3$ |  |  |  |  |
| - A J 32 |  | -1094 | West | North | East | South |
| \& Q 62 |  | ¢ J 104 | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A 1092 |  | 3 | - | 3 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - K J 4 |  | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - Q 65 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | * A K 98 |  | 2 | - | 2 | $\%$ |

E/W did well to reach 3NT after the opponent's opening bid. The double of $1 *$ may not be to everyone's taste, but it is normally safer to come into these auctions at one's first turn rather than let the opponents limit themselves.
Sartaj Hans led $\mathbf{v}$, consistent with holding the ten with or without the king, and Bilal's first good move was to take the ace. If he had run the lead to South's king the defenders would surely have found the club shift.

Declarer continued with the 10 to the king, and a second heart went to the king. McGann tried \&K now, to see if partner could encourage that, then reverted to hearts.

With diamonds $3-3$ we would all make nine tricks now in a canter, but Bilal showed that he could cope with a $4-2$ diamond break as well. He cashed four spade tricks, pitching his club queen, then played $\curvearrowleft J$ from the table. If South won that he would be end-played to lead a club back to dummy or a diamond round to the nine, if he ducked, declarer would be in dummy to run diamonds.

Barry Rigal

| Dealer: North | A 843 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | -K8643 |  |  | Pass | 1\% | 1 |
| Brd 21 | -2 |  | Double | Pass | 2* | 2^ |
|  | \& Q 732 |  | Double | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| AQ972 |  | A 6 | 3NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| - A Q J 5 |  | $\checkmark 1072$ |  |  |  |  |
| -K1093 |  | - A 4 | West | North | East | South |
| \& 9 |  | \&AK108654 | 2 | - | 2 | - NT |
|  | A AKJ 105 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 A |
|  | $\checkmark 9$ |  | 2 | - | 2 | - $V$ |
|  | -QJ8765 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | \& J |  | 3 | - | 3 |  |

This hand featured two very sad stories. First let's look at the deal as a declarer play problem. Barbara Travis played 3NT as West when South had bid her two-suits
One can hardly blame North for guessing badly at trick one what to lead. When a diamond appeared on the table declarer won in hand and led the \&9, North following low. At this point in the hand Travis knew South was $6-5$ in diamonds and spades; if he had a singleton club it was more likely to be a small club than the queen or jack. So she covered with dummy's ten, and lost to the singleton honour. Back came the $\boldsymbol{\&} 10$ and declarer was toast when clubs and hearts did not behave.

At another table South was on lead to 3NT having bid both his suits. He led the $\mathbf{\$ 1 0} 10$ to the first trick (nice play!) and continued with the $A J$ when it held the trick. Declarer covered, pitching a heart from hand. He next led the $\% 9$ from dummy...and North covered. A bad time for a 'senior moment'.

## A MIXED BAG: THE QUARTERFINALS FIRST HALF

John Carruthers
HANS (Sartaj Hans-Hugh McGann, Geo Tislevoll-Michael Ware) would face HIRST (Michelle Brunner-John Holland, Andrew Hirst-Bill Hirst-Howard Melbourne) in one match, while TRAVIS (Barbara Travis-Fiona Brown, David Appleton-Peter Reynolds) would do battle with NOBLE (Barry Noble-Ishmael Del'Monte-Ashley Bach, Tom Jacob-Martin Reid) in the other. I wonder if anyone keeps track of the number of times a team that picked its opponent loses the match. HANS had picked HIRST. Board 1 started one match off with a bang, but the other was a damp squib.

| Dealer: North | AK5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - AKJ3 |  |
| Brd 1 | -1094 |  |
| Tms QF Set 1 | \& K Q 93 |  |
| ヘ10642 |  | A J 3 |
| - Q 95 |  | -10862 |
| - J 75 |  | - AK2 |
| \& J 82 |  | \& A 1075 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A A Q } 987 \\ & \vee 74 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | - Q 863 |  |
|  | * 64 |  |


| West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 3 | - | 2 | NT |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | $\uparrow$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | $\downarrow$ |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | $\vdots$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | $\vdots$ |

In the Travis-Noble match, both teams declared three no-trumps and made it for a push. Not so in Hirst-Hans. Brunner-Holland slogged their way to three no-trumps via a transfer and an invitation, accepted. Although it is possible to make that contract, Holland did not, having not been blessed with the ability to see through the backs of the cards, minus 100, down two. Their teammates did considerably worse, going four off in three clubs doubled for minus 800. Hans led 14-0.

All four teams declared a routine four spades on Board 2. Three of them made 10 tricks while Ish made 11. Most pairs who play transfers over no-trump openings and overcalls have some sort of super-acceptance in their arsenal. Ish does...

| Dealer: East Vul: N-S | AJ 987642 $\bullet 52$ |  | West <br> Travis | North <br> Noble | East <br> Brown | South Del'Monte |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 2 | - Q 72 |  |  |  | 18 | 1NT |
| Tms QF Set 1 | \& 7 |  | Pass | 27 | Pass | 4A |
| A Q 3 |  | A 5 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| -106 |  | -KQJ43 |  |  |  |  |
| - J 9643 |  | - A 8 | West | North | East | South |
| \& A 1032 |  | \& J 9865 | - | 2 | - | 2 NT |
|  | A AK 10 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 a |
|  | - A 987 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - $V$ |
|  | -K105 |  | - | - | - | - |
|  | \& K Q 4 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - $\%$ |

Most experts would say that Ish's bid does not exist. Ishmael would not agree.
On Board 3, the Hirst team got into the bidding first and won partials at both tables for 6 IMPs. Travis won 3 IMPs for a larger plus.
System played a big part in the swing on Board 4 in Hans v. Hirst.

| Dealer: West | A --- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - Q 82 |  |
| Brd 4 | - A 653 |  |
| Tms QF Set 1 | *Q J 10752 |  |
| A 953 |  | A J 764 |
| -K753 |  | - A 964 |
| -10987 |  | - K Q 4 |
| \& 43 |  | \& 86 |
|  | A AKQ 1082 |  |
|  | - J 10 |  |
|  | - J 2 |  |
|  | \& A K 9 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ware | Holland | Tislevoll | Brunner |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | 4a |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| - | 4 | - | 4 NT |
| - | 3 | - | 3 a |
| - | 1 | - | $1 \checkmark$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |
| - | 5 | - | $5 \%$ |

Michelle Brunner liked her hand after John Holland's passed-hand, natural two-club response, and who can blame her? However, there were three top losers and a late trump loser. All three other tables declared three no trumps. That was minus 100 and 12 IMPs away for a $26-6$ lead for Hirst. Travis led 3-2. Were they playing the same boards?

A few IMPs exchanged hands on the next two boards, and then...what would you lead as West from...the following hand and auction.

| A 5 | West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 109752 | Ware | Holland | Tislevoll | Brunner |
| KJ75 | Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| $\$ 43$ | Pass | 1ヵ | Pass | 1NT |
|  | Pass | 2\$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
|  | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

A case can be made for all four suits. Michael Ware's choice of his singleton spade was not a success, as you can see:

| Dealer: South | ヘ Q J 9 8 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - K 3 |  |
| Brd 7 | - Q 83 |  |
| Tms QF Set 1 | \& ${ }^{\text {a }} 76$ |  |
| A 5 |  | AK10763 |
| -109752 |  | $\bullet$ Q J |
| -KJ75 |  | -102 |
| \& J 42 |  | \&Q1053 |
|  | A A 4 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 864 |  |
|  | - A 964 |  |
|  | \& K 98 |  |

West North East South

Vul: Both $\quad$ K 3
Brd 7
Tms QF Set 1

- 5
-109752
KJ75
A A 4
A 864
*K 98

| West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | $\uparrow$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | $\downarrow$ |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | $\vdots$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | 4 |

Brunner put in the eight, Tislevoll played the ten and Brunner had nine tricks when the diamond king proved to be onside. That was worth 13 Imps when the same contract drifted two off at the other table. Hirst had taken the lead 30-26. The other match was 8-7 Travis. Were they playing the same boards?

Four IMPs went to Hans on Board 8, tying the match. Then on Board 9, David Appleton for Travis displayed great declarer play:

| Dealer: North | A 975 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | -Q654 |  | Reid | Appleton | Jacob | Reynolds |
| Brd 9 | - AK 6 |  |  | 1\% | Pass | 14 |
| Tms QF Set 1 | \& A 98 |  | Pass | 1NT | Pass | 2-[1] |
| A Q 4 |  | A 1063 | Pass | $2 V$ | Pass | 24 |
| -KJ1072 |  | $\checkmark 98$ | Pass | 34 | Pass | 44 // |
| - Q 1092 |  | - J 874 | West | North | East | South |
| \& 104 |  | \&KQ 75 | - | 4 | - | 4 NT |
|  | A AKJ 82 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 a |
|  | - A 3 | [1] Game Forcing Relay | - | 2 | - | 2 |
|  | - 53 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 * |
|  | \&J 632 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 \% |

Three very good declarers failed in four spades here with the help of the losing spade finesse. Appleton received the nine of hearts opening lead. He won the ace, just in case there was a ruff about, and played another heart. West won the king and shifted to a diamond, declarer winning his ace. Appleton now played the queen of hearts. Can you blame East for ruffing this? When he did so, Appleton placed West with the queen of spades and played the ace-king of the suit for plus 420 and 10 IMPs in. Travis led 18-7. The other match was still 30-30.

