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130+ TRIVIA PARTICIPANTS RAISE MONEY FOR YOUTH PLAYER - WELL DONE ALL


## OPEN TEAMS QUALIFYING ONE

Barry Rigal

For the first round of the teams I focused on two tables. At one table Michal Klukowski and Stan Golebiowski were taking on Mary Allison and Margaret Yuill (Burke v Stewart). At the other Pauline Gumby and Howard Melbourne were playing Pam Horton and Helena McLauchlan (Kanetkar vs Valentine).

Both tables for Burke started with a bang, Golebiowski making 4 on normal but friendly defence, while Gill was doubled into game the other way. The board was flat at 420 in our other match.

A couple of deals later Klukowski treated a 4333 14-count as a strong no-trump to get to $4 \vee$, missed in the other room. The normal passive lead from three small trumps picked up partner's doubleton queen (over dummy's ace-king) and Burke led 21-0. Valentine-Mortess played 3NT rather than 4 $\mathbf{\bullet}$, which it was impossible to guess right. Kanetkar led 15-0.

| Dealer: West | - 1072 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - AJ 103 |  |
| Brd 4 | - 932 |  |
| Open Teams Q1 | \% AK 10 |  |
| - 5 |  | ¢ A J 6 |
| -9876 |  | - 54 |
| - Q J 1085 |  | - AK 4 |
| \& 973 |  | *QJ542 |
|  | - KQ9843 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K Q 2 |  |
|  | - 76 |  |
|  | -86 |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
| - | 4 | - | 4 | $\oplus$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| 2 | - | 2 | - |  |
| 2 | - | 2 | - | $\varrho$ |

Valentine struck back at once when Gumby/Lazer stayed out of game after a non-forcing response in competition in the auction $1-(2 \boldsymbol{*})$-2ll Pass. You may say that this treatment deserves to lose a game swing every time it comes up; I couldn't possibly comment. But if you MUST play something why not switch the majors, that way you at least get a little more bang for your non-forcing buck?
In our other match Stewart-Banner also missed game; but since Klukowski /Golebiowski had collected 1000 from 1NTxx (yes there might have been a way to hold the loss to 400) it hardly mattered. Burke led 34-0.
The Stewart team got off the mark nicely on the next deal.

| Dealer: North | - K Q 1076 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - J43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 5 | - 84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Teams Q1 | \& A Q 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 984 |  | ¢ --- |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1096 |  | $\checkmark$ AKQ 752 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J 9 |  | - Q 1062 |  | Make | Co |  |  |
| \& J 1063 |  | +K97 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | - J 532 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | - 8 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - AK753 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 854 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | 4 |

Burke/Gill had escaped for - 50 in 50 in one room (as had Kanetkar/Neill). In the other Golebiowski played 44 on repeated heart leads - far and away the best defence. Declarer correctly played three rounds of diamonds at once and Yuill seized her chance to discard her third heart. When declarer led out the $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \mathrm{K}$ from hand she could win and shift to $\boldsymbol{\&}$ J and declarer was toast. He finished down two. Meanwhile Gumby also played 4 but on a top heart lead and club shift. That gave her the tempo to set up diamonds without an overruff, for an impressive +620 .

| Dealer: South | ¢ 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - K 63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 7 | -KQ963 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ A Q J 5432 |  | ¢ 87 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 4 |  | -AJ75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J 852 |  | - 74 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \% 4 |  | \& 108532 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | ¢ K 10 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | \$ |
|  | - Q 10982 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A 10 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& AK Q 6 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | 8 |

It was Warren Lazer's chance to play a hand nicely here. After opening 10 he balanced with a double of 3 and Gumby put him in $4 \boldsymbol{\top}$. He won the club lead in dummy to try a heart to the ten, followed by a heart to the king and ace. He could cross back to dummy eventually to repeat the heart finesse. That was only worth three imps since $4 \times$ had gone two down in the other room. Burke picked up a big swing when they might have lost one. They defeated $4 \checkmark$ in one room after a club lead, while in the other room Klukowski opened a Polish Club, and heard 3 come back to him. He bid 3NT, and when Yuill led a diamond he was home with nine tricks. Obviously a spade lead would have given declarer an eighth trick - but declarer would then have had to read the position pretty well to guess diamonds at once.

After Valentine and Stewart had each stretched to bid a non-vulnerable game and found a remarkably favourable lie of the cards, Yuill-Allison missed a slam bid everywhere else. Burke led 58-14, but their opponents were about to go on a nice run, while keeping a clean sheet for the last five deals. Meanwhile Kanetkar was up 29-18.
Both Norths for Valentine and Stewart came in over 19-2 with:

- 87
- K Q J 85
- 64
\& K J 82
Stewart ended up down 100 in 4 , while Valentine passed Carr's 3 call with a balanced 12-count. Well judged - and +140 for 7 IMPs, since 2 made the other way in the other room.
Stewart added 6 IMPs when a Burke/Gill defence to $5 \times x$ turned +500 into +200 (and it should have been 750). In the other room 44x fetched 590 the other way - and that could have been 690.

Stewart picked up one more big swing when Yuill/Allison played a safe partscore in one room while 3NT was lucky to escape for two down in the other. The match finished 58-37 for Burke, while Valentine pulled back to a losing draw when a Kanetkar/Neill experiment at the three-level cost 800, against a possible non-vulnerable game, not bid by Gumby/Lazer.

## OPEN TEAMS QUALIFYING TWO

## Barry Rigal

For the second round I would keep an eye on Cooper versus Malinas and Wyer versus Stralow. For the betting man, you are asked to speculate on which of the two tables I was watching was nothing but laughter and good cheer, which was sniping from the trenches interspersed with TD calls...
Wyer broke on top when Stralow/Wood missed a slam that was generally bid around the room, but Stralow hit back with three big pick-ups on the next three deals. The first one posed a problem round the room: after an unopposed sequence $1-1$ - would you bid on with;
-K 10732
-KJ73

- 62
\& 82
Partner has the perfecta with ФAJ9 and all the cards lie as well as possible. Malinas/Malaczynski and Stralow/Wood both got to game for a decent pick-up.
On the next deal each of the pairs in Cooper-Malinas reached 50 as did Wyer/Anderson, but Wood/Stralow did brilliantly:

| Dealer: North | ¢ Q |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - Q 9843 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 17 | - A Q |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Teams Q2 | \& K Q 843 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢97654 | ¢ J 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K 65 | - J 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J 106 |  | -987532 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& J 9 |  | \& 1076 | - | 6 | - | 6 | NT |
| ¢ AK 1083 |  |  | - | 5 | - | 6 | \$ |
| - A 72 |  |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\checkmark$ |
| - K 4 |  |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
| ¢ A 52 |  |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | \% |

They reached 6NT, and on a diamond lead won the ace, unblocked spades, tested two clubs ending in hand and played the AK, claiming when the jack appeared. Had clubs not broken, the contract might make if hearts behaved well. 6e is an equivalent contract but I think no-trump has slightly the better chances. Both are considerably better than hearts.
On the next deal Stralow/Wood did it again, bidding to - a slam with virtually no play on a club lead, but a claimer on any other lead. When the hand on lead to slam was dealt \&KJ10 and a variety of other passive options, the die was cast. Stralow led 31-13 after four deals. Alas for them, they did not score on the remaining 10 deals, while Wyer was just warming up. By comparison it was 7-0 to Malinas in our other match.

| Dealer: West Vul: Both | ¢ $A 1053$ +97 |  | West Lewis | North Cooper | East <br> Li | South <br> Nagy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 20 | -Q105 |  | 10 | Pass | 1NT | 24 |  |
| Open Teams Q2 | \& J 853 |  | 2 | 3\% | 34 | Pass |  |
| ¢ K 76 |  | ¢ J 84 | 4 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - K J 1085 |  | -63 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 8763 |  | - AK J 92 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& A |  | \& 642 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ Q 92 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | ¢ |
|  | - AQ4 2 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\bullet$ |
|  | - 4 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& K Q 1097 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | 9 |

At one table in Cooper-Malinas Melbourne/Lilley stopped in $3 *$. Above is the auction from the other table.
Li's intelligent 3 call (predicated on the unlikely assumption that Lewis might have his bidding) was a nonspecific game try for diamonds. Lewis won the club lead in $4 \diamond$ and crossed to a trump to lead a heart to the jack. The spot cards marked South as $4-5$ in the round suits, with no spade bidding by North, might the indicated play be to take the diamond finesse? It ought not to matter, since best defence still sets $4 \diamond$. Anyway, Lewis crossed to the $\forall K$ and played a second heart. Nagy won and exited in clubs, letting Lewis ruff and play OK. Cooper ruffed in, as dummy pitched the last club, and exited with a club. That gave declarer a ruff and discard, but left him with two spade losers whatever he did. Down one and 5 IMPs to Cooper.

The next deal seemed to be a lot more fun to defend than to play, based on the results from the four tables I was covering.

| Dealer: North | - Q J 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A 9875 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 21 | -KJ3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Teams Q2 | \% J |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K |  | - A 842 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -1062 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 10 |  | - A 8765 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& K 1097653 |  | ¢ 2 | - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | -10753 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | - |
|  | - K Q |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\bullet$ |
|  | - 942 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | \& A Q 84 |  | - | - | - | - | 4 |

Stralow/Wood played $4 \checkmark$ down 200, the other three tables reached $4 \uparrow$ from the weak hand. On the lead of the Q both declarers covered happily, then put up the $\$ 9$ when a diamond came back. Oops. Now what to do?

Both declarers unblocked $\because K Q$ and tried to ruff a club in dummy. Elaine Li overruffed, and cashed $\uparrow 9$ as partner pitched a heart. The third heart did not promote a trump, so Anderson escaped for down one. By contrast Yumin Li did not overuff the club, pitching a heart and ruffing the $\uparrow$ A at the next trick. Declarer overruffed and ruffed another club in dummy. Li could still have ensured one off the easy way by overruffing and cashing a diamond, but he discarded a diamond again. This was the ending:


Nagy led a heart from dummy, and NOW finally it was incumbent on East to ruff. Again he discarded, and Nagy pitched his diamond, letting Lewis ruff in and play a club. Declarer had to ruff high, and Li finally overruffed and led a diamond, scoring his $\$ 8$ for the setting trick. Notice the difference if, once Li discards on the heart nine, South pitches his club not his diamond. East ruffs in (if he doesn't he gets endplayed with a trump at his next turn) and is forced to give a ruff and discard. Declarer discards the diamond from dummy and can ruff in hand. Then leads a diamond and ruff with the © 9 , and this time East is the one who gets endplayed!