Board 10 was way too difficult for three of the pairs to handle. The only ones to handle it efficiently were Brunner-Holland, and even they were not perfect.

| Dealer: East | AK |  | West | North Holland | East <br> Tislevoll | South Brunner |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark 4$ |  | Ware | Holland |  |  |  |
| Brd 10 | - AK62 |  |  |  | Pass | Pass |  |
| Tms QF Set 1 | *AK Q J 532 |  | Pass | 1\% | Pass | 19 |  |
| A AJ92 |  | A 7643 | Pass | 2 | Pass | 3NT |  |
| - A 10973 |  | $\bullet$ Q 8 | Pass | 4\% | Pass | 4NT |  |
| - 953 |  | - Q J 8 | West | North | East | South |  |
| \& 10 |  | ¢ 8764 | - | 4 | - | 4 | NT |
|  | A Q 1085 |  | - | - | - |  | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ KJ 652 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -1074 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ |
|  | - 9 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 |  |

It looks like Michelle Brunner's three-notrump bid was an attempt to say, "Leave me alone." John Holland had way too good a hand to let her out, but was convinced to do so the next time.
Michael Ware led a diamond and Brunner ducked it to Tislevoll's J. At this point, Tislevoll faced an unenviable decision. If Ware had, for example, hearts headed by the ace-jack-ten or ace-king, he must play the heart queen, If Ware had both major-suit aces, he should play his low heart to give Brunner a guess in the suit. After much deliberation, he returned the heart queen and Brunner was home. IN the other match, it was even more exciting...

| West | North <br> Appleton | East <br> Racob | South <br> Reynolds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1V[1] | Dble[2] | Pass | Pass |
| Pas |  |  |  |

[^0]4. I have no key cards, partner (Exclusion Key Card - do the opponents really have 12 clubs?)
5. No they don't, you idiot, I have the clubs!
6. I have the heart king, partner
7. I've heard enough, boys
8. Yes, me too
9. This I'm sure I can beat
10. Yes, me too

This time, Appleton's brilliant declarer play could not save him; he lost the two aces and a diamond for minus 500. That was 12 IMPs to Hans after Barry Noble made a bid I admire immensely:

| West <br> Travis | North <br> Noble | East <br> Brown | South <br> Del'Monte |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 P[1] | $2 \&[2]$ | Pass | Pass |
| Pass |  |  |  |

1. Watch what havoc I create, partner
2. I'm a disciple of Eric Kokish and an advocate strong overcalls; besides, I have only two major-suit cards, so it'll never go all-pass, will it partner?
3. Eric who?

Noble made two overtricks for plus 130. Hugh McGann and Sartaj Hans paid me an extraordinary amount of cash not to publish their auction to the inelegant contact of seven clubs doubled, down three for minus 800 and 14 IMPs away.

The scores were Hirst 44-Hans 30 and Noble 19-Travis 18. There were two boards to go.
Board 11 was a curiosity - it was flat in both matches: Noble-Travis at 130 in three diamonds, and Hirst-Hans at 480 in one no-trump doubled with three overtricks! The doubler had a balanced 16-count and his partner had a queen. On the lucky lie of the cards (for declarer) nine tricks were cold.
On the last board, Hirst and Noble both won 5 IMPs for making three hearts at one table and beating it at the other. The contract depended on guessing the heart jack with a two-way finesse.
At the end of the first half, Hirst led Hans 50-30 and Noble led Travis 26-18.

## QUARTER-FINALS - SECOND HALF

Barry Rigal

| Dealer: North Vul: Both | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A Q } 632 \\ & \vee 5 \end{aligned}$ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 13 | - A 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tms QF Set 2 | * AJ752 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K 987 |  | $\text { A A } 104$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A Q J 9 8 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ \& 84 \end{gathered}$ |  | - J 108532 | West | North | East | South |  |
|  |  | \& 1063 | - | 2 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A J 5 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | a |
|  | - K 10643 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $v$ |
|  | $\text { K Q } 4$ |  | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | * |

The second half started with the underdogs (per the finishing order) Travis and Hirst leading by 8 and 20 imps respectively. The Travis lead did not survive the first deal;

Where N/S had an uncontested auction, as they did in three of the four tables, the final contract was 3NT. Martin Reid and Michael Ware kept their hands off the heart lead, and both declarers played on hearts early and made eight tricks.

At the other tables both Wests (Melbourne and Brown) had the system available to bid hearts at their first turn, despite the fact that South had bid the suit - and both had cause to regret it. Both Souths (Hanlon and Del'Monte doubled when the auction got back to them at 2У, to end the auction. Both Norths led spades but Melbourne escaped for 200 by leading a trump to the seven, while in the other room declarer misguessed the trumps and lost a ruff and two trump tricks. 6 imps to Hans, 12 to Noble.
Noble increased their lead by bidding a very thin game on the next deal (needing spades $3-3$ with the king onside). The cards forgave, and Noble led by 11. Both tables in the other match also bid game. Holland and Brunner scored a goal a board later when Brunner displayed more cojones than all of her counterparts in the South seat.

| Dealer: South | A A Q 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\bullet$ A J |  |
| Brd 15 | - A J 1083 |  |
| Tms QF Set 2 | \& Q 84 |  |
| A 85 |  | A 2 |
| - Q 632 |  | - K 10987 |
| - Q 7542 |  | - K 9 |
| \& 65 |  | \&K9732 |
|  | A K J 109643 |  |
|  | - 54 |  |
|  | - 6 |  |
|  | \& A J 10 |  |


| West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| - | 6 | - | 6 | NT |
| - | 6 | - | 6 | 4 |
| 1 | - | 1 | - |  |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | 4 |

She opened 4a and Holland jumped to slam - a reasonable shot since if West was dealt a high honour in clubs and could lead it, it might still be the only lead to let the slam through. On any other lead slam could hardly be worse than a finesse.
Ware led a diamond, and Brunner went up with $\forall A$ and ruffed a diamond, then drew trumps ending in dummy and pitched a heart on the top diamond, with two sure discards to come, thanks to the fall of the 9 . That took the lead to 26 imps .

| Dealer: West | A A9632 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | -Q85 |  | Pass | 14 | $2 \vee$ | 30 |
| Brd 16 | - A Q |  | Pass | 4a | Pass | Pass |
| Tms QF Set 2 | $\%$ Q J 8 |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| A J 10874 |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 42$ |  | -KJ10763 |  |  |  |  |
| - K 6 |  | -9432 | West | North | East | South |
| * 10965 |  | \& AK 7 | - | 4 | - | 4 NT |
|  | A KQ 5 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 a |
|  | - A 9 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - $V$ |
|  | - J 10875 |  | - | 4 | - | 3 |
|  | \& 432 |  | - | 2 | - | $2 \%$ |

The board of the tournament, as far as I am concerned, came up here. Three tables out of four opened 1NT with the North cards and played 3NT, wrapping up at least nine tricks. John Holland was playing a weak notrump, so opened 1A and rebid 4A.

Tislevoll led three rounds of clubs. Declarer won in hand and led a low trump to the queen, finding the bad news. Then a diamond finesse and when the $\downarrow$ A dropped the king, suddenly there was hope. Holland led a low spade to the king and had reached this ending:


In this position when the $\checkmark J$ is led from dummy, the winning defence is to ruff with an intermediate trump (even a low trump will do - though it is a little harder work). Declarer can do no better than discard a heart when West ruffs high. Back comes a heart, won in dummy, and West ruffs the next diamond to leave North with a heart loser.

Ware actually pitched a heart on the $>J$, as did Holland, and also on the next diamond. When the third diamond was led Ware ruffed with an intermediate trump, and as I sat behind Holland I saw him realize that if he had preserved his $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} 3$ or $\boldsymbol{A} 2$ he would have been able to pitch his heart then ruff low in hand and over-ruff in dummy. He could see that discarding a heart would fail when Ware played a club, since he would have to win
in hand, and over-ruffing with the $\uparrow$ A would fail when he led a heart to dummy since West would score both his trumps.
Eventually the light-bulb went on: he under-ruffed and West folded his cards. No swing, but a great board for the bulletin.

Noble increased their lead to 15 imps , and Hans closed the margin to 21 imps when they made a small plus in both rooms. Then came something more substantial

| Dealer: East <br> Vul: N-S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJ543 } \\ & \vee \text { Q } 752 \end{aligned}$ |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 18 | -8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tms QF Set 2 | \& Q J 32 |  |  |  |  |  |
| A AK8 |  | A 2 |  |  |  |  |
| - J964 |  | $\checkmark$ A 10 |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 732 |  | - AKJ1096 | West | North | East | South |
| \& 86 |  | \& AK 94 | 5 | - | 5 | - NT |
|  | A Q 10976 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - 1 |
|  | -K83 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - $\downarrow$ |
|  | -54 |  | 7 | - | 7 | - |
|  | \& 1075 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - \% |

With 13 top tricks in diamonds you'd expect that playing the small slam might lose you imps. It was a flat board in Noble-Travis, but Tislevoll-Ware missed slam altogether, and Melbourne-Hirst reached the grand slam after a strong two in diamonds. 14 imps to Hirst to give them a lead of 35 imps .

| Dealer: South | ^Q 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - AKQ109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 19 | - --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tms QF Set 2 | \& K Q 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AKJ95 |  | - 632 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 2$ |  | $\checkmark 43$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J8763 |  | - AK5 | West | North | East | Sout |  |
| \& 832 |  | \&J10965 | - | 5 | - | 5 | NT |
|  | A A 1074 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 5 |  | - | 6 | - | 7 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -Q10942 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | \& A 7 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\%$ |

The next board produced the mirror-image result from this one. Here you want to play slam but not the grand slam - it needs a minor miracle in the diamonds and no spade lead - that removes the entry to the long diamonds prematurely, since you need to use the \&A and a club ruff as your entries to ruff out diamonds.
By a curious symmetry all four pairs missed the mark here. In each match one table missed slam (Holland Brunner failed on the auction $1 \vee-1 \vee-1 \wedge-3 V[G F]-4 \vee-5 \%-5 \vee-P a s s)$. Their team-mates had the chance to
 diamond it allowed declarer to set up the $\vee Q$ for the discard he needed. The Hirst lead was back down to 21 imps.

It was a lot easier for Jacob on lead to $7 \boldsymbol{V}$ in the other match, since Reid had doubled a spade cue-bid. 11 imps to Noble, leading by 26 imps now.

Hans and Noble added a further medium-size gain when Del'Monte and Hanlon each brought home a delicate game on a finesse.
The last board of the match had the potential for swing, but it was not quite enough for Hans:

## THANKS SO MUCH

Fred Whitaker, a strong supporter and sponsor of the Gold Coast Congress is an expert in arm twisting. He managed to obtain a large number of restaurant prizes as well as negotiating excellent discounts for bridge players at the local restaurants. He has asked me to thank the players for using the local restaurants and taking advantage of the excellent offers available. He has excellent feedback from the restaurants on the strong patronage by the bridge players which will ensure that they are all on board next year.

| Dealer: West | A A 1054 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark 54$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 24 | -QJ104 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tms QF Set 2 | \& Q 94 |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Q 976 |  | A 2 |  |  |  |  |
| -AKJ10872 |  | - Q 93 |  |  |  |  |
| - --- |  | -K98532 | West | North | East | South |
| \& 107 |  | \& A J 3 | 1 | - | 1 | - NT |
|  | A K J 83 |  | - | 2 | - | 3 a |
|  | $\checkmark 6$ |  | 5 | - | 5 | - $V$ |
|  | - 76 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | \& K 8652 |  | - | 2 | - |  |

The deal was a push in $4 \mathbf{V}$ in that match, so Hirst had held on to win by 13 imps . Both tables in Travis-Noble played $6 \checkmark$ by West on an auction where declarer's hand was somewhat undefined. Even with the $\star$ A coming down in three rounds, a club lead would take the entry to dummy out at the wrong moment; you can cross to dummy three times in trumps but don't get the spade ruff. Neither table found the club lead - one led the $\vee Q$, the other a trump. No swing; Noble had blitzed their opponents 48-0 thanks to an immaculate card by ReidJacob against Reynolds-Appleton.

## SEMI FINALS SET 1 - IT'S IN THE BAG, PARTNER: IMANUAL V. HIRST John Carruthers -

On the first board of their quarterfinal match, the Hirst team spotted Hans 14 IMPs , then stormed back to win the match. Since they only gave up 9 IMPs to Imanual on Board 1 in the semifinal, it seemed the match was certain to go Hirst's way.

| Dealer: North | A Q 10974 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark 4$ |  | Melbourne | Wohon | A. Hirst |  |
| Brd 1 | -KQJ2 |  |  | Pass | $1{ }^{\circ}$ | 2* |
| Tms SF Set 1 | \& 754 |  | Pass | 2A | $4 \checkmark$ | 44 |
| - 86 |  | AKJ2 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| $\checkmark 872$ |  | - AK109653 |  |  |  |  |
| - A 5 |  | - --- | West | North | East | South |
| \& K J 9 8 62 |  | \% Q 103 | Imanual | Holland | Ananda | Brunner |
|  | A A 53 |  |  | 24 | 4 | 4^1 |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q J |  | 5 | Pass | Pass | Pass |
|  | -10987643 |  |  |  |  |  |

Rogi might have made four spades, but he played a diamond early on, giving the defence its ruff. That, however, was still good enough to win 9 IMPs with the plus 450 at the other table.

Rogi played Board 2 better than he played Board 1:

| Dealer: East | A J 1053 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - Q 98 |  |
| Brd 2 | - J 87 |  |
| Tms SF Set 1 | \& 843 |  |
| AK76 |  | -942 |
| - AJ743 |  | $\checkmark 1062$ |
| -95 |  | - AKQ6 2 |
| \& Q J 5 |  | \& 107 |

> A A Q 8
> ण K 5
> 1043
> \& AK 962

| West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | $\mathbf{~}$ |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | $\vdots$ |
| 2 | - | 2 | - | $\vdots$ |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | $\mathbf{\%}$ |

Playing in one no trump after a heart lead, Rogi immediately led the spade queen from hand. When West ducked his king, Rogi ducked a club and had seven tricks. That was good for another 6 IMPs when the defence allowed their teammates to make three hearts at the other table.

Board seven was a tricky five clubs bid and made at both tables:

| Dealer: South | A 95 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -AQJ10974 |  | Melbourne | Wohon | A.Hirst | Rogi |
| Brd 7 | - 875 |  |  |  |  | Pass |
| Tms SF Set 1 | $\% 4$ |  | 1\% | 37 | Dble | Pass |
| A Q 6 |  | A A J 43 | 4 | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| $\checkmark$ K |  | -652 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| - A Q 96 |  | - J 32 |  |  |  |  |
| \& A J 10965 |  | \& K Q 8 | West | North | East | South |
|  | AK10872 |  |  |  |  | Pass |
|  | $\checkmark 83$ | [1] Precision 16+ | 1\%[1] | 4 | Dble[2] | Pass |
|  | - 104 | [2] Positive | 5\% | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Melbourne received the ace of hearts and another heart lead. He ruffed, crossed to a club and led the diamond jack to the king and ace. He went back to dummy with another club and led a spade to the queen, South ducking. He cashed the diamond queen, went back to dummy with yet another trump, and led a diamond. Making five for plus 400.
Imanual received a spade lead. He ducked and Brunner won and continued spades. Declarer won the queen, drew trumps and discarded a heart and a diamond on dummy's spades. The diamond finesse was trick 11 for a flat board.

Wohon-Rogi lost their way on Board 10...

| Dealer: East | A J 985 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - J 86 |  | Melbourne | Wohon | A.first | Rogi |
| Brd 10 | -987 |  |  |  |  | 1ヵ[1] |
| Tms SF Set 1 | * Q J 2 |  | Pass | $1 *[2]$ | Pass | 1 T 3 ] |
| A A 73 |  | A 42 | Pass | 1NT[4] | Pass | 2 |
| -10953 |  | - Q 74 | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 24 |
| -KJ4 |  | -63 | Pass | 34 | Pass | 4NT |
| \& K 85 |  | \& 1097643 | Pass | 5* | Pass | 64 |
|  | A K Q 106 | [1] Precision 16+ | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK2 | [2] 0-7 | Melbourne | Wohon | A. hirst | Rogi |
|  | - A Q 1052 | [3] Relay | Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 *$ |
|  | $\therefore \mathrm{A}$ | [4] 4-7 HCP | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

It's not clear that North ever showed any values other than four-card spade support and a few points. Declarer lost a spade and two diamonds for minus 200.
This auction, on the other hand, was simplicity itself. Brunner lost the same three tricks for plus 130 and 7 MPs in. After a mostly-dull set of boards, the score was dead even, 16-16.

## SEMI FINALS - SET 2

## Barry Rigal

The commentators have had much experience of watching paint dry, but in fact that might have proved more exciting than most of the second set of the semi-finals on BBO. There were only two big deals, one of which did not produce a swing. The others eight deals certainly had some potential but resulted in no more than an imp or two changing hands.

| Dealer: South | A A J 104 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A 10875 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 15 | - 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tms SF Set 2 | ¢983 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AQ87653 |  | A 92 |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  | -K643 |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 6 |  | - A 10754 | West | North | East | South |
| *KJ742 |  | * Q 5 | - | , | - | 2 NT |
|  | AK |  | 1 | - | 1 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - Q J 92 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 V |
|  | -KJ932 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 * |
|  | \& A 106 |  | - | - | - | 8 |

The differences in valuation of the East cards suggests that one of the partnership had a different opinion as to what suits the $2 \diamond$ bid showed. When West described a two-suiter, Neill jumped to $4 \checkmark$ putting Jedrychowski in $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ doubled. Meanwhile, Jacob bid only $2 \boldsymbol{V}$, and let the opponents play $4 \boldsymbol{V}$.
Jedrychowski drew one round of trumps then played on clubs, losing four trumps and two aces for -500 . Lavings played $4 V$ on a spade lead, won in dummy, and declarer now made the mistake of playing a trump; arguably he might have won the VA, but he ducked and let East play a second diamond. Then he led a diamond to the jack, and on the club shift he won the ace, ruffed a diamond, cashed the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and cross-ruffed. But in total he scored three black-suit winners and only six trumps; down one. On the surface of it he had a guaranteed route for ten tricks by winning the spade and leading a low diamond from dummy. That ensures the cross-ruff for ten tricks. Equally, Lavings' duck of the first trump trick appeared to be an error, if a forgivable one. If he planned to lead a diamond up, then ducking the first trump gained nothing. Had he won the heart to play a diamond up would (as the cards lie) have ensured his game.
That gave Noble 12 imps instead of 3 imps going the other way.
Holland played $4 \vee$ on the not unfriendly lead of the $\star$ A, wrapping up 11 tricks in no time at all. That was worth 11 imps when in the other room Melbourne escaped for down one in 3 A - also on a lead that did not bother him unduly, the $V$ A.

| Dealer: West | - 63 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - K Q 10984 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 20 | $\text { Q Q } 632$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| AKJ7 |  | ^A1098 |  |  |  |  |
| - AJ73 |  | $\checkmark 65$ |  |  |  |  |
| - A 75 |  | -K 9 | West | North | East | South |
| \& K J 9 |  | ¢65432 | 2 | - | 2 | - NT |
|  | A Q 542 |  | 3 | - | 3 | A |
|  | $\checkmark 2$ |  | 1 | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 104 |  | 4 | 1 | - | 1 * |
|  | \& A Q 1087 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - \% |

Both East and West were remarkably passive against Bach, selling out to $3 \star$ when they had excellent play for 3NT. 3 was allowed to collect nine tricks when Neill led a club (allowing a spade to get away) and Jedrychowski won his $\vee A$ and shifted to ace and another trump, preventing the heart ruff.