Anyway, it went down in the scorebooks as another dull push.
The next deal saw big swings in both our matches.

| Dealer: East | - 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | -KQJ107653 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 22 | - Q 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Teams Q2 | \& K 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 93 |  | - AK 62 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 4 |  | $\bullet$--- |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & * \text { A K } 62 \\ & * 10742 \end{aligned}$ |  | -109873 |  | ak | C |  |  |
|  |  | \& Q J 63 | 3 | - | 3 | - | NT |
|  | - J 10854 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |
|  | - 922 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 5 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | + A 85 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | 4 |

At one table in each room E/W defended to 40x down one. Francis and Moren for Wyer played 4@ by West on a top heart lead. You may care to speculate how that came to ten tricks. I could tell you but then l'd have to kill you... 11 IMPs to Wyer, and a similar number to Cooper, when Melbourne/Lilley played a more pedestrian 5 and the defenders, naturally, did not find the club ruff to set it.


Board 25 represents a good example of what some pompous bridge writers (OK, it's me) would call a pons asinorum. Those of you familiar with Euclid's theorems may recall that there was one relating to equal angles in an isosceles triangle that was at the basic end of simple. To understand and prove the theory was regarded as the very least you could do and be considered able to do mathematics. Fail that and you were out on your ear.

So dear reader, which side of the fence are you going to be on?
At one table I was watching (again only the names have been changed to protect the guilty) North thought he had a 1 opener and E/W climbed to $2 \uparrow$, making for a loss of 10 IMPs against 3NT in the other room by Melbourne/Lilley. In our other match one table made it easy by leading $\% 6$ against $4 \boldsymbol{4}$. But let's cut to the
chase; to cross the Bridge of Fools you must make 4 after North has opened a weak 2 or 3 on the lead of $\checkmark J$ and three rounds of diamonds.
It is all too easy when I give it to you as a problem - I hope. Simply discard a heart loser on the third diamond, then win the heart return and ruff a heart, finesse in spades and draw trump, and now you know RHO has four clubs and LHO two, so you finesse against North and rack up your game. It didn't go that way at the table...Just guess how many pairs out of 35 made 4 4 on the lead of $\downarrow$. would you believe 9 ? Neither would $I$.
Anyway, 13 more IMPs to Wyer, who notched a further part-score swing at the end to win 55-31.
Cooper picked up two big swings on the last two deals, Nagy making a 3NT that could have been defeated on precise defence (while they were playing $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ in the other room). Then they opted to play a $7-1$ heart fit in $4 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$, making in some comfort, while in the other room 3NT hinged on finding the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, and Malinas/Malaczynski did not do that. Those 20 IMPs on the last two boards made it 51-8 for Cooper.

## PAIRS FINAL REVISITED

## Barry Rigal

The following deal produced a good story and a might-have-been. First the good story:


Klinger led ace and another spade. Milne found the best way to induce pressure on his opponents, using Tony Forrester's tip about the power of the closed hand. He ruffed the second spade and led a diamond to dummy and a club towards his hand. Mullamphy split his honours (in a comparable position McGann ducked to defeat the game). So Milne won and drew a second trump, then led a second club towards his hand. When Mullamphy went up with the king the contract was home. On a purely technical basis, can North help his partner by discarding say the 9 J on the second trump? If South knows there is no heart trick to come, he should work out the defence.


In the same contract after a similar auction (here North had shown 5-5 in the majors) Travis led $\uparrow$ A and shifted to $\boldsymbol{\&}$, giving David Weston the chance to be a hero.
Win the club ace, trump to dummy ruff a spade, trump to dummy ruff a spade, and now $\triangle A K$. This is the position:

Declarer leads a club from dummy and South must win. But now he can do no better than give a ruff and discard, when declarer ruffs in either hand and pitches the losing heart from the other hand, or he can lead a club. Whether he leads high or low, declarer can set up the club and cross to hand on a trump for the rest.

## INTERMEDIATE TEAMS QUALIFYING THREE - LOTS OF ACTION

## Brent Manley

When they introduce themselves to other players, people often think the members of the Barry Foster team are from Brisbane. It's a natural mistake, of course, because they also say they play at the Brisbane Water Bridge Club - which happens to be located north of Sydney.


Lying in eighth place after two rounds on Tuesday, Foster and his teammates - partner Hope Tomlinson, Martin Johnson and David Snow - faced the Keith Blinco squad. Blinco was playing with Tex Sheedy. Their teammates are Eric Baker and Chris Stead.

The Blinco team got the best of the match, but all four players acquitted themselves well in the14-board set.
On this deal, Johnson and Snow had reason to feel disappointed after the result they achieved at their table:

Pictured LtoR: Martin Johnson, David Snow, Hope Tomlinson and Barry Foster

| Dealer: West | - Q 762 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | -1084 |  |
| Brd 12 | $765432$ |  |
| - K 8 |  | - A J 1094 |
| - 93 |  | - K J J 5 |
| -K |  | - A 98 |
| \& A Q 1086542 |  | \% K |
|  | - 53 |  |
|  | - A 762 |  |
|  | - Q J 10 |  |
|  | \& J 973 |  |


| West <br> Snow | North | East <br> Johnson | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1\% | Pass | 14 | Pass |  |
| 24 | Pass | 3 | Pass |  |
| 4\% | Pass | 4¢ | Pass |  |
| 5\% | Pass | Pass | Double |  |
| Pass | Pass | 5NT | Double | // |
| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | - | 4 | - | NT |
| 5 | - | 4 | - | \$ |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
| 5 | - | 5 | - | 9 |

At the other table, Johnson found himself in an usual doubled contract as shown above,
The record of the play was not provided, but it is likely that at some point South cashed the A. That would give declarer three hearts to go with three spades (via the finesse against North's queen), three clubs and two diamonds. Plus 670 looked like a fine result considering that 5NT could have been defeated and, on a heart lead, the club slam cannot be made.
Here's what happened at the Foster table.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blinco | Foster | Sheedy | Tomlin |
| 14 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | 6 | All Pa |

Foster, with no particular reason to lead a heart, started with a low diamond. For all he knew, Tomlinson could have been ruffing a diamond.

Blinco won the diamond lead in hand and played a club to dummy's king, getting the news about the 4-0 break in trumps. He played a club to the king and noting the bad break cashed the $\checkmark$ A, pitching a heart, and ruffed a diamond to hand. Next came the two club honours and the $\Phi$ K. Blinco followed that with a spade to the jack, which held. When he played the A, Tomlinson was able to ruff with the master trump, but Blinco simply discarded his heart loser and claimed plus 920 . Well played!
The board was played 88 times in the Intermediate Section. Thirty-five times, the contact was $6 \boldsymbol{\$}$ or 6 NT (one optimistic pair got to $7 \&$ and were doubled, going down one). In all, $6 \%$ made four times, 6NT three. The upshot for the Foster and Blinco teams is that 920 minus 670 was 250 for Blinco, a 6 -IMP win.

This deal, early in the match, helped Foster to a 12-IMP gain.

| Dealer: West | ¢ 74 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -K92 |  | Blinco | Foster | Sheedy | Tomlinson |
| Brd 4 | - A 97 |  | 1 | 2\% | Double | Pass |
|  | \& A K J 97 |  | 20 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| ¢ Q J 86 |  | ¢ AK 3 | 3 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| - AQ J 7 |  | - 84 |  |  |  |  |
| -Q643 |  | -KJ 82 |  | Makea | le Contra | cts |
| 46 |  | \& Q 854 | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | 4 10952 |  | 3 | - | 3 | ¢ |
|  | -10653 |  | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -105 |  | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 1032 |  | - | 1 | - |  |

Tomlinson started with the $\$ 10$. Foster played the encouraging $\$ 7$, ducked by Sheedy. A second club went to the 9 . Sheedy had to win or the defenders would take the first five tricks. Sheedy cashed four spade tricks, but when he called for a diamond from dummy, Foster rose with the ace and cashed out. That was plus 100 to the Foster team.

At the other table, North apparently did not overcall after West opened $1 \downarrow$. The same contract was reached, but the opening lead was a low spade, giving declarer a chance to set up diamonds and get home with plus 600.

Blinco prevailed 46-24, but Foster came back in the next set to win their match.

## TILL THE PIPS SQUEAK...

Barry Rigal
Of course no one would accuse Matt Mullamphy of being a pipsqueak. But he made the cards talk here.

| Dealer: West | ¢ 932 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - Q 9532 |  |
| Brd 8 | - A J 3 |  |
| Open Prs Final S2 | ¢96 |  |
| ¢Q108764 |  | ¢ A K |
| -108 |  | -AK J 4 |
| -62 |  | -K97 |
| \& 872 |  | \& K Q 53 |
|  | - J 5 |  |
|  | - 76 |  |
|  | -Q10 854 |  |
|  | \& A J 104 |  |



He played 4. as East after a non-constructive route to game
As Brent Manley remarked, no one as South would find a club lead - would they? A trump lead might be more plausible, I admit. Mullamphy received a diamond lead to the $\backslash$ and a top of a doubleton club shift to the king and ace, followed by a club back. He won, unblocked spades, played three rounds of hearts, and ran the trumps. This was the position as the last one was led.


The last trump sounded the death-knell for the defence. North had to keep his heart, so discarded a diamond. Klinger could pitch his heart now and squeeze South in the minors. For those of you unfamiliar with the genre, this is a simultaneous doublesqueeze. Yes, a simple heart finesse works as well, but this line also brings in queen-third of hearts with South.
Declarer could also have gone wrong by playing to enter dummy with a diamond ruff, to go for a club heart squeeze on South. This was more elegant, though!

## SUCKER PUNCH

Barry Rigal

- 742

Board 18 Open Pairs Final Session 1
-A974

| - A Q J 53 | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -2 | Baron | Giura | Whibley | Hughes |
|  | 1\% | $1{ }^{*}$ | $1 \checkmark$ | 1. |
| ed for Convenience | Pass | 24 | Double | All Pass |

$-82$

- 9874
- J 8

Here is Nick Hughes detailing a declarer play problem he was faced with.
Steve Baron led M6, which turned out to be a good start for the defence, Hughes ducked. Michael Whibley cashed $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, then switched back to QK to dummy's ace.

A club now might be best but Hughes wanted to avoid a trump promotion so he played a top trump, which West won to clear trumps.
Feeling confident, he finished trumps then took the diamond finesse, which won. South came back to hand by ruffing a heart with his last trump, and led another diamond, ready to chalk up +870 .
Dealer: East
Vul: N-S
Brd 18

- K
© Q J 103
K 6
\& Q 10964

```
@ Q J 1065
\bullet82
* 9874
& J }
4 A983
\bullet}6
-102
&AK 7 5 3
$742
-A974
-AQJ53
&2
```

When the second finesse lost to the bare $\checkmark K$ Hughes was -800 instead and a clear bottom.
This was a nice duck by Whibley. He could have grabbed the $\downarrow \mathrm{K}$ the first time for +200 but that would not have been great, given they have game on. Since some of the field missed game or went down in it, down one would actually have been an average for N/S
Note also that an initial top club lead by Baron would have given the location of $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ away, leading to -200 at worst for Hughes.