In the other room 3NT on a low diamond lead saw declarer win in dummy and lead a club towards his hand. Krochmalik took the ace and played a second diamond, ducked all round, then cleared diamonds. Reid could now only play North for the $\uparrow \mathbf{Q}$, and when the finesse lost he was down one.
In the other match Hirst, aided by the 11 imps shown above and a second deal where Melbourne and Hirst had jockeyed their opponents into bidding a slam off two aces, took the set 30-1, to lead 46-17. (They had trailed 16-0 in mid-set).

## SEMI FINALS - SET 3 <br> John Carruthers

There wasn't a whole lot of excitement in the first few boards of the third quarter. Neill won 6 IMPs with a double partscore swing to tie the match at 22 Imps, and there it rested until...

| Dealer: East | A J 106 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - AK9764 |  | Del'Monte | Neill | Bach | Jedrychowski |
| Brd 6 | - A 6 |  |  |  | Pass | 2^[1] |
|  | ¢J 8 |  | $3 \%$ | 34 | $4 \%$ | Pass |
| A A Q 5 |  | A 82 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| $\checkmark 10$ |  | - J 53 |  |  |  |  |
| - J 8 <br> \& K Q 97632 |  | -K1054 | Lavings | Jacob | Krochmalik | Reid |
|  |  | -A 1054 |  |  | Pass | 2^[1] |
|  | AK9743 | 1. A and minor, weak |  | 44 | Pass | Pass |
|  | - Q 82 |  | Pass |  |  |  |
|  | -Q9732 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \& --- |  |  |  |  |  |

Both sides can come close to making game. How'd they do?

Ish and Ash were allowed to buy the hand in four clubs, a filthy result for North-South as they can make four spades. Ish misguessed diamonds to justify not being in game himself. At the other table...

Jacob simply blasted game, shutting Krochmalik out. Lavings led his singleton, won his $\uparrow \mathbb{Q}$ and misguessed by leading a club. Declarer ruffed and drew trumps. Was East wrong to follow with his smallest heart at trick one? Plus 420 and plus 130 gave 11 IMPs to Noble, now leading 33-22.

On boards 7 and 8, Noble won 5 and 4 IMPs respectively for two partscore swings. Board 9 was a push and then came the nail in the coffin:

| Dealer: East | A AK54 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark 8763$ |  | Del'Monte | Neill | Bach | Jedrychowski |
| Brd 10 | -9 |  |  |  | 1NT | Pass |
|  | \& 10654 |  | 2* | Pass | $2 v$ | Pass |
| A 62 |  | ค97 | $3 \%$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| - AKJ5 2 |  | $\bullet$ Q 10 | 36 | Pass | 4 | All Pass |
| - 42 |  | - AKQJ 105 | Lavings | Jacob | Krochmalik | Reid |
| * AK 73 |  | \& Q J 8 |  |  | 1 | Pass |
|  | ヘ Q J 1083 |  | 10 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
|  | $\checkmark 94$ |  | 4\% | Pass | 4 | Pass |
|  | - 8763 |  | 4NT | Pass | 5* | Pass |
|  | -9 2 |  | 5* | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

Again the board was won in the auction. When Ash simply raised to four hearts without cue bidding, Ish let it go. Plus 650. Whatever your opinion of that one no-trump bid, it allowed Ash to later describe his hand fairly accurately.
One of the first lessons we learn as new players is not to bid Blackwood with no control in an unbid suit. Experts later learn when to disregard that rule. Lavings thought this was such an occasion; he could not envision a three-diamond bid without a spade card. By the same token, Krochmalik could not envision Lavings bidding Blackwood without a spade control. It did not matter whether East or West declared - both South and North had standout spade leads. Minus 100 and 13 well-deserved IMPs to Noble.

Noble had scored 33 IMPs in the last five boards to make the score 55-22 in their favour.

## RAFFLE WINNERS

So I am sitting in a café having what I consider a well deserved lunch. I would certainly accept that others may not think it is well deserved but.... My phone rings, hmmm Kim Ellaway, "This better be good" I answer to which she breaks out in hysterical laughter. Sound good, I thought. "You know that session of bridge you donated to the Mega Raffle, you won't believe it but you were the winner". The thought of my playing a session of bridge with myself was so uninviting that I donated it to be redrawn. Here are the winners.

| Prize | Winner |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 Carat Yellow Gold \& Sapphire Ladies Bracelet | S Ingham |
| Travel Voucher | T Strong |
| Perfection Gift Card Package | G Fletcher |
| Expression Gift Card Package | B Wishart |
| Expression Gift Card Package | P Hooper |
| Expression Gift Card Package | C Jackman |
| Two Hour IT Consultation \& Service | J Carter |
| Session of Bridge with David Stern | D Morgan |
| Meal Vouchers (Coogee, NSW) | D McLeish |
| Meal Vouchers (Coogee, NSW) | C Hyne |
| Lonsdale Store Gift Vouchers | M Keating |
| Lonsdale Store Gift Vouchers | S Mabin |
| Bourke Street Bakery Love Package | Eunice Foo |
| Bourke Street Bakery Love Package | Freda B |
| Bourke Street Bakery Love Package | J Simons |
| Bourke Street Bakery Love Package | T Thatcher |
| Bourke Street Bakery Love Package | Arch Morrison |
| One Year Subscription to NZ Bridge Magazine | Kaplan |


| Prize | Winner |
| :--- | :--- |
| One Year Subscription to NZ Bridge Magazine | S Burgess |
| Free Entry NZ National Congress | J Baker |
| One Year Subscription Australian Bridge | Judy Brown |
| One Year Subscription Australian Bridge | Helen Lowry |
| One Year Subscription Australian Bridge | Gray |
| One Team Entry for any 2012 Summer Festival Of Bridge Teams Event | Judy Johnson |
| One Intimo Lingerie Voucher | Sheila Hurst |

## HAVE YOU DISCUSSED? - FOR THE INTERMEDIATE PLAYER - TRIAL BIDS Barry Rigal

Before we start let's define terms. When we have agreed a trump suit but have not forced to game we may want simply to invite game facing a maximum for the auction thus far, or we may want partner to focus on one suit in his hand and use his holding there as a yardstick. The suit we focus on we will designate as a help-suit.
Help-suit game tries should be based on $\operatorname{Hxx}(\mathrm{x})(\mathrm{H}=$ honour) typically. You should prefer to make a game try in a suit with one top honour than one where you have three or four cards to an honour accompanied by the jack or ten or both. Responder should accept with any maximum (unless xxx in help-suit), or any moderate hand with a good holding in the help-suit.
The best holdings in a help suit are any two of the three top four cards. The ranking of optimal help would be Any two of the top three ( $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{Q}$ ) honours then one of the honours plus the jack followed by $A x / K x$, then $A 10 x, K 10 x, Q x$ or Q10x.

Next comes a small doubleton with longer than expected trumps which is about an average holding. Any four card suit to one top honour tends to be better than any three-card suit to one top honour. Anything else is bad news!
If responder cannot accept the try but has a moderate hand and space to make a repeat game try that suggests length and strength in the suit he can do so. Typically such a suit should NOT be headed by the ace alone, so that opener knows length in his hand in that suit is good, and a singleton is bad.
Help suit game tries apply most typically after responder raises opener's suit. But the principle can be expanded and the method improved on.

Let's look at the possibility of combining long and short-suit tries (this works especially well in a strong notrump base where opener will never need to show an invitational balanced hand at his second turn.

| $2 \uparrow-2 \downarrow$ | Artificial; promising a short-suit try somewhere |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2 N T / 3 \& / 3$ |  |$\quad$ Natural long-suit tries in S/C/D respectively - no balanced game-try is needed.

Over the artificial $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ response responder can ask, or sign off, or jump to game, or make his own repeat longsuit try if he thinks that is more important for partner (and will help keep the strong hand undefined).
Exactly the same method can be used after Drury, either directly or after the 2D temporizing call:
Pass 1A 2\& 2* 24

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
2 N T & \text { Coded short-suit slam [/game] try } \\
3 \star / 3 \diamond / 3 \vee & \text { Long-suit slam [/game] try }
\end{array}
$$

Opener can make a direct slam-try with calls of 2NT and higher over the Drury 2* bid. Or if he has only game interest he relays with $2 \star$ and then if partner makes the minimum action of $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ he goes into the same game-try sequences.
Care needs to be taken with how responder tries for game after responder bids a major at the one-level and opener raises that suit. Particularly in a five-card major opening style, where opener can raise responder with three trumps in an unbalanced or semi-balanced hand, responder needs opener to clarify his hand type in some instances rather than making a game-try. The following approach covers most bases:

| 1minor | 1Major | Shape relay (opener bids $3 \uparrow / 3 \star$ with a minimum hand and 3 or 4 trumps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2Major | 2NT |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 3NT } & \text { Game going - pass with three trumps or correct with four trumps } \\
2 \mathbf{2 N * / 3} & \text { Long suit tries promising five cards in responder's major. }
\end{array}
$$

As an aside, you can play $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ as the relay over $2 \boldsymbol{V}$ (if so, 2NT is the long suit-try in spades). Particularly if you
 spade fit facing a hand $4-4$ or $4-5$ in the majors. Accordingly after $1 \oplus: 1 v: 2 \vee-2 \wedge$ raise to $3 \wedge$ anytime you have four spades and three hearts.

## REMINISCENCES - 1995 GOLD COAST TEAMS

Michael Courtney - Australian Bridge June 1995
The 1995 Gold Coast congress stood out, as is its habit, as the friendliest tournament on the calendar. This was due to the organising efforts of Tony Jackman, Richard Grenside, Joan McPheat, Reg Busch, Enid Busch, Roger Penny, etc. and to the good sportsmanship and competitive interest of the players. The organisers wish to thank the players, particularly Mary McMahon and Tim Seres, for their loyalty to the event. The traditional Vugraph was greatly facilitated by the superb software provided by David Grimshaw.
The best joke of the week was delivered at the height of the tense Vugraph final, The match had just drawn level and every player was reaching for a chance to score. An infant escaped from its parent's grasp and crawled at break-neck speed for the giant illuminated screen. Reaching the light source it delivered an almighty blow and the well-built screen swayed gently. "That's what I call a swing-ing board," quipped Tony Hutton from the panel. The audience roared and the miscreant avoided parental retribution.
The most touching moment of the week was at the prizegiving. Winning team's captain Del'Monte stormed the microphone to present, on behalf of himself and teammates Mullamphy and Bach, a medallion to Richman reading "World's Greatest Kiddy Carrier". There is more in this than just this hat-trick of teams victories with Bach and Del'Monte. Many young players have enjoyed early victories opposite Bobby. Di Smart and Richman won the 1973 Interstate for Victoria. Richman-Courtney won the 1982 Trials, Richman - Kozakos won the 1985 Interstate Pairs, Richman-Surany won the 1976 Blue Ribbon Pairs, Richman - Jim Wallis qualified second in the 1987 Australian Teams Trials. Bobby has won the national Men's Pairs with Keith Kat and Ben Thompson. Perhaps, indeed, he is the "World's Greatest Kiddy Carrier".

Richman has interesting views about bidding, today a hybrid of old Sydney and modem New Zealand ideas, but always with a background in 'Animal Acol'. Bobby does not believe that the McCampbell Point Count is a strong guide to the issue of whether to open the bidding. He prefers to rely on the Losing Trick Count. The key point to understand is this: on the first round of the bidding, playing Richman-style, you bid because you can. In most traditional systems it is rather case of you bid because you must. Each player having said what they can at their first call, the lines of defence having been laid, both players need significant extra strength or fit to continue the bidding. Note that in Richman style, in later rounds you bid on because you must while in traditional natural systems you do so because you can.

## WHAT IS YOUR NATIONAL RANKING?

Most of Australia's tournament-level bridge players are rated in the Alan Woods Rating System. The rating is based on a player's performance in national events and on results from participating clubs. The results from the Summer Festival and the Gold Coast Congress will be included by early April.
You can find out what your rating is by going to www.bridgecentral.com and logging in. You can either use your bridge name, which is usually the first letter of your christian name and your surname. So my bridge name is pmarston. Otherwise you can log in with your ABF number and surname. Then you can see where you are ranked within your club and nationwide as well as a list of your sessions. For each session you will see the name of your partner, your percentage, your placing, your expected placing and the impact of that session on your rating.
How accurate are the ratings?
The ratings are reasonably accurate and they are getting more so all the time as more events are included. In the end, the accuracy of a rating system is measured by its ability to predict results. Soon we will publish the system's predictions for a national event and show how good they are.
The ratings are accurate because the system takes into account the strength of your partner and that of the opponents. Ratings range from about 30 to about 70 with 50 being average. The majority of players are in the range of 45 to 55 .

Ron Klinger

Learn how to improve your bridge and find out more about my upcoming holidays and seminars at RonKlingerBridge.com
Regards.

Waily Problems
4 Weekly Quizzes
An entire Library
articles Premium Membership to get access to all Ronklinger has to offer.

| Dealer: South Vul: Nil | A 106432 | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - K 3 |  |  |  | 14 |
|  | -K7 | Pass | 2NT | Pass | 34 |
|  | \& A Q 52 | Pass | 4* | All Pa |  |
| A A Q |  |  |  |  |  |
| -8642 |  | 2NT was a Jacoby raise showing |  |  |  |
| - Q J 3 |  | 4+ spades and 13+ HCP |  |  |  |
| \& 10987 |  |  |  |  |  |

West leads the $\uparrow 10-\AA A-\infty$ (low-encourage, high-discourage)- $\uparrow 4$. South plays the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} 2$ from dummy: $\uparrow 9-\uparrow \mathrm{J}-\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$. What should West play at trick 3?

Answer: Partner’s $\ddagger 6$ looks like high-discouraging and suggests that a club continuation would not work. The only time another club is needed is if partner began with $\boldsymbol{\circ} \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{J}-6$ and even then you can collect only one club trick, since South would then have started with a doubleton club.

Out of hearts and diamonds, a shift to the $Q$ is more attractive. If you shift to a heart, that works if partner the $\vee \mathrm{A}$-Q. Switching to the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ requires partner to have only the -A. That makes a diamond switch more attractive.

But wait . . . is there a way to tell which red suit is the right one?
Yes, definitely, if South began with five spades. In that case East's $\boldsymbol{A} 9$ is singleton and so you should cash the $\uparrow A$ and await partner's signal. That will tell you whether to play a heart or a diamond next.

## 2011 BRIDGE HOLIDAYS WITH RON AND SUZIE KLINGER

$3^{\text {rd }}$ to $10^{\text {th }} \quad$ May
$28^{\text {th }}$ May to $4^{\text {th }}$ June
$3^{\text {rd }}$ to $8^{\text {th }} \quad$ July
$10^{\text {th }}$ to $17^{\text {th }} \quad$ August
$6^{\text {th }}$ to $12^{\text {th }} \quad$ September
$4^{\text {th }}$ to $11^{\text {th }} \quad$ December

Kangaroo Island, off Adelaide
Lord Howe Island
Murray River Cruise
Tangalooma Wild Dolphin Resort off Brisbane
Coral Princess Barrier Reef Cruise, Townsville to Cairns Norfolk Island Holiday - Our $28^{\text {th }}$

Details, inquiries, brochures from HOLIDAY BRIDGE
P.O. Box 140, Northbridge, NSW 1560 - Telephone: (02) 9958-5589

Email: suzie@ronklingerbridge.com Details at the www.ronklingerbridge.com website
Cosmetics plus is one of our major sponsors, and they have also kindly donated the hand cream in your satchels. Please support those who support you!


## SUPPORT THOSE WHO SUPPORT BRIDGE

## Gold Coast 2012

Now we know that you haven't quite recovered from Playing in the Fiftieth Anniversary Gold Coast Congress
But Mark your Calendars for next year because at the rate we are growing you may have to pre-book to ensure you get a seat

> Saturday $25^{\text {th }}$ February to
> Saturday $3^{\text {rd }}$ March Inclusive


JASPER. Furniture that changes with the times.


Unique Jasper. Award winning Jasper. You'll enjoy feather-down comfort because Jasper is built around a unique steel frame with the Postureflex ${ }^{\oplus}$ seating system. Deep-seat cushions you can sink into. As times change, so can Jasper. Different seasons, different settings. Formal or informal.
A complete setting or separate pieces. A sofa or a bed. Jasper is a triumph of design and skilled comfort engineering. Jasper is available in your choice of King fabrics and uxurious leathers.
Jasper is exclusive to King Furniture.

| Saturday <br> 05-Mar-2011 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:30 <br> Walk-In Pairs |  |  |
| 09:00 <br> Open Teams <br> Championship <br> Final <br> $4 \times 12$ | Ivy Danler <br> Swiss Pairs <br> Matches <br> 8/9/10 of 10 | 10:30 <br> Walk-In Pairs |
| 19:15 Drinks for 19:45 <br> Dinner Dance |  |  |
| Saturday <br> 05-Mar-2011 |  |  |