## HITTING THEIR STRIDE

## Brent Manley

In the Novice Pairs B final, Noosa players Jenny Mawson and Cherry Barnett had a couple of so-so sessions before settling in for the third set. With help from an opponent, they started Final 3 with a bang.

| Dealer: East Vul: Both | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - Q } 4 \\ & \bullet \text { K Q } 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | West <br> Barnett | North | East <br> Mawson | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 10 | - A J |  |  |  | Pass | Pass |  |
| Novice Prs Fin S3 | \& Q 107532 |  | 14 | 24 | 24 | Pass |  |
| ¢AK 8752 |  | ¢ J 103 | 4¢ | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - A 2 |  | -J75 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 762 |  | -K10543 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& K |  | \& J 4 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | ¢96 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | ¢ |
|  | -109843 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 98 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& A 986 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\%$ |



A heart lead from North would have held Barnett to 10 tricks, but North started off with the A , continuing the suit. Barnett won in hand, banged down the top trumps and was able to claim, pitching her low heart on a long diamond. Plus 650 was good for $85 \%$.

On the next round, Barnett chose the right strain for slam and, again with an assist from the opening leader, Mawson brought it home. (Pictured left Jenny Mawson and Cherry Barnett)

| Dealer: East | $\text { ゆ J } 73$ |  | West <br> Barnett | North | East <br> Mawson | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\bullet 652$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 14 | -1096432 |  |  |  | 2NT | Pass |  |
| Novice Prs Fin S3 | \& J |  | 34 | Pass | 3 | Pass |  |
| ¢ K 84 |  | - Q 95 | 6NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - K J 97 |  | - AQ 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 5 |  | - AKQ 7 |  | Make | le Cont | acts |  |
| \& K Q 654 |  | \& A 92 | 6 | - | 6 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ A 1062 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | ¢ |
|  | -1043 |  | 6 | - | 6 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 8 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 10873 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | 9 |

Of the two players, Mawson is the more aggressive, usually to their side's benefit. On board 14, it was Barnett who took the bull by the horns to get to the right spot. She might have probed for a slam in clubs, but slam in that strain has no chance because of the foul break in the trump suit.
6NT can always make, but it takes a bit of work.
Say South leads a heart, which gives declarer nothing. East wins in hand and plays a spade. South ducks and West's king wins. Now declarer starts cashing winners, putting pressure on South. After cashing diamonds, declarer plays the $\backsim A$ and follows with the $\backsim$, overtaking in dummy. When the $\backsim J$ is cashed, South must find a discard from $\uparrow A 10$ and $\$ 108$. The only choice is to bare the $₫ A$, so declarer can play a spade from dummy, ducking to South's ace. He wins the last two tricks with the $\$ Q$ and the $₫ Q$.

This was made a moot point, however, when South started with the $\uparrow$ A. Suddenly, Mawson had 12 top tricks. Plus 990 was good for $81 \%$.

This board was good for a $73 \%$ score.

| Dealer: East <br> Vul: E-W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q AJ } 10 \\ & \bullet \text { Q } 96543 \end{aligned}$ |  | West <br> Barnett | North | East <br> Mawson | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 6 | -8 |  |  |  | 1 | Pass |  |
| Novice Prs Fin S3 | \& 983 |  | 14 | Pass | 24 | All Pass |  |
| ¢9742 |  | ¢ K Q 83 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -2 |  | - K 87 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 1075 |  | -KQ963 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& K Q 105 |  | \& J | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | ¢ 65 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | ¢ |
|  | - A J 10 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 42 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ¢ A 7642 |  | - | - | - | - |  |

North started with the $>8$ to the jack and Barnett's ace. She played a spade up, North playing the 10. The $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ won the trick and Barnett tried a low heart from dummy. South won the $\boldsymbol{v 1 0}$ and gave her partner a diamond ruff, won the club return with the ace and gave partner a second ruff (with the trump ace). That was it for the defenders. Plus 140 was a good result because eight of the 14 pairs were in game with the East-West cards but only two made it.
The two ended their third session with a respectable $52.71 \%$ game, good for 11 th out of 28 pairs.

## THAT BOARD

It's normal for bridge journalists to hover around the playing area and hope to see a good hand or two or better still to have someone they respect show them a nice hand. Unfortunately life doesn't always work like that and one can have a set with very interesting or very dull hands to report on.

For the first session of the teams I decided to watch a few boards and see if there was one I could follow and voila, I found it. Now if in the future you see me moving from table to table don't think for one moment that I am just watching one interesting hand, this was a one-off.

So let me ask a question first - would you open a weak two bid showing a major with a four card suit in the other major? The answer to that question would be pivotal to how you score on this board.


Let's try the actual hand. First in hand not vulnerable versus vulnerable would you open THIS hand 2ข? Be honest now.
Well your editors relatively believe that the combination of a relatively weak suit, an outside four card major and a three suited hand strongly points towards not opening a weak two bid.

Here is a history of what happened on this board and some indications of better and worse actions. Here is the full hand.

| Dealer: West <br> Vul: N-S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ↔ } 1083 \\ & \bullet K 1075 \end{aligned}$ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 12 | $\begin{aligned} & +K 863 \\ & +96 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ↔J954 } \\ & \bullet \text { QJ964 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ↔ K Q } 762 \\ & \bullet A 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 105 |  | - Q 9 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& --- |  | \& Q 432 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | - A |  | 5 | - |  | - | - |
|  | $\bullet 8$ |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 742 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ¢AKJ 10875 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | 4 |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline West Wall Pass 4. \& North Henbest Pass Pass \& East
Hoare
10
Pass \& South
Brown
3NT
Pass

N/S -420 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
West <br>
Rowe <br>
Pass <br>
34 <br>
4 <br>
Pass <br>
$1 \mathrm{NT}=19$ <br>
3 =6-9

 \& 

North <br>
Wallis <br>
Pass <br>
Pass <br>
Pass <br>
Pass <br>
or 11-15 <br>
ade raise

 \& East Winsor 14 3. Pass Double takeout \& 

South <br>
Konig <br>
1NT <br>
44 <br>
54 <br>
All Pass <br>
N/S -200
\end{tabular} \& West Kolosz 10 4 \& North

Cooper
Pass
Pass \& East
Wild
14

Pass \& | South |
| :--- |
| Nagy |
| 4 |
| Pass |
| NS -420 | <br>

\hline West Barany Pass 4. \& | North |
| :--- |
| Milne |
| Pass |
| Pass | \& East Fleisher 1. Pass \& South Grifitith 24 Pass \& West Stephen Pass 4. \& | North |
| :--- |
| Brown |
| Pass |
| Pass | \& East Pettigrew 1. Pass \& | South |
| :--- |
| Nunn |
| 24 |
| Pass | \& West McNamar 2 Pass $2 \wedge=$ Weak $2 \downarrow=$ Pass \& | North |
| :--- |
| aKozakos |
| Pass |
| Pass |
| Major |
| or correct | \& | East |
| :--- |
| Lowe |
| $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | \& South Cormack 54 <br>

\hline \& \& \& N/S -420 \& \& \& \& N/S -420 \& \& \& \& NS -100 <br>

\hline \multirow[t]{7}{*}{West K o'Connor $2{ }^{2}$ Pass} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{| North |
| :--- |
| Parasian |
| Pass |
| Pass |} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{| East |
| :--- |
| P o'Connor |
| Pass |
| Pass |} \& \multirow[t]{6}{*}{| South |
| :--- |
| Asbi |
| 34 |} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{West Grifitits Pass 34 4 5} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{| North |
| :--- |
| Sebesfi |
| Pass |
| Pass |
| Pass |
| Double |} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{| East |
| :--- |
| Clarke |
| 1. |
| 3 |
| Pass |
| All Pass |} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{| South |
| :--- |
| Chan |
| 24 |
| 4 |
| 54 $N / S+100$ |} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{West Gunston 2 Pass} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{North Grynberg Pass Pass} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{| East |
| :--- |
| Moss |
| 26 |
| Double |} \& \multirow[t]{7}{*}{South Mitchell 54 All Pass NS +550} <br>

\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& N/S +130 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

So what can we learn from this board? Those pairs who opened a weak two bid invariably ended up with a poor result. Was this deserved or could they have mitigated their loss on the hand? Your editors have a view
that after opening a weak $2 \checkmark$ and hearing partner bidding $2 \checkmark$ pass or correct OR opening $2 \checkmark$ and hearing it passed around to right hand opponent who bids say $3 \$$ that West has every right to double for takeout Even when you fail to make a takeout double, East has every right to balance with $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ with his opening hand and $\checkmark$ A2.

Delving more into the results we find that the datum on the board was N/S -180 comprised:

| 3NT Making | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3* or 4* Making | 23 |
| $3 \bullet, 4 \checkmark$ or $5 \cup$ Failing | 14 |
| 3¢, 4 or 5 Failing | 48 |
| 3¢, 4\&, 5\& or 5\&x Failing | 33 |
| Major Partscores Making | 5 |
| 4* or 5 Making | 72 |
| 2• Doubled Making | 1 |
| Other Assorted Scores | 7 |

Conclusion. If you want to open a flawed weak two bid then a weak suit, side major, three suiter, defence on the side - that's OK. To have one or two flaws may be a misfortune. To have four looks very like careless.


If you're a grumpy player, you may think it's a crime the way your partner plays bridge sometimes. In Thailand recently, the police thought every player in a bridge game at a seaside resort was breaking the law.
According to a report by the Sydney Morning Herald, two Australians (including Avon Wilsmore) were among 32 ageing Westerners arrested and detained for 12 hours for playing bridge in Pattaya, a resort city renowned for its seedy nightlife.
More than 40 police, soldiers and local officials disrupted the genteel afternoon session in what they portrayed as a swoop on illegal gambling.
But police later conceded they found no evidence of money changing hands in the second-floor Jomtien and Pattaya Bridge Club that has been holding bridge sessions since 1994.

Club organiser Jeremy Watson said on Friday that police had decided to drop all charges. Watson said the police finally understood that they had been misinformed "about what we were doing."
Even so, Watson is still in hot water because there were more than 120 playing cards on a table at the club. That is a violation of the Playing Cards Act of 1935. Further, the cards did not have the government excise markings. Adding to Watson's headaches, the police noted that the club was not licensed.
The authorities were helped to their change of mind by Khunying Chodchoy Sophonpanich (Esther) the Thai president of the Asia-Pacific Bridge Federation and a civic activist who is also a member of Thailand's most prominent banking family, who rushed down from Bangkok to tell the police, in a polite Thai way that "they were idiots" to pursue this case.

She said the players were upset by the accusation they were gambling.
When police arrived club members refused to have their session interrupted and kept playing for about an hour while the police watched.