Christian72
Wotherspoon ..... 70
Haythornthwaite ..... 69
Wylie ..... 69
Nash ..... 68
Kwok ..... 63
Arbuckle ..... 60
Soppet ..... 55
Mcghee ..... 55
Ham 47

| Rank | Pair | North-South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | Pauline GUMBY - Warren LAZER |
| 2 | 2 | Arjuna DE LIVERA - lan ROBINSON |
| 3 | 8 | Stan KLOFA - Alex CZAPNIK |
| 4 | 29 | Peter LIVESEY - Roger THOMAS |
| 5 | 9 | Ervin OTVOSI - Kennet CHRISTIANSEN |
| 6 | 43 | Shakeel CHANDNA - Helena DAWSON |
| 7 | 27 | John BUCKLETON - Douglas RUSSELL |
| 8 | 41 | Adrian THOMPSON - Val EVANS |
| 9 | 12 | Graham WAKEFIELD - Michael PEMBERTON |
| 10 | 44 | Wayne BURROWS - Kaylee LEMON |
| 11 | 69 | Christine HOUGHTON - Wayne HOUGHTON |
| 12 | 47 | Linda BEDFORD-BROWN - Robin PATERSON |
| 12 | 39 | Geoff WOLFARTH - Ros WOLFARTH |
| 12 | 4 | Tony BURKE - Seamus BROWNE |
| 15 | 109 | Ian DRYSDALE - Bobbi DRYSDALE |
| 15 | 28 | Brian THORP - Andrew STRUIK |
| 15 | 7 | Justin WILLIAMS - Peter HOLLANDS |
| 18 | 34 | David MCRAE - Frank KOVACS |
| 18 | 51 | Andy HUNG - Glenn COUTTS |
| 18 | 10 | Jill MAGEE - Terry STRONG |
| 18 | 42 | Tania GARIEPY - Kim FRAZER |
| 22 | 40 | Geoffrey NORRIS - Patrick KENNEDY |
| 22 | 32 | Theo MANGOS - Leigh FORAN |
| 24 | 15 | Tony LEIBOWITZ - Adam EDGTTON |
| 24 | 101 | Jamie MCFALL - Judy JOHNSON |
| 26 | 17 | Julia HOFFMAN - Mary WEDDELL |
| 26 | 52 | Mariella CHARREL - John MASTERS |
| 28 | 102 | Fern MCRAE - Rosemary MATSKOWS |
| 28 | 22 | Judy MOTT - Giselle MUNDELL |
| 30 | 20 | Susan INGHAM - Alex SMIRNOV |
| 30 | 82 | Allan SCERRI - Susan SCERRI |
| 30 | 14 | Nicky STRASSER - George BILSKI |
| 33 | 61 | Nikki RISZKO - Matt BLACKHAM |
| 33 | 56 | Denise KEENAN - Dawn SWABEY |
| 33 | 6 | Jane DAWSON - George SMOLANKO |
| 33 | 25 | Shirley DRAGE - Shirley BLOCH |
| 37 | 107 | Jenny CLEAVER - Judy Holdom |
| 37 | 23 | Bruce CARROLL - Paul ROBERTS |
| 39 | 24 | Paul COLLINS - lan AFFLICK |
| 39 | 65 | Pam SCHOEN - Phil HALE |
| 41 | 74 | Kathleen WOOLER - Helen BROOKSBANK |
| 42 | 103 | Kay LEETON - Jenny HOFF |
| 43 | 38 | Bridget COOKE - Elizabeth COOKE |
| 43 | 13 | Julie SHERIDAN - Karen MARTELLETTI |
| 43 | 113 | Murray WIGGINS - Derek SNELLING |
| 43 | 37 | Nick JACOB - James COUTTS |
| 43 | 60 | Ruth HAIR - Judy PAYNE |
| 43 | 97 | Donald CARTWRIGHT - Peter COX |
| 43 | 3 | Jamie EBERY - Marlene WATTS |
| 43 | 46 | Denis GRAHAME - Jeanette GRAHAME |
| 43 | 18 | Sue MABIN - Adrienne KELLY |
| 52 | 30 | Andrew HILL - David SHILLING |
| 52 | 48 | Damien CZAPNIK - Alex RIGGS |
| 52 | 57 | Dawn TURNER - Jeanette DOUGHERTY |
| 52 | 50 | John JOHNSON - Bill REDHEAD |
| 52 | 5 | Bob RICHMAN - Sara TISHLER |
| 52 | 105 | John GRAY - Ross BEST |
| 52 | 112 | Beverley MORRIS - Allan MORRIS |
| 59 | 92 | Isabella GORSKI - Edith MOENS |

Total Rank
$143 \quad 1$
137
Pa
Pair

East-West
Susan SYKES - Gerard PALMER
Larry MOSES - Graeme TUFFNELL 132
Terry BROWN - Avinash KANETKAR
Theo ANTOFF - Albert SIMPSON 130
130
Bert POLII - Hasyim ARIF
Dan CROFTS - Gary HYETT 128
127

Ron KLINGER - Matthew MULLAMPHY
Frances GARRICK - Bruce DAGLISH 123

Kieran DYKE - Jeanette REITZER
Andrew HEGEDUS - Andrew MILL
Michael WILKINSON - Michael WARING
Barry JONES - Jenny MILLINGTON
Milan DUROVIC - George FINIKIOTIS
Mike ROBERTSON - Bijan ASSAEE
David BEAUCHAMP - Susan CROMPTON
Tony LENART - Paula JENNER
Michael JOHNSON - David TUCKER
Neville FRANCIS - Annette MALUISH
Nathan VAN JOLE - Ralph PARKER
Joan BUTTS - Andrew BRAITHWAITE
Ken WILKS - Rosalie BROUGHTON
Eva SAMUEL - Jeff FUST
Len MEYER - Phyllis MORITZ
Peter GILL - Gulzar BILAL
Gwen GRAY - Colleen TOGNETTI
Kerry HISCOCKS - Delma PURCELL
Catherine RITTER - Stephen WEISZ
Chris LORIMER - Greg SARGENT
Barry RAWICKI - Simon ROSE
Wendy BOXALL - Nick VAN VUCHT
Michael CHRAPOT - Traian CHIRA
Patricia MANN - Ron SPEISER
Ann BUCKLEY - Dorothy MACKAY
lan JESSER - James WOOD
Maureen JAKES - Rosemary GREEN
Elizabeth JEFFERY - Therese DEMARCO
Lyn ARNETT - Mike GILFOYLE
Pat ROGERS - Audrey BONNICK
Gwen CORDINGLEY - Desma SAMPSON
Bruce FRASER - Pim BIRSS
Ken HOCKING - Kevin LANGE
Peter HALL - Sarah STRICKLAND
Lorraine CARR - Margo BRENNAN
Shirley WANZ - Susanne MOULD
Andrew SLATER - William HEALY
Ron CASEY - John KELLY
Dong HUANG - Jet LIU
Val HOLBROOK - Emlyn WILLIAMS
Janina FLEISZIG - Gabor FLEISZIG
Max WIGBOUT - Joan WALDVOGEL
Lyn MULLER - Sarah KALIN
Anne YOUNG - Robert MCARTHUR
Neil GIBSON - Elizabeth GIBSON
Lise ALLAN - Rilla ENGLAND
Noel WOODHALL - Alister STUCK
Tom STRONG - Arie MEYDAN
Sally CLARKE - Garry CLARKE
Tereska KNAP - David MAY
Blanche SLAUGHTER - Neil STRUTTON