One German woman in her 60s refused to sign her confession and post bail money and spent an entire night at the police station.

As well as the Australians, those arrested included twelve British nationals, three Norwegians, three Swedes, a German, a Dane, a Canadian and a New Zealander.
Pattaya is a popular retirement destination for Western foreigners.
More information and a video report can be found at http://tinyurl.com/j5e3g8k.

## STRENGTHEN YOUR GAME

## Getting the most from your conventions - Part 5 Brent Manley

At a club game, Richard Cassell (Alexandria VA) and his partner had just defeated a contract when all four players at the table called for the director. The director was putting out refreshments, but he responded to the call and was told by Cassell's opponent that Cassell had psyched a preempt. Cassell's partner pointed out that he had preempted, not Cassell, and that declarer had revoked during the play. Dummy confirmed this. The director then turned to Cassell and asked, "And what's your problem?" Said Cassell: "Nothing. I just wanted a cookie."

In yesterday's installment, the double was introduced as an effective way to deal with the pesky opponents who interfere with your auctions.
Here's another good use for the red X in your bidding box: the support double. It's very important to get to a good trump fit when the opponents are bidding their heads off, and the support double is an essential tool in that quest. Here's a sample auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| You |  | Partner |  |
| 14 | Pass | 10 | 14 |
| ? |  |  |  |
| You (West) hold |  |  |  |
| ¢ 94 | - A 10 | - K 1 | \& A |

Now is the time for you to act. If you pass and your LHO raises to $2 \boldsymbol{4}$, partner may be in a very difficult spot, especially if your side is vulnerable. He might have a decent hand with five hearts but loath to bid at the three level for fear of ending up playing opposite a doubleton heart - or worse.

You could raise to $2 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, but if partner has only four he could be in trouble in the play by repeated spade leads, forcing him to ruff, which would weaken an already-shaky trump suit.
Support doubles were made for this situation. Double directly over the 14 bid to show three-card support. Now if your LHO raises to 24, partner will have information to help with his decision.
If you raise directly to $2 \boldsymbol{\top}$, showing four, and partner has five hearts, he may be able to compete even to the three level, knowing of the nine-card trump sit.
The other benefit of playing support doubles is that a pass denies even three-card support
Knowing you have at most a doubleton could be important information for partner in the bidding and on defense.
I recommend that you play support doubles through $2 \boldsymbol{}$. Making the limit higher could put your side in danger, especially if you are vulnerable.
Another double worth considering - and discussing with partner - is known as the responsive double. It's easy to remember because it occurs only when the opponents have bid and raised a suit with partner acting between the two opponents. For example:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | You | Partner |  |
| 1 | Double 2 | $?$ |  |

You hold

You must take some action, but there's no need to guess. A double tells partner to pick the suit. As the level goes higher - say East raised preemptively to $3-$ the HCP requirement also grows ( 9 plus HCP at the three level). Note that if partner doubles a $1 \vee$ opener and RHO bids $2 \boldsymbol{\vartheta}$, double tells partner to pick a minor. If you had four spades, you would have bid $2 \uparrow$.

On occasion, you will find yourself loaded in the opponents' trump suit and wish you could double for penalty, but you're better off saving double for the much-more-frequent takeout situations. You can also use this gadget when partner overcalls, as with

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | You |  | Partner |
| 10 | $2 \&$ | $2 \varnothing$ | $?$ |

Double by you shows length in diamonds and spades.
Discuss this convention with your partner and establish how high you want to go. The most common upper limit is $4 \diamond$, but you and partner can decide on a comfort level.
Just remember that responsive doubles apply when the opponents are bidding and raising the same suit.

# inherSHOES 

## local \& imported shoes • bags • accessories

## All Bridge Players Are Invited To A Breakfast With Light Refreshments

Commencing 8:00am on Thursday 25th to be held at "In Her Shoes" on the ground floor at the Oasis Shopping Centre.

Head down towards the beach end and it is on the right-hand side past the chocolate shop opposite Bright Eyes Sunglasses. See you there!

## BUILDING A BETTER MOUSETRAP

## Barry Rigal - Raising Partner

This article is all about how opener and responder should continue after a simple raise or a jump raise of a major suit. Many of these thoughts come directly from ideas from Jeff Aker and Glenn Milgrim -- though they may not be original to either player!

There are three categories we need to consider when your partner raises your opening bid (or overcall). First for an unpassed partner facing an opening bid we need to plan continuations after a raise, and also after a jump raise (including Bergen sequences and splinter raises). Finally, we must think about how our approach should change in competition.

## Continuations After The Simple Raise

When the partnership starts with a simple raise in an uncontested auction, the focus must be on three issues: trying for game, trying for slam, and making life hard for the opposition - either by getting to game in as unrevealing a fashion as possible, or by keeping the opponents out.

Before we start, let's determine that in the context of playing a forcing no-trump, we play the simple uncontested raise as at least mildly constructive -- the right seven-count will qualify. I'd raise $1 \odot$ to $2 \boldsymbol{w}$ wh:
-975

- Q 103
- J 94
\& A 986
But I would go through a forcing no-trump in response to a 1 opening, since the quality of the trump support and the possibility of the red-suit honours being worthless to your partner makes the difference.

Let's assume after partner makes a simple raise of our major that the re-raise is non-constructive, a jump to game is terminal, and that a jump to 3NT shows a strong balanced hand, offering a choice of game. If you
learn only one thing from this piece, it should be that a re-raise of the trump suit (in almost any auction!) should not be a buck-passing invitation with general extras.
It is my suggestion that we need to have ways to show both long and short suit tries, ideally both for game and slam. Also, in as many cases as possible responder should know his partner's intentions as regards game or slam before responding to the try. The best way to divide the tries is to use the first step after the raise as a non-specific short-suit try, (2NT over 2 $)$ with the next three calls being long-suit tries in the suit bid, and notrump replacing the 'lost' suit in the heart auctions. These tries are assumed to be tries for game not slam. This method can be described as Reverse Romex, the original Romex tries having the long and short suit tries inverted.

Thus 1- 2- 2 starts short-suit tries, with opener's 2NT or 3 or being long-suit tries for spades, clubs and diamonds, respectively. A short-suit try is based typically on a singleton, and when in doubt l'd opt for a short-suit try rather than a long-suit try. With:

- A Q J 76
- Q 93
- 2
\& A Q 86
Show short diamonds rather than make a heart game-try. Best is for the singleton not to be a high honour. In response to the announcement of a short-suit try, responder can ask, if he needs to know, he can try to sign off at three of his side's major, or he can jump to game if not interested in the response. He can also (if appropriate) respond in a suit where he has the values to make game - so long as partner is not short.
Thus after $1 \checkmark-2 \downarrow-2 \oplus$ bid $3 \bullet$ with:
- K 876
- J83
- Q 92
\& Q 106
Some of your values will be wasted whatever suit partner is short in. (Indeed, maybe this hand doesn't qualify for a constructive raise in the first place.)
By contrast bid 2NT with:
- Q 62
- Q 103
- 9872
- A 104
since you want to play game facing either short clubs or short diamonds. Opener's responses are to bid the first three steps with singletons (looking for game or slam) and the next three steps after that with voids, slamoriented.

As responder, after 1-2-2 bid 3 with:

- J 76
- Q 103
- J 92
\& K Q 86
because you want partner to play game without revealing his shortage unless he has short clubs, when 30 will be high enough. This will also make a possible slam-try decision easier for your partner. For the record: with the same nine-count but \& A J 86 , you might bid $4-$ - even facing short clubs you have a hand with most of your values working reasonably well.
The long-suit try is a call that is much abused, with players making the call on holdings that are either too weak or too strong, with responder as a result unable to tell what holding is good and what bad. It isn't always possible to perfect this sequence unless you minimize the number of hands on which you can make the try. But if you live with the following general rules, this may help you do the right thing most of the time, while allowing you to issue the game-try relatively often.
The basic principle is relatively simple. A help-suit game try should consist of a three- or four-card suit headed by one of the three top honours. You can have the ten in addition, or at a pinch the jack, but not a second top honour. Meanwhile, you do not really want to make a game try on a suit weaker than jack-fourth.

In reply, responder tends to reject the game try on any complete minimum or accept with a complete maximum, and when in-between he looks at his holding in the help-suit. Best holdings contain any two of the top four cards, then a doubleton honour, with $\mathrm{H}-10-\mathrm{x}-\mathrm{x}$ or $\mathrm{H}-10-\mathrm{x}$ better than average, a small doubleton or singleton being an acceptable holding (in the latter case, maybe only with decent trump length). Top honourfourth is no more than an average holding, better than $J-x-x-x$ or $Q-x-x-x$, while honour-third is an average minus holding, and three or four small the worst.
Let's see how this works in practice - and of course single deals never prove anything except the adeptness of the writer to turn one hand into a general adage.

After 1-2-3-

- AKJ 62
- 105
- A 2
-K K 864
By the rule above responder should accept with:
- Q 73
$\bullet 95$
- 1094
- A Q 5

But reject if his clubs were switched with his diamonds or hearts.
Note that if declarer makes a try on too good a suit:

- AK J 62
- 108
-K 2
\& K Q 104
Responder may reject with:
- 10943
-K53
-A 104
\& J 75
When game is more than playable. And she may accept with:
- 973
- Q J 3
- J 94
\& A J 75
When game is not an attractive spot.
If responder bids a new suit after a long-suit game try it should show in-between values with a concentration in that suit (typically without the ace). He should also remember that he can bid 3NT with a maximum and no honour in the help-suit, but cards in both off-suits. Take our last example hand after $1 \boldsymbol{-}-2 \boldsymbol{-}$, for example - especially if the $\cup Q$ were the king.

Opener's direct jumps to 3 or 4 are second five-card suits, natural help-suit slam-tries. In response, side aces, minor honours in the long suit and trumps will be pulling their weight.

```
@AQ964 ©J102
-AK743 `J52
A - K J 8
&K6 &Q1042
```

After $1 \Phi-2-$ East has a pile of manure. But switch the suits round to:

- K J 8
- Q 1042
- J 32
\& J 102
And East can jump to 6⿶. Bingo!