| Open Swiss Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 | 59 | Brian CLEAVER - Isobel ROSS | 105 | 60 | 532 | Robert ASHMAN - Don LEVIN | 103 |
| 59 | 19 | Hugh GROSVENOR - Ann PATON | 105 | 60 | 578 | Peter KAHLER - Jeannette COLLINS | 103 |
| 62 | 33 | Anne MITCHELL - Lisa WYLIE | 104 | 60 | 501 | Janet HILL - Bernie ADCOCK | 103 |
| 62 | 70 | Ian SOUTHEN - Sue STERRENBURG | 104 | 63 | 616 | Lynn BAKER - Yong WHITE | 102 |
| 62 | 75 | Barbara STENING - Stephen STENING | 104 | 63 | 529 | Elma PAULL - Dieter BENDT | 102 |
| 65 | 26 | Andrew RICHMAN - Sandra RICHMAN | 103 | 63 | 614 | Gizella MICKEVICS - Mary WATERHOUSE | 102 |
| 65 | 89 | Jenny WILLIAMS - Katrina HEWINGS | 103 | 63 | 548 | Brian ASHWELL - Jan ASHWELL | 102 |
| 65 | 16 | Maggie CALLANDER - Shirley COLLINS | 103 | 67 | 537 | Michel GEROMBOUX - Geoffrey SCHALLER | 101 |
| 65 | 106 | Trish ANAGNOSTOU - Gillian GONTHIER | 103 | 67 | 511 | Suzanne ROLPH - John ROLPH | 101 |
| 69 | 114 | Jan SPAANS - Yuzhong CHEN | 102 | 67 | 544 | Gwenda MEALYEA - Cecile SENIOR | 101 |
| 70 | 110 | Malcolm SMITH - Alison SMITH | 101 | 67 | 557 | Hayden SEAL - Jan DAVIS | 101 |
| 70 | 21 | George PICK - Susie PICK | 101 | 67 | 551 | Peter HEAZLEWOOD - Jenny DELANY | 101 |
| 70 | 96 | Winston GUYMER - Paul CRUICKSHANK | 101 | 72 | 546 | Brian LEACH - Carolyn LEACH | 100 |
| 73 | 36 | Ian BROOKES - Joyce O'BRIEN | 100 | 72 | 603 | Sandy LEACH - Yvonne DENNIS | 100 |
| 73 | 87 | Geoffrey ROBERTS - Kevin DEAN | 100 | 72 | 609 | Nancy SHARP - John KABLE | 100 |
| 73 | 116 | Anna CORNELL-BRAY - Denise KENNEDY | 100 | 75 | 589 | Dawn CULLEN - Maha HOENIG | 99 |
| 73 | 73 | Sandra ALLEN - Evol CRESSWELL | 100 | 75 | 600 | Janet CLARKE - Frances LYONS | 99 |
| 73 | 85 | Ken MOSCHNER - Alison DAWSON | 100 | 75 | 514 | Paul WEAVER - Brian SOUTTER | 99 |
| 73 | 108 | Judy O'NEILL - Graham GILKISON | 100 | 75 | 549 | Ken CARMICHAEL - Glenys DEAN | 99 |
| 79 | 58 | Simon ANDREW - Gwen KING | 99 | 75 | 558 | Roy ROBERTS - John GLENNIE | 99 |
| 79 | 77 | Jocelyn STEELE - John STEELE | 99 | 80 | 517 | Judy WULFF - Marilyn WHIGHAM | 98 |
| 79 | 55 | Arch MORRISON - Lex BOURKE | 99 | 81 | 588 | Patricia GRIGSON - Elizabeth WILSON | 97 |
| 79 | 35 | Kae FRENCH - Nicole MCMANAMNY | 99 | 81 | 515 | Pat LEIGHTON - Gaylene BROWN | 97 |
| 83 | 53 | Allan BARCLAY - Denise BARCLAY | 96 | 81 | 554 | Bev GUILFORD - Sue SPENCER | 97 |
| 83 | 31 | Lorraine STACHURSKI - Mindy WU | 96 | 81 | 587 | Allayne GRAY - Anne SIMPSON | 97 |
| 83 | 76 | Barbara HOSPERS - Gladys TULLOCH | 96 | 85 | 543 | Maureen COLLINGWOOD - Michael AULTON | 96 |
| 86 | 64 | Aileen SHEA - Judith APFELBAUM | 95 | 85 | 613 | Alan CLAYTON - Ann NICHOLS | 96 |
| 87 | 104 | Ken ANDERSON - Lindy ANDERSON | 93 | 87 | 606 | Jill ALLANSON - Evan ALLANSON | 95 |
| 87 | 84 | Michael STONEMAN - Val ROLAND | 93 | 87 | 534 | Michael CONGREVE - Merle GOLTZ | 95 |
| 87 | 100 | Keith LONG - Leslie CHEUNG | 93 | 87 | 607 | Dorothy BERZINS - Peter BERZINS | 95 |
| 87 | 11 | Garry RIPPON - Tim DAVIS | 93 | 87 | 507 | Frances THOMPSON - Ken SMITH | 95 |
| 87 | 71 | Val CHURCHILL - Gene EFINGER | 93 | 87 | 608 | Di DUNNE - Edi SFREDDO | 95 |
| 92 | 91 | Frank CAMPBELL - Heather GRANT | 92 | 87 | 505 | Larry NORDEN - Kendall EARLY | 95 |
| 92 | 98 | Carole COOKE - Carmen HAMILTON | 92 | 93 | 596 | Jennifer ROTHWELL - Tony FALLET | 94 |
| 92 | 86 | Jane SWANSON - Krystyna HOMIK | 92 | 94 | 539 | Kaye ROBERTSHAW - Patricia WARE | 93 |
| 92 | 111 | Sandra CALVERT - Kim GILKISON | 92 | 95 | 577 | Julette ALEXANDER - George LOVRECZ | 92 |
| 92 | 80 | Terence FARRALL - Neale CONSIGLIERE | 92 | 95 | 523 | Susan PHILLIPS - Judith ROBERTS | 92 |
| 97 | 54 | Alexander IVANYI - Judith IVANYI | 91 | 95 | 598 | Peter ANDERSSON - Ashok TULPULE | 92 |
| 97 | 78 | Vicki FOOTS - Anne GRIFFIN | 91 | 95 | 503 | Justin BROWN - Angela NORRIS | 92 |
| 97 | 66 | Jan TUNKS - Jan CLYNE | 91 | 99 | 513 | Wendy O'BRIEN - John HICKS | 91 |
| 97 | 115 | Barbara DALY - Joan GORDON | 91 | 99 | 553 | Les AJZNER - Paul KRON | 91 |
| 97 | 45 | Allison DAWSON - Meredith LAMBERT | 91 | 99 | 591 | Ann MELLINGS - Margaret WALTERS | 91 |
| 97 | 79 | Neville DE MESTRE - Lazar MIKATA | 91 | 99 | 552 | Helen HEALY - Tim HEALY | 91 |
| 97 | 81 | Jim THATCHER - Trish THATCHER | 91 | 103 | 585 | David HARRIS - Kevin FEENEY | 90 |
| 97 | 93 | Elizabeth ZELLER - Eileen JOSEY | 91 | 103 | 583 | Adam RUTKOWSKI - Judy MARKS | 90 |
| 105 | 99 | Fran MCDONALD - Lee LEWIS | 90 | 105 | 541 | Murray PERRIN - Laurie SKEATE | 89 |
| 106 | 62 | David FLYNN - Jill PERCIL | 88 | 105 | 535 | Lucy ROBINSON - Lee ANDREWS | 89 |
| 106 | 90 | Anna OLSZEWSKA - Sheela SAHASRABUDDHE | 88 | 105 | 602 | Kuldip BEDI - Richard MISIOR | 89 |
| 106 | 95 | Janet WALLIS - Ann BULLOCK | 88 | 108 | 516 | Christina MACQUARRIE - Christine PARKIN | 87 |
| 109 | 94 | Alison INCHLEY - Sue TRAHAIR | 87 | 109 | 611 | Malcolm ALLAN - Diana STEWART | 86 |
| 109 | 88 | Elizabeth FRENCH - John FELL | 87 | 110 | 530 | Patricia MANN - Carmel BOURKE | 85 |
| 111 | 72 | Jeanette ROUGHLEY - Margaret BAZZAN | 85 | 111 | 576 | Carl HAGAN - Leone SZABO | 84 |
| 112 | 83 | John SEAR - Dale WELLS | 84 | 111 | 506 | John COX - Bev TRAVERS | 84 |
| 113 | 63 | Geoff ALLEN - Andrew WING LUN | 83 | 113 | 545 | Heather FLANDERS - Lillian SEALY | 79 |
| 113 | 68 | Alison TALBOT - Marian OBENCHAIN | 83 | 114 | 555 | Pamela GLYN - Julian GLYN | 75 |
| 115 | 49 | Roman MORAWIECKI - Ruth WEBB | 82 | 115 | 542 | Patricia FITZGERALD - Marie SIGANTO | 72 |
| 116 | 67 | Geoffrey THOMAS - David HURST | 75 | 116 | 522 | Maureen PHILLIPS - Cathy SLAUGHTER | 68 |
| Restricted Swiss Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rank | Pair | Names | Total | Rank | Pair | Names | Total |
| 1 | 49 | Mike EDWARDS - Liz JACKA | 135 | 31 | 43 | Tony GHUSN - Anne GHUSN | 103 |
| 2 | 23 | Alan DAVIES - Vivien ELDRIDGE | 126 | 31 | 22 | Marian PEIRIS - Birgitt BINGHAM | 103 |
| 3 | 1 | Jill CHURCH - Rhondda SWEETMAN | 124 | 31 | 42 | Lou TILLOTSON - Christina BERGMAN | 103 |
| 4 | 10 | Gayle BODDICE - Kay CONWAY | 123 | 31 | 44 | Margaret AISTON - Jenny CRAWT | 103 |
| 5 | 11 | Jeffrey LACEY - John BRISTOW | 122 | 35 | 46 | Diana MCKENZIE - Jim VERVER | 102 |
| 6 | 40 | Joan LECKIE - Margaret WILLIAMSON | 121 | 36 | 31 | Carole ROACH - Carmel MORAN | 101 |
| 7 | 38 | Margaret SLY - Maria RUTTIMAN | 118 | 36 | 45 | Flossie AIZEN - Sue SmALL | 101 |
| 7 | 9 | Lex RANKE - Jack ROHDE | 118 | 36 | 7 | Patricia HOBSON - Helen FITZPATRICK | 101 |
| 7 | 13 | Diane NICHOLS - Susan EASTMAN | 118 | 36 | 19 | Kristin HUGHES - John HUGHES | 101 |
| 10 | 59 | Barbara GORDON - Janice QUIGLEY | 117 | 40 | 2 | Norma NEWTON - June NESBITT | 100 |
| 11 | 36 | Neil RAWARD - Shirley FITZGERALD | 116 | 40 | 35 | Helen CLARKE - Helen CHAMBERLIN | 100 |
| 11 | 54 | Barry O'DONOHUE - Margie KNOX | 116 | 42 | 34 | Rodney CURTIN - John STACEY | 99 |
| 13 | 58 | Janet MUNRO - David MUNRO | 114 | 43 | 15 | Rosemary KELLEY - Ned KELLEY | 98 |
| 13 | 4 | Margaret PARTRIDGE - John ROGERS | 114 | 43 | 20 | Ann WOOD - Barbara LOVE | 98 |
| 13 | 16 | Janet HANSEN - Diane MORGAN | 114 | 43 | 27 | Norma BROWNE - Jillian GRIFFITH | 98 |
| 16 | 8 | Maureen WILSON - Bev WISHART | 112 | 43 | 18 | Pauline WEBB - Toni PFAFFLIN | 98 |
| 16 | 3 | Pat CREMA - Joan CAMPBELL | 112 | 47 | 6 | Helen ROLLOND - Peter ROLLOND | 97 |


| 16 | 14 | Andrew WOOLLONS - Robin STEINHARDT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | 53 | Helen WALKER - Kevin WALKER |
| 16 | 60 | Marie IRVING - Alison SIMON |
| 16 | 48 | Irene HAMILTON - Denis WARD |
| 22 | 28 | Dave MITCHELL - Sharon STRETTON |
| 22 | 56 | Patricia GEORGE - Lyn LEVY |
| 22 | 37 | Adrian LOHMANN - Ruth GOERG |
| 22 | 32 | Peter NILSSON - Deborah NILSSON |
| 26 | 55 | Robin BENNETT - Jean BENNETT |
| 27 | 39 | Margaret PISKO - Paul BRAKE |
| 28 | 57 | Dale PEAK - Roger PEAK |
| 28 | 50 | Anne LAMPORT - Chris COOPER |
| 30 | 21 | Ian BARFOOT - Peter ROBBINS |


| 112 | 48 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 112 | 48 | 17 |
| 112 | 48 | 29 |
| 112 | 51 | 30 |
| 110 | 51 | 52 |
| 110 | 53 | 47 |
| 110 | 54 | 51 |
| 110 | 54 | 12 |
| 108 | 56 | 25 |
| 107 | 57 | 24 |
| 106 | 58 | 33 |
| 106 | 59 | 26 |
| 105 | 60 | 41 |


| Novice Swiss Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | Pair |  | Sess 1 | Sess 2 | Total |
| 1 | 29 | Barbara LANE - Gail THOMPSON | 61.44 | 62.33 | 123.77 |
| 2 | 21 | Sally LAZAR - Richard LAZAR | 56.64 | 62.66 | 119.31 |
| 3 | 7 | Odette HALL - Daniel CHUA | 52.61 | 63.70 | 116.31 |
| 4 | 2 | Lou INNES - Pat DAVIS | 57.73 | 55.84 | 113.58 |
| 5 | 530 | Sheryl HASLAM - Denise HARTWIG | 59.91 | 52.92 | 112.83 |
| 6 | 526 | Diana SHER - Carolyn RIGHETTI | 61.00 | 49.26 | 110.26 |
| 7 | 501 | Camilla BOYD - Cherry MCWILLIAM | 47.39 | 60.56 | 107.95 |
| 8 | 5 | Karen ERENSTROM - James FYFE | 51.31 | 55.50 | 106.81 |
| 9 | 521 | Leslie TREASURE - Martin BEECH | 51.09 | 54.47 | 105.56 |
| 10 | 525 | Helen TYLER - Terry NADEBAUM | 47.60 | 57.66 | 105.26 |
| 11 | 26 | John SLAUGHTER - Casey SLAUGHTER | 59.37 | 45.23 | 104.60 |
| 12 | 510 | Idalia DE VOS - Patricia RYAN | 56.10 | 48.39 | 104.49 |
| 13 | 509 | Sharron MARTON - Julie FRASER-EASTON | 53.16 | 51.28 | 104.44 |
| 14 | 10 | Lynn KELLY - Bryan BARNETT | 55.12 | 49.22 | 104.34 |
| 15 | 3 | Trevor FLETCHER - Noriko NISHIGAMI | 54.47 | 48.76 | 103.22 |
| 16 | 504 | Susan LIPTON - Maureen GIBNEY | 53.81 | 49.30 | 103.11 |
| 17 | 25 | Peter HOOPER - Susie HERRING | 50.22 | 52.51 | 102.73 |
| 18 | 27 | Roy REYNOLDS - Judy REYNOLDS | 53.70 | 49.00 | 102.70 |
| 19 | 1 | Margaret WATSON - Colin PEARDON | 47.60 | 54.76 | 102.36 |
| 20 | 23 | Garry SMITH - Marleen SMITH | 53.81 | 47.18 | 100.99 |
| 21 | 9 | Lindsey SMITH - Nola POTTER | 50.33 | 50.37 | 100.70 |
| 22 | 508 | Kay ROBERTS - Linda NORMAN | 48.47 | 52.11 | 100.59 |
| 23 | 506 | Byron LONGFORD - Lance COFFEY | 40.74 | 59.66 | 100.40 |
| 24 | 28 | Trevor SHAW - Trevor HURFORD | 47.06 | 53.29 | 100.35 |
| 25 | 502 | Cathy CRAWFORD - Jenelle DALTON | 51.09 | 48.68 | 99.77 |
| 26 | 523 | David CORNEY - Margaret CORNEY | 46.84 | 51.75 | 98.59 |
| 27 | 507 | Martin JOHNSON - June SMYTH | 52.83 | 45.60 | 98.44 |
| 28 | 4 | Ronnie NILANT - Jenny WALKDEN | 46.84 | 50.22 | 97.06 |
| 29 | 522 | Jennifer BAVAGE - Maree FILIPPINI | 51.74 | 44.82 | 96.57 |
| 30 | 529 | Judith MACKLOW - Sue WELBOURN | 51.42 | 42.90 | 94.32 |
| 31 | 8 | Clare COLES - Jane STEARNS | 41.61 | 51.74 | 93.35 |
| 32 | 524 | Shirley BURGESS - Judy BLOMFIELD | 46.41 | 46.82 | 93.23 |
| 33 | 505 | Denise RICHARDS - Yvonne WAIN | 53.81 | 39.09 | 92.90 |
| 34 | 22 | June ORFORD - Bill ARMSTRONG | 43.68 | 44.97 | 88.65 |
| 35 | 528 | Loretta SHELTON - Rowena HEALY-BROWN | 51.53 | 36.12 | 87.65 |
| 36 | 24 | Patricia GARNER - Susan WRIGHT | 35.62 | 51.76 | 87.38 |
| 37 | 503 | Margaret CARR - Catherine ASHCROFT | 42.59 | 37.87 | 80.46 |
| 38 | 6 | Peter FORSYTH - Carmel POLLARD | 42.37 | 37.59 | 79.96 |
| 39 | 527 | Peter EBERT - Pauline FORD | 32.46 | 45.59 | 78.05 |
| 40 | 30 | Judith DAVIS - Doreen HINTON | 38.45 | 38.51 | 76.96 |

## Medium

| 5 | 6 | 9 |  |  | 4 |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  | 4 |  |
|  |  | 3 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 5 |
|  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| 7 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
|  | 7 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 9 |
|  | 3 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 4 |

Diabolical

|  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 2 |  | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  | 3 |  |
|  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |  | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 8 | 5 |  |
|  | 9 |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |  | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  | 6 |  |
| 3 |  | 7 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |

## THAT'S ENTERTAINMENT - SOLUTIONS TO YESTERDAY

Medium

| 1 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 |
| 4 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 8 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| 5 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| 7 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 6 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 7 |

## Diabolical

| 9 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 7 |
| 5 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| 7 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 4 |
| 2 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 8 |

## Netlingo - how good is your knowledge?

- ABITHIWTITB = A Bird In The Hand Is Worth Two In The Bush
- ADIP = Another Day In Paradise
- AISI = As I See It
- $\quad \mathrm{AWC}=$ After A While Crocodile
- AYOR = At Your Own Risk
- AYSOS = Are You Stupid or Something
- $\mathrm{B} 2 \mathrm{~B}=$ Business to Business
- B4YKI = Before You Know It
- BB4N = Bye Bye For Now
- BOBFOC = (particularly liked this one) Body from Baywatch Face from Crimewatch
- CMIW = Correct Me if I'm Wrong
- CRAP = Cheap Redundant Assorted Products
- CWOT = Complete Waste of Time
- DHYB = Don't Hold Your Breath
- DNBL8 = Do Not Be Late
- DQMOT = Don't Quote Me On This
- DYJHIW = Don't You Just Hate It When....
- ESEHED = Every Second Of Every Hour Of Every Day
- FGDAI $=$ Fuhgedaboutit or Forget About It
- FIGJAM = F... I'm Good Just Ask Me
- FITB = Fill In The Blanks
- FMTYEWTK = Far More Than You Ever Wanted To Know
- FOMCL = Falling Off My Chair Laughing
- FWIW = For What It's Worth
- GAL = Get A Life
- GALGAL = Give A Little Get A Little
- G2GLYS = Got To Go Love You So
- GGOH = Gotta Get Outta Here
- GIDK = Gee I Don't Know
- GTRM = Going to Read Mail
- H\&K = Hugs and Kisses
- HITAKS = Hang In There And Keep Smiling
- HWGA = Here We Go Again
- IANAE = I Am Not An Expert
- IGTP = I Get The Point
- IIMAD = If It Makes Any Difference
- $\quad \mathrm{IMHO}=$ In My Humble Opinion
- IMHEIUO = In My High Exalted Informed Unassailable Opinion
- IMPOV = In My Point Of View
- NADT = Not A Damn Thing
- NALOPKT = Not A Lot Of People Know That
- NB4T = Not Before Time
- NIFOC = Nude In Front Of The Computer (hmmm..)
- NNWW = Nudge Nudge Wink Wink
- NWOT = New Without Tag
- $\mathrm{OOO}=$ Out Of Office
- $\mathrm{OTOH}=\mathrm{On}$ The Other Hand
- PAL = Parents Are Listening


[^0]:    1. Watch what havoc I create, partner
    2. I'm too good for any other bid and I don't want to go past 3NT
    3. To play, but..