## IT＇S RAINING CHOCOLATE FROGS

Margaret Williamson：kindly delivered all boards assisting the nominee who could not easily manage this．
Manfred Junge－Patricia Seppelt－just a nice experience to play against polite to opponents and partner．
Charles and John McMahon－two polite，friendly and modest men who are a credit to their family．
Anne Kelly－being a newbie who plays with enthusiasm and good humour．
Allan Byrnes and Steven Parkes－extremely helpful in describing their bidding methods．

## COMMON MISUNDERSTANDINGS（DISASTERS）PEOPLE HAVE

Andy Hung
Let＇s face it．Misunderstandings will almost inevitably occur in any partnership，but there are some that come up more often than others．Knowing（and discussing）through these situations should strengthen a partnership， particularly if it＇s a partner you play on a non－regular basis．Here are some situations where misunderstandings occur on a frequent basis，so it might be a good idea to discuss these with your partner！
Take a look at this auction：

| West | North | East <br> 1ヵ | South Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3{ }^{1}$ | Double | 3 | ？？ |

What does partner＇s（North＇s）double mean？Does it show something like 4 PAQ85 KQ72 A943 where we might want to think about bidding $4 \bullet$ now，or does it show something like $\mathbf{\$ 7 5}$ 『83 Q983 \＆AKJ74 where it＇s lead directing？What if West had bid $3-(10-12$ points with $4+\oplus)$ ，and partner doubles，would that be different or the same？It doesn＇t really matter which you agree on（takeout of the major，or lead directing），but as long as you are on the same page！

Here＇s an auction that causes frequent disasters：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $4 \oplus$ | Pass | ？？ |

Sitting as South，you open with a pre－emptive $4 \bullet$ and partner bids $4 \uparrow$ ．Now what is $4 \boldsymbol{\text { ？}}$ ？Is it a control－asking bid where North has something like $\$ 754$ UKQ AKQ96 \＆AK8 and would like South to bid slam with a first or second round control in spades（similar to 4凹－Pass－5\＆or 44－Pass－5 where it＇s best to play those 5 －minor bids as control－asking），or is it a＇to play＇bid where it shows something like ¢AKQ10875 『－KQ3 \＆A32 and thinks 4 is a better game contract than $4 \boldsymbol{V}$ ？

How about an auction that may have a confusing 4NT bid：

| West | North | East | South <br> $1+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1ヵ | $2 \oplus$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | 4NT |  |  |

Is 4NT a Blackwood（or Roman Key Card Blackwood）asking in the last bid suit（hearts），or is it simply a quantitative bid asking South to pass with a minimum or bid slam with a maximum（similar to 1NT－4NT where 4NT is quantitative）？This auction may not be a＇common＇auction，but the general auction is for one person to bid 4NT over their partner＇s NT bid．

Tip：A 4NT bid after any NT bid，provided no fit has been established，is best used as quantitative（inviting slam，so 4NT can be passed if the other person has a minimum）．If you want to ask for aces，you can always use 4母（after a NT bid）as Gerber to ask for aces，or you could find a way to force and establish a fit first before bidding 4NT（because once a fit is established，a 4NT bid that follows would no doubt be an ace ask）．
Here＇s one for the Minorwood advocates：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 1 |
| 1 | Double | 2 |  |
| 3 | 4 | Pass | 3 |

Is North's 4 bid Minorwood (asking for aces/key cards), or is it simply a competitive bid? My advice? Don't play Minorwood at all! (Unless you are in a serious partnership where you have complete set rules stating when Minorwood is on or off.)

Now this auction below probably wins as the auction where it causes the most accidents:

| West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | South |  |
| Double ${ }^{1} 2 \downarrow$ | Pass | ? ${ }^{2}$ ? |

## ${ }^{1}$ Penalties

As South, we open 1NT (whatever range that could be, say 15-17 for simplicity), West doubles for penalties, and our partner North bids $2 \boldsymbol{*}$. Is that natural to play (i.e. a weak hand with $5+\boldsymbol{\square}$ that wants to play in hearts), or is it a transfer to spades? Yes, this is the million dollar question. Particularly at vulnerable, you would want to know what it is! Discuss this with your partner - this auction isn't uncommon at all. Other similar examples would be for North to bid $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ or even - are these bids natural, or is it 'system on' where $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ is Stayman and 2 is a transfer?
Tip: If the Double is not penalties, then play system on (i.e. $2 \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is Stayman, $2 \checkmark / 2 \boldsymbol{*}$ is transfers, etc.) but if the Double is penalties, then system is off and bids are just natural to play (since it is important to be able to bid $2 *$ or 2 as natural).
With these above auctions discussed, they should certainly help your partnership have lesser misunderstandings (than you currently have), and hopefully lead to better (or more normal?) results!
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# ((SOUNDSOF LIFE)) 

Phone 1-300-744-432 www.soundsoflife.com.au
Sounds of Life is a new sponsor for the 2016 GCCC. This came about as a result of Jan Malinas' life changing experience with their services. Here is Jan's story.


Tracy Ong has literally changed my life. In denial, despite not enjoying some important things in my life such as theatre, movies, live music, dinner parties and bridge and despite the kids, husband and friends telling me I HAD to get hearing aids...I resisted. Vanity is a strange thing!
From day one under Tracy's guidance I have embraced my hearing aids. As an independent audiologist Tracy offers many different brands thus enabling you to find the right ones for your specific hearing problems. Most audiologists are linked to a specific manufacturer - they are not all the same! Tracy has a try before you buy practice and I found it a great help when deciding what was right for me.
Naturally she offers a free hearing test so why not call her and change your life while supporting someone who is supporting Bridge as a sponsor for the Sounds of Life Senior pairs.

## AUSTRALIAN BRIDGE MAGAZINE YOUR LINK TO THE WIDER BRIDGE COMMUNITY

With entertaining columns and quizzes for players of all levels, and ideas to improve your game from many of the world's best writers.
Subscribe at the GCCC at Paul Lavings' book stall, or Email: mail@australianbridge.com, Phone: 0412-335-840.
$\$ 59$ for one year (6 issues) or $\$ 112$ two years
We also have a separate online edition of the magazine just for novice players - only $\$ 25$ per year for 6 issues.
Brad Coles, owner of Australian Bridge has generously donated four Subscriptions to Australian Bridge and four Subscriptions to the Novice Edition which will be used as prizes at the GCC.
Two Subscriptions for leading Datum Scorers in the Pairs subject to having played 5 matches together Two Subscriptions for winners of the Open A Consolation Two Novice for the winning pair in the Restricted Two Novice Subs for winning pair in the Novice


## Think Simple - Think Fancy - Think Wizard - Think Ireland Think Anything Emerald PRIZES FOR THE BEST DRESSED GROUP IN THE EMERALD THEME



## THE GOLD COAST CONGRESS HONOUR ROLL <br> GOLD COAST OPEN PAIRS WINNERS 1962-2015

| Richman, Bobby | 1981 |
| :--- | ---: |
| McMahon, Mary | 1964 |
| Seres, Tim | 1963 |
| Evans, Don | 1965 |
| Melbourne, Howard | 2002 |
| Borin, Jim | 1980 |
| Burgess, Stephen | 1983 |
| Del'Monte, Ishmael | 1993 |
| Weiss, lan | 1965 |
| Bach, Ashley | 1994 |
| Borin, Norma | 1980 |
| Browne, Seamus | 1990 |
| Jedrychowski, Richard | 2001 |
| Klinger, Ron, | 1987 |
| Marston, Paul | 1983 |
| Travis (Gill), Barbara | 1979 |
| Armstrong, John | 2007 |
| Beauchamp, David | 1992 |
| Bellingham, Frank | 1972 |
| Bentley, R | 1995 |
| Brightling, Richard | 1999 |
| Brunne, Michelle | 2005 |
| De Livera, Arjuna | 2009 |
| Durmus, Unal | 1992 |
| Eaton, Ruth | 1964 |
| Edgtton, Nabil | 2012 |
| Filipowicz, Dominik | 2010 |
| Francis, Neville | 2015 |
| Glubok, Brian | 1985 |
| Greenwald, D | 1985 |



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


Sign up to gain access to
Daily Problems
Weekly Quizzes
An entire Library
full of my bridge
articles


Make sure to sign up for Premium Membership to get access to all RonKlingerBridge.com has to offer.

| Grosvenor, Hugh | 1998 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Hanlon, Tom | 2008 |
| Havas, Elizabeth | 1989 |
| Hiley, Harold | 1962 |
| Hochmuth, Harold | 1972 |
| Holland, John | 2005 |
| Horton, Mark | 1996 |
| Howard, Justin | 2014 |
| Huilin, Zhu | 2000 |
| Jacob, Tom | 2001 |
| Jamieson, Peter | 1979 |
| King, Phil | 1995 |
| Landy, Tom | 1966 |
| Lavings, Paul | 1978 |
| Lester, John | 1982 |
| Lilley, David | 1987 |
| Martens, Krzysztof | 2010 |
| McCance, lan | 1975 |
| McGann, Hugh | 2008 |
| Moren, Magnus | 2015 |
| Neill, Bruce | 2003 |

1966

| Neill, Don | 1966 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ong, Tony | 2000 |

Polii, Bert 1997

Pomfrey,Mike 2002
Pszczola, Jacek 2004
Scott, Wally 1975
Selinger, Jack 1967
Senior, Brian 1996
Smilde, Roelof 1963
Smith, David 1981
Stepinski, Jeremi 2006
Stern, Gerda 1970
Stern, Rudi 1970
Szymanowski, Marek 2006
Tislevoll, GeO 2011
Walsh, Alan 1989
Ware, Michael 2011
Watulingas, Giovani 1997
Westcott, George 1967
Williams, Bob 1962

BRIDGE FOR THE IMPROVER Ron Klinger

| DIr S E/W Vul | North <br> © A K J 2 <br> - J 73 <br> - A 4 <br> \& 5432 |
| :---: | :---: |
| West <br> - Q 1072 <br> - Q 109 <br> - Q 3 <br> \&K 1076 |  |


| West | North | East | South <br> $1 ष$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass 2 |  |

West leads the $\%$. East wins with the $\& A$ and returns the $\&$. South follows with the $\$ 8$, then $\%$. What should West play?

## Solution: from National Teams Event

West should overtake the $\& \mathrm{Q}$ with the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ at trick 2 and play a third club. This cannot cost whether East or South has the $\% \mathrm{~J}$. On the actual layout East ruffs the third club and $4 \varphi$ is one down. At the other table 40 made. Datum: N-S 270.


## FUTURE WORLD CHAMPION?

## PAIRS CLASSIFICATION WINNERS

|  | Best Women's Pair |
| :--- | :--- |
| Open: | Mindy Wu and Lorraine Stachurski |
| Best Queensland Pairs |  |
| Open: | Gary Malinas and Garry Khemka |
| Seniors: | Malcolm Carter and Tony Hutton |
| Intermediate: | Chris Stead and Eric Baker |
| Restricted: | Nannette Loxton and Brodie Loxton |
| Novice: | Eduardo Besprosvan and Jack Luke-Paredi |

## MEET "MR BRIDGEMATE" - THURSDAY 9:30AM TILL 10:00AM

Ron Bouwland, The Developer and Owner of Bridgemate will be available for a meet and greet at Paul Lavings stand at the Gold Coast Congress. Come and discuss any aspect of Bridgemate or even provide some suggestions.

## THINGS ARE HOTTING UP IN THE ATTENDANCE STAKES

Dear Editor, I read with interest your article featuring the Rye Beach Bridge Club, located on the beautiful Mornington Peninsula in Victoria.
I live on the even more beautiful Northern Beaches Peninsula in Sydney $)$. However, before moving there, I lived in Melbourne for three years \& really enjoyed my congress games at Rye \& so can also attest to it being a fun \& friendly club.
My home team now is the Peninsula Bridge Club in Sydney \& we also promote a fun \& friendly atmosphere, starting with welcoming smiles for our beginners when they first arrive and follow up with copious choc bikkies at tea breaks as well as the occasional wine \& cheese at the end of a big day.

This year, PBC has more than forty members playing in the GCC, with most entered in the restricted fields. For many of us this will be our first or second time at the GCC and we are all loving it!
We even have members who come to the GCC just to meet up at Therese's afternoon tea and then play golf So, let the (friendly) challenge begin? We will start looking for a sponsor for our team uniform - thinking hats? Stay tuned.
Cheers Cath Whiddon Director of Bridge Education at PBC.

## DIRECTOR'S TIP COUNT YOUR CARDS

Players should count their cards before looking at them.
If missing or extra cards are discovered once play commences, affected players can be disadvantaged. For example, a missing card is deemed to be part of the hand at all times, and a revoke may have occurred.

| Holiday Walk-in Pairs Event 1 <br> Results - Overall |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Place | Pair | Total |
| 1 | Eddie Mullin - Dianne Mullin | 180.6 |
| 2 | Patricia Scott - Sharon Jackson | 164.7 |
| 3 | Paul Thiem - Terence O'Dempsey | 160.0 |
| 4 | Gary Heyting - Phillip Morris | 156.5 |
| 5 | Dianne Hillman - Odette Hall | 156.2 |
| 6 | Mary Doneley - Jennie Tucker | 146.4 |
| 7 | Susanne Hollis - Deborah Carmichael | 143.6 |


| Open |  | 74.35 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | 10 | R Cooper - D Lilley - H Melbourne - D Middleton - Z Nagy | 69.69 |
| 2 | 18 | R Wood - M Wood - R Pelkman - K Yule - K Yule | 68.69 |
| 3 | 7 | A Kanetkar - B Neill - P Gumby - W Lazer | 68.07 |
| 4 | 33 | L Kalmin - L Kalmin - L Ichilcik - M Ichilcik | 63.06 |
| 5 | 5 | S Konig - I Del'Monte - J Howard - J Wallis - A Bach - M Cornell | 62.90 |
| 6 | 2 | B Ibradi - T Asbi - R Parasian - F Karwur - J George - D Hutahaean | 62.30 |
| 7 | 28 | M Watts - M Prescott - S Crompton - M Green | 60.94 |
| 8 | 27 | C Richardson - A Tarbutt - S Boughey - A Boughey | 60.91 |
| 9 | 16 | B Hirst - P Gue - D Weston - J Foster | 60.72 |
| 10 | 14 | S Hinge - B Haughie - J Cormack - G Kozakos | 60.08 |
| 11 | 103 | C Ingham - T Munro - J Free - S Collinson | 60.03 |
| 12 | 39 | R Dempster - L Dempster - J Butts - G Mundell |  |


| Open |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 13 | 13 | L Gold - V Brown - W Jenner-O'Shea - M Doecke - J Haffer |  |  |  |  | 60.01 |
| 14 | 6 | A Burke - H Horwitz - M Klukowski - S Golebiowski - P Gill |  |  |  |  | 59.61 |
| 15 | 8 | J Coutts - T Jacob - N Jacob - G Coutts |  |  |  |  | 58.98 |
| 16 | 9 | P Wyer - D Anderson - N Francis - M Moren |  |  |  |  | 58.67 |
| 17 | 24 | W Zhang - L Jin - H Chan - T Kiss - A Beck |  |  |  |  | 58.36 |
| 18 | 12 | C Duckworth - B Callaghan - R Klinger - M Mullamphy |  |  |  |  | 58.31 |
| 19 | 46 | A St Clair - D Harley - O Nolf - J Gaspar |  |  |  |  | 58.17 |
| 20 | 11 | F Rew - B Coles - M Brown - J Newman - P Hollands - M Henbest |  |  |  |  | 57.45 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 21 | 34 | Zhou | 57.34 | 113 | 154 | Howes | 37.70 |
| 22 | 143 | Runting | 55.85 | 115 | 98 | Morgan-King | 37.63 |
| 23 | 19 | Fischer | 55.34 | 116 | 93 | Frazier | 37.52 |
| 24 | 56 | Mayo | 55.14 | 117 | 48 | Jeffery | 37.25 |
| 25 | 1 | Olanski | 55.12 | 118 | 129 | McGlew | 37.20 |
| 26 | 69 | Howard | 54.95 | 119 | 118 | Watt | 37.18 |
| 27 | 161 | Fox | 54.52 | 120 | 40 | Hoffman | 37.09 |
| 28 | 71 | Simes | 54.24 | 121 | 199 | Dormer | 36.94 |
| 29 | 20 | Giura | 54.16 | 122 | 68 | Millar | 36.42 |
| 30 | 30 | Sawicki | 53.43 | 123 | 202 | Randhawa | 36.10 |
| 31 | 66 | McLeod | 53.41 | 124 | 61 | Mott | 36.08 |
| 32 | 35 | Berrington | 53.28 | 125 | 173 | Mealyea | 36.03 |
| 33 | 83 | Mayers | 52.98 | 126 | 90 | Gunner | 35.96 |
| 34 | 3 | Nunn | 52.61 | 127 | 101 | Bouton | 35.95 |
| 35 | 141 | McAlister | 52.53 | 128 | 96 | Bugeia | 35.80 |
| 36 | 58 | Smith | 52.50 | 129 | 122 | Crafti | 35.74 |
| 37 | 37 | Baron | 51.95 | 130 | 105 | O'Connor | 35.73 |
| 38 | 63 | Samuel | 51.71 | 131 | 64 | Smee | 35.69 |
| 39 | 38 | Csima | 51.48 | 132 | 92 | Grahame | 35.48 |
| 40 | 197 | Ajzner | 51.16 | 133 | 128 | Kilvert | 35.28 |
| 41 | 74 | Ridley | 51.03 | 134 | 189 | Jackson | 34.79 |
| 42 | 205 | Moore | 50.68 | 135 | 51 | Barda | 34.76 |
| 43 | 15 | Cheval | 50.54 | 136 | 89 | O'Dempsey | 34.44 |
| 44 | 148 | Webb | 50.39 | 137 | 146 | Obenchain | 34.43 |
| 45 | 60 | Walters | 50.20 | 138 | 184 | Watson | 34.04 |
| 46 | 25 | Brown | 50.06 | 138 | 144 | Moffitt | 34.04 |
| 47 | 32 | Livesey | 49.87 | 140 | 206 | Mill | 33.89 |
| 48 | 41 | Kempthorne | 49.65 | 141 | 203 | Batchelor | 33.86 |
| 49 | 73 | Kruiniger | 49.01 | 142 | 195 | Gray | 33.58 |
| 50 | 186 | Barrett | 48.29 | 143 | 75 | Kefford | 33.49 |
| 51 | 155 | Silcock | 48.28 | 144 | 59 | Brockwell | 33.41 |
| 52 | 52 | Strong | 48.22 | 145 | 130 | Marker | 33.33 |
| 53 | 108 | De Luca | 48.01 | 146 | 151 | Welch | 33.29 |
| 54 | 80 | Mangos | 47.97 | 147 | 97 | Potts | 33.18 |
| 55 | 23 | Ashton | 47.76 | 148 | 131 | Pike | 33.15 |
| 56 | 178 | Morris | 47.27 | 149 | 167 | Cook | 33.08 |
| 57 | 76 | Mottram | 47.02 | 150 | 142 | Nichols | 32.98 |
| 58 | 45 | Strasser | 46.94 | 151 | 136 | Longford | 32.43 |
| 59 | 112 | Tredrea | 46.77 | 152 | 150 | Boyce | 32.30 |
| 60 | 62 | Abrams | 46.65 | 153 | 106 | Bates | 32.16 |
| 61 | 50 | Martelletti | 46.36 | 154 | 152 | Grant | 32.02 |


| Open |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 62 | 21 | Malinas | 46.25 | 155 | 116 | Ma | 31.91 |
| 63 | 49 | Grosvenor | 46.17 | 156 | 72 | Chen | 31.89 |
| 63 | 36 | Brown | 46.17 | 157 | 95 | Small | 31.86 |
| 65 | 22 | Carter | 46.03 | 158 | 193 | Matskows | 31.46 |
| 66 | 77 | Smith | 45.99 | 159 | 170 | Wagstaff | 31.45 |
| 67 | 42 | Lockwood | 45.49 | 159 | 157 | Houghton | 31.45 |
| 68 | 67 | Steinwedel | 45.23 | 161 | 78 | Mellings | 31.15 |
| 69 | 160 | Quigley | 44.79 | 162 | 94 | Bogatie | 31.01 |
| 70 | 111 | Kwok | 44.69 | 163 | 127 | Woolf | 30.74 |
| 71 | 4 | Milne | 44.57 | 164 | 91 | Weathered | 30.44 |
| 72 | 44 | Lenart | 44.50 | 165 | 149 | McFall | 30.41 |
| 73 | 110 | Valentine | 44.14 | 166 | 169 | Langston | 30.07 |
| 74 | 177 | Vearing | 43.54 | 167 | 176 | Alexander | 29.98 |
| 75 | 84 | Lorraway | 43.42 | 168 | 165 | Leighton | 29.72 |
| 76 | 47 | Sharp | 43.33 | 169 | 134 | Dudley | 29.33 |
| 77 | 156 | Bonnick | 42.61 | 170 | 82 | Halmos | 29.28 |
| 78 | 187 | Birch | 42.47 | 171 | 114 | Hagan | 29.22 |
| 79 | 43 | De Luca | 42.33 | 172 | 139 | Leach | 29.08 |
| 80 | 109 | Stewart | 42.21 | 173 | 147 | Birss | 27.72 |
| 81 | 65 | Afflick | 42.20 | 174 | 168 | Kable | 27.70 |
| 82 | 182 | Clayton | 42.00 | 175 | 138 | Lee | 27.51 |
| 83 | 85 | Lisle | 41.73 | 176 | 124 | Smith | 27.29 |
| 84 | 198 | Kennedy | 41.71 | 177 | 194 | Coats | 26.95 |
| 85 | 201 | Spencer | 41.61 | 178 | 172 | Wilson | 26.70 |
| 86 | 196 | McGrath | 41.48 | 179 | 17 | Braun | 26.47 |
| 87 | 31 | Lowry | 41.37 | 180 | 137 | Oyston | 26.44 |
| 88 | 188 | Whiddon | 41.27 | 181 | 158 | Carroll | 26.28 |
| 89 | 57 | Finikiotis | 41.08 | 182 | 126 | Gilfoyle | 25.97 |
| 90 | 87 | White | 41.03 | 183 | 123 | Hanson | 25.60 |
| 91 | 53 | Gibbons | 40.71 | 184 | 159 | Wood | 25.40 |
| 92 | 29 | Stralow | 40.67 | 185 | 81 | Strong | 25.11 |
| 93 | 86 | Stobo | 40.62 | 186 | 183 | Cordingley | 24.91 |
| 93 | 166 | Thirtle | 40.62 | 187 | 171 | Fletcher | 23.56 |
| 95 | 162 | Churchill | 40.50 | 188 | 174 | Rowlatt | 23.37 |
| 96 | 135 | Collins | 40.14 | 189 | 204 | Abdelhamid | 23.24 |
| 97 | 153 | O'Hara | 40.07 | 190 | 115 | Allan | 23.09 |
| 98 | 70 | Berger | 40.04 | 191 | 140 | Lynn | 22.97 |
| 99 | 26 | Adams | 39.98 | 192 | 99 | Morrison | 22.96 |
| 100 | 119 | Power | 39.80 | 193 | 117 | Sklarz | 21.88 |
| 101 | 180 | Miller | 39.42 | 194 | 107 | Fleischer | 21.82 |
| 102 | 100 | Hale | 39.41 | 195 | 113 | Kolozs | 21.10 |
| 103 | 192 | Athea | 39.38 | 196 | 79 | Briscoe | 20.85 |
| 104 | 179 | Smith | 39.25 | 197 | 185 | Rose | 20.50 |
| 105 | 55 | Bailey | 38.50 | 198 | 181 | Webb | 19.60 |
| 106 | 175 | Mills | 38.46 | 199 | 102 | Darley | 19.28 |
| 107 | 120 | Swabey | 38.42 | 200 | 125 | Mitchell | 18.11 |
| 108 | 200 | Inglis | 38.24 | 201 | 164 | Bourke | 16.73 |
| 109 | 191 | Cukierman | 38.15 | 202 | 145 | McEntegart | 16.24 |
| 110 | 88 | Wigbout | 38.14 | 203 | 132 | Fraser | 14.00 |
| 111 | 54 | Marler | 37.85 | 204 | 121 | Biro | 13.13 |


| Open |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 112 | 190 | Boettiger | 37.77 | 205 | 163 | Utzen | 12.58 |
| 113 | 104 | Orsborn | 37.70 | 206 | 133 | Chapman | 7.64 |
| Seniors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 4 | M Bloom - N Rosendorff - S Bock - L Grewcock |  |  |  |  | 65.52 |
| 2 | 1 | R Brightling - D Hoffman - P Buchen - C Hughes |  |  |  |  | 59.35 |
| 3 | 11 | D Stern - R Grynberg - T Moss - D Zines - S Picus - B Manley |  |  |  |  | 58.85 |
| Seniors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 4 | 8 | T Robb - A Janisz - P Walters - L Geursen |  |  |  |  | 55.75 |
| 5 | 12 | A Robbins - D Newland - D Happell - G Ridgway |  |  |  |  | 53.79 |
| 6 | 3 | M Bourke - N Ewart - F Beale - R Van Riel |  |  |  |  | 53.73 |
| 7 | 6 | P Chan - R Januszke - C Lorimer - R Sebesfi |  |  |  |  | 53.66 |
| 8 | 5 | A Walsh - B McDonald - E Havas - A De Livera |  |  |  |  | 50.85 |
| 9 | 15 | L Moses - J Gough - M Robson - B Lee |  |  |  |  | 49.29 |
| 10 | 7 | S Arber - G Gaspar - R Gallus - R Greenfield |  |  |  |  | 46.99 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 9 | McLeish | 46.64 | 23 | 34 | Van Leeuwen | 34.29 |
| 12 | 17 | Milward | 44.41 | 24 | 23 | Reid | 33.62 |
| 13 | 10 | Creet | 44.24 | 25 | 13 | Kahler | 33.61 |
| 14 | 2 | Krochmalik | 44.21 | 26 | 21 | Clarke | 31.36 |
| 15 | 27 | Cohen | 43.31 | 27 | 22 | Ruddell | 30.03 |
| 16 | 14 | Jackman | 42.86 | 28 | 33 | Brown | 29.94 |
| 17 | 16 | Yovich | 40.37 | 29 | 19 | Palmer | 25.63 |
| 18 | 32 | Harman | 39.52 | 30 | 29 | Hopwood | 25.29 |
| 19 | 18 | Fitz-Gerald | 38.69 | 31 | 25 | Schoutrop | 25.15 |
| 20 | 24 | French | 36.43 | 32 | 31 | Dellaca | 21.83 |
| 21 | 28 | Andersson | 36.32 | 33 | 26 | Berzins | 19.11 |
| 22 | 30 | Lee | 34.73 | 34 | 20 | Ashwell | 14.25 |
| Intermediate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 76 | A Jonsberg-G Baker - J Lahey - C Larter |  |  |  |  | 66.96 |
| 2 | 40 | K Blinco - T Sheedy - E Baker - C Stead |  |  |  |  | 62.20 |
| 3 | 15 | A Brown - F Brown - J Hansen - D Morgan |  |  |  |  | 61.30 |
| 4 | 13 | J Rohde - L Ranke - A Hewat - J Donovan |  |  |  |  | 60.04 |
| 5 | 23 | J Francis - P Sleat - S Deacon - S Filler |  |  |  |  | 59.17 |
| 6 | 8 | G Gosney - M Plunkett - P Nilsson - D Nilsson |  |  |  |  | 58.60 |
| 7 | 28 | P Moroney - M Driscoll - C Sheldrake - K De Palo |  |  |  |  | 57.72 |
| 8 | 12 | C Tough - M Tough - P Thompson - M O'Donohue |  |  |  |  | 56.42 |
| 9 | 37 | D Giles - J Argent - B Morgan - C Denaro |  |  |  |  | 55.09 |
| 10 | 19 | J Williams - K Hewings - M Pritchard - C Stone |  |  |  |  | 55.00 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 4 | Pisko | 53.50 | 50 | 9 | Eastman | 39.61 |
| 12 | 7 | Grant | 52.80 | 51 | 18 | Howard | 39.53 |
| 13 | 34 | Moody | 51.98 | 52 | 44 | Schmalkuche | 39.47 |
| 14 | 88 | Kennealy | 51.71 | 53 | 47 | McNee | 38.06 |
| 15 | 25 | Owen | 51.49 | 54 | 39 | Roache | 37.50 |
| 16 | 74 | Ward | 51.31 | 55 | 73 | Hollingworth | 37.25 |
| 17 | 43 | Murray | 50.83 | 56 | 3 | Cooksley | 36.66 |
| 18 | 82 | Koster | 48.45 | 57 | 2 | Steele | 35.12 |
| 19 | 68 | Gold | 48.32 | 58 | 22 | Sutherland | 34.38 |
| 20 | 20 | O'Gorman | 48.14 | 59 | 35 | Campbell | 33.90 |

## Intermediate

| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | 61 | Robinson | 47.78 | 60 | 50 | Staley | 33.71 |
| 22 | 33 | Tomlinson | 47.51 | 61 | 48 | Edwards | 33.47 |
| 23 | 52 | Jones | 46.42 | 62 | 42 | Featherstone | 33.30 |
| 24 | 53 | Tucker | 46.30 | 63 | 46 | Bartos | 33.03 |
| 24 | 79 | Cariola | 46.30 | 64 | 45 | Rogers | 32.98 |
| 26 | 1 | Krosch | 45.67 | 65 | 49 | Houlton | 32.96 |
| 27 | 41 | Wells | 45.44 | 66 | 31 | Paris | 32.64 |
| 28 | 24 | Anderson | 44.80 | 67 | 75 | Holewa | 32.20 |
| 29 | 72 | Baynes | 44.63 | 68 | 60 | Delaney | 31.34 |
| 30 | 21 | Eldridge | 44.44 | 69 | 14 | Darling | 31.31 |
| 31 | 5 | Johnson | 44.33 | 70 | 38 | Fulton | 31.11 |
| 32 | 66 | Routley | 44.16 | 71 | 55 | Chesser | 30.91 |
| 33 | 85 | Walker | 43.60 | 72 | 16 | Gordon | 30.80 |
| 34 | 10 | Romeijn | 43.54 | 73 | 63 | Scott | 30.00 |
| 35 | 83 | Purves | 43.03 | 74 | 51 | Kavanagh | 28.84 |
| 36 | 36 | Macaulay | 42.88 | 75 | 65 | Davidson | 27.50 |
| 37 | 70 | Bristow | 42.77 | 76 | 69 | Hurst | 27.16 |
| 38 | 58 | Goddard | 42.68 | 77 | 62 | Morgan | 26.36 |
| 39 | 56 | Fenwicke | 42.18 | 78 | 71 | Fletcher | 26.21 |
| 40 | 29 | Jackson | 42.17 | 79 | 57 | McNaughton | 25.08 |
| 41 | 11 | Butler | 42.13 | 80 | 78 | Greenway | 23.77 |
| 42 | 86 | Quigley | 42.06 | 81 | 77 | Winter | 22.24 |
| 43 | 54 | Rogers | 41.96 | 82 | 32 | Tuckey | 21.60 |
| 44 | 87 | Snelling | 41.92 | 83 | 80 | Bish | 21.36 |
| 45 | 27 | Sinclair | 41.66 | 84 | 30 | Knox | 19.72 |
| 46 | 6 | Warnock | 40.93 | 85 | 26 | Beckett | 19.48 |
| 47 | 84 | Church | 40.84 | 86 | 67 | Mundell | 18.60 |
| 48 | 64 | Carradine | 40.45 | 87 | 81 | Roy | 15.47 |
| 49 | 17 | Bandy | 40.16 | 88 | 59 | Wozniczka | 15.20 |
| Restricted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 46 | C Trengove - M Rex - S Hunt - J Grieve |  |  |  |  | 65.28 |
| 2 | 61 | G Brahma - V Taylor - J Zhu - T Jiang |  |  |  |  | 64.80 |
| 3 | 17 | I Pick - G Carson - A Riley - N Wills |  |  |  |  | 60.90 |
| 4 | 3 | B Coker - I Wright - F Symons - D Upsall |  |  |  |  | 59.72 |
| 5 | 95 | B Patel - N Patel - D McLay - S Cryer |  |  |  |  | 57.16 |
| 6 | 9 | B Wippell - K Nicoll - B Wippell - M Doherty |  |  |  |  | 56.73 |
| 7 | 22 | M Irving - J Griffith - A Simon - G Hare |  |  |  |  | 56.18 |
| 8 | 85 | S Jacobs - M Anderson - S Nathan - L Abel |  |  |  |  | 55.98 |
| 9 | 8 | T Haley - L Chan - D Macneil - F Ahmet |  |  |  |  | 55.48 |
| 10 | 28 | J Gray - T McKenzie - J Ham - J Ham |  |  |  |  | 55.19 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 80 | Driscoll | 54.28 | 54 | 81 | Gilder | 38.84 |
| 12 | 75 | Stearns | 54.00 | 55 | 6 | Clifford | 38.83 |
| 13 | 72 | Hajmasi | 53.94 | 56 | 84 | Singer | 38.19 |
| 13 | 89 | Linden | 53.94 | 57 | 66 | Webb | 38.02 |
| 15 | 43 | Stewart | 53.80 | 58 | 42 | Rosetta | 37.75 |
| 16 | 59 | Junge | 53.23 | 59 | 50 | Holmes | 37.06 |
| 17 | 52 | Hoschke | 51.70 | 60 | 76 | Baldwin | 37.02 |
| 18 | 77 | Wlodarczyk | 51.43 | 61 | 78 | Verity | 36.43 |


| Restricted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 19 | 39 | Biscoe | 51.18 | 62 | 20 | Hapeta | 35.60 |
| 20 | 33 | Stick | 50.20 | 63 | 86 | Wilson | 35.56 |
| 21 | 64 | Chaffey | 50.15 | 64 | 11 | Treloar | 35.49 |
| 22 | 19 | Armstrong | 47.56 | 65 | 4 | Jacka | 35.36 |
| 23 | 27 | Hilder | 47.36 | 66 | 31 | Cook | 35.30 |
| 24 | 34 | Elich | 46.76 | 67 | 68 | Lawson | 35.28 |
| 25 | 79 | Klibbe | 46.42 | 68 | 67 | Kommeren | 34.60 |
| 26 | 69 | Henke | 46.29 | 69 | 23 | Fraser | 33.66 |
| 27 | 94 | Woodbury | 45.93 | 70 | 13 | Rossiter-Nuttall | 33.56 |
| 28 | 41 | Wright | 45.35 | 71 | 36 | Nearhos | 33.48 |
| 29 | 14 | Packer | 45.23 | 72 | 16 | Small | 32.71 |
| 30 | 24 | Hayes | 45.01 | 73 | 44 | Reid | 32.13 |
| 31 | 96 | Mabin | 44.94 | 74 | 91 | Adamson | 31.30 |
| 32 | 29 | Smith | 44.38 | 75 | 51 | Fawcett | 30.75 |
| 33 | 74 | Adams | 44.19 | 76 | 65 | Macintosh | 30.69 |
| 34 | 5 | Dunlop | 43.81 | 77 | 38 | Hall | 29.90 |
| 35 | 30 | Wood | 43.72 | 78 | 83 | Mayer | 29.79 |
| 36 | 71 | Martin | 43.45 | 79 | 21 | Corney | 28.71 |
| 37 | 12 | McMaster | 43.43 | 80 | 58 | Van Bakel | 28.25 |
| 38 | 88 | Edwards | 42.84 | 81 | 49 | Brake | 28.24 |
| 39 | 1 | Green | 42.75 | 82 | 92 | Parker | 27.80 |
| 40 | 56 | Lawson | 42.61 | 83 | 2 | Stuart | 27.66 |
| 41 | 62 | Jones | 42.51 | 84 | 45 | Vickers | 27.48 |
| 42 | 90 | Yoon Yap-Giles | 42.27 | 85 | 63 | Bennett | 26.44 |
| 43 | 26 | Howe | 41.88 | 86 | 47 | Sawyer | 26.32 |
| 44 | 32 | Bardone | 40.84 | 87 | 57 | Haworth | 25.94 |
| 45 | 55 | Merrin | 40.83 | 88 | 73 | Higgins | 25.32 |
| 46 | 35 | Fuhrmann | 40.73 | 89 | 87 | Mitchell | 24.86 |
| 47 | 7 | Gardner | 40.53 | 90 | 37 | Peever | 24.40 |
| 48 | 10 | Reynolds | 39.67 | 91 | 18 | Clark | 21.93 |
| 49 | 93 | Joseph | 39.60 | 92 | 70 | Hodges | 20.26 |
| 50 | 25 | Perry | 39.33 | 93 | 82 | Brodman | 20.05 |
| 51 | 15 | Heck | 39.26 | 94 | 48 | Munro | 17.37 |
| 52 | 54 | Gibney | 38.99 | 95 | 60 | Knight | 16.35 |
| 53 | 40 | Harrison | 38.87 | 96 | 53 | Devlin | 13.06 |
| Novice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 1 | T Bowmaker - K Gilchrist - F Jeppesen - K Griggs |  |  |  |  | 59.49 |
| 2 | 30 | A Byrnes - S Parkes - U Suliman - P Taylor |  |  |  |  | 58.05 |
| 3 | 2 | H Van Weeren - P Clarke - C Dempster - N Grech |  |  |  |  | 56.64 |
| 4 | 15 | L Bowen-Thomas - C Bowen-Thomas - J Conde - A Hemmingway |  |  |  |  | 54.84 |
| 5 | 32 | L Martin - C Brinkman - R Harrison - J Rogers |  |  |  |  | 51.65 |
| 6 | 7 | A Scott - N Mclver - A Phillips - D Nixon |  |  |  |  | 50.36 |
| 7 | 9 | D Gaskill - J Lowe - A Marsland - H Blair |  |  |  |  | 49.45 |
| 8 | 18 | H Hassall - J Squires - M Kennedy - C Youngman - J Youngman |  |  |  |  | 48.02 |
| 9 | 28 | S Van Kruistum - C Van Kruistum - N Smith - L Le Provost |  |  |  |  | 47.80 |
| 10 | 19 | D Williams - I Cameron - P Morris - C Moule |  |  |  |  | 47.29 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 26 | Carter | 45.12 | 22 | 5 | Du Temple | 33.69 |
| 12 | 13 | Nilsson | 44.77 | 23 | 10 | Sargent | 33.59 |
| 13 | 23 | Gibbens | 43.88 | 24 | 20 | Jackson | 32.84 |
| 14 | 4 | Weston | 43.30 | 25 | 12 | Burt | 32.67 |
| 15 | 11 | Bellis | 42.36 | 26 | 8 | Nugent | 32.04 |
| 16 | 21 | Wilson | 41.56 | 27 | 27 | Bowra | 29.89 |
| 17 | 31 | Reilly | 40.74 | 28 | 25 | Waldron | 28.98 |
| 18 | 3 | Robertson | 39.06 | 29 | 17 | Northey | 28.32 |
| 19 | 14 | Archer | 36.80 | 30 | 16 | Howitt | 25.80 |
| 20 | 6 | McClintock | 36.06 | 31 | 22 | Garside | 15.87 |
| 21 | 24 | Anderson | 35.59 | 32 | 29 | Waters | 13.48 |

## GOLD COAST CONGRESS 2016

|  | Wednesday <br> 24th February | Thursday 25th February | Friday 26th February | Saturday 27th February |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OPEN EVENTS |  |  | Q/F Teams S/F Teams |  |
| Open Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Open Butler Swiss Pairs Friday Teams | 10:30am Start <br> $4 \times 14$ Brds R5-R8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 9:00am 2×12 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} \mathrm{4} \mathrm{\times 10}$ <br> Brds Brds <br> 10:00am 1/3 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 3$ <br> 10:00am 1/2 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 2$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { S.Uvallı } \\ \text { Start } 4 \times 12 \\ \text { Rerc Cinnol } \\ \text { 10:00am 3/3 } \end{gathered}$ |
| SENIORS EVENTS |  |  |  |  |
| Seniors Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start 4x12 Brds Final | Dinner |
| INTERMEDIATE EVENTS (Under 750MPs) |  |  |  |  |
| Intermediate Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Intermediate Butler Swiss Pairs | 10:30am Start <br> $4 \times 14$ Brds R5-R8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final $10: 00 \mathrm{am} 1 / 3 \quad 2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 3$ |  |
| RESTRICTED EVENTS (Under 300MPs) |  |  |  |  |
| Restricted Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Restricted Butler Swiss Pairs | 10:30am Start <br> $4 \times 14$ Brds R5-R8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final $10: 00 \mathrm{am} 1 / 3$ $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 3$ |  |
| NOVICE EVENTS (Under 100MPs) |  |  |  | OKi |
| Novice Teams Friday Novice Pairs | 10:30am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R5-R8 | 10:30am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R9-R12 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final 10:00am 1/2 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 2$ | Essential |
| ROOKIE PAIRS (Under 10MPs) |  |  |  |  |
| Rookie Pairs - Single Session Events |  | 10:30am 1/1 |  |  |
| UNDER 50MP PAIRS |  |  |  | Depending |
| Under 50 Masterpoint Pairs | 10:30am 1/2 3:00pm 2/2 |  |  | Number Sessions |
| MIXED TEAMS |  |  |  | P |
| Seres/McMahon Mixed Teams |  |  | 10:00am 1/2 2:00pm $2 / 2$ |  |
| WALK-IN PAIRS |  |  |  |  |
| Holiday Walk-In Pairs 2 - Play 1, 2 or 3 Sessions Holiday Walk-In Pairs 3 - Play 1, 2 or 3 Sessions | 10:30am S2 | 10:30am S3 | 10:00am S1 2:00pm S2 | 10:00am S3 |
|  | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday |


| JoanBUTTS | GOLD COAST CONGRESS 2016 <br> CALENDAR OF CELEBRITY SPEAKERS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | When to Bid Over the Opponent's 1NT Openings AND When Not To |  |  | Thursday 25th February | $\begin{gathered} \text { Friday } \\ \text { 26th February } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:30am } \\ & \text { to } \\ & \text { 10:15am } \end{aligned}$ | 1 |
| WILLIMM O'SHEA | Opening Leads and Planning the Defence |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:15pm } \\ & \text { to } \\ & 2: 45 \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PHIL } \\ & \text { GUE } \end{aligned}$ | Simple Ideas in Competitive Bidding |  | Phil Gue has taught bridge for 30 years. <br> aught at the Adelaide Bridge Centre. <br> Phil has played for Australia at all the major World and Regional Championships. Championships. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:15am } \\ & \text { to } \\ & 9: 45 \mathrm{am} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Thursday | Friday |
| MINIMUM \$5 Contribution to the ABF Friends of Youth Bridge Fund GREATER Contributions Greatly Appreciated By Our Youth Players |  |  |  |  |  |


| CALENDAR OF SOCIAL AND OTHER ACTIVITIES GOLD |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOVICE AND ROOKIE ACTIVITIES | Venue | Wednesday 24th February | Thursday 25th February | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Friday } \\ & \text { 26th } \\ & \text { February } \end{aligned}$ |
| GCC 0-50 MP Welcome Assistance with System Cards and How it all Works etc | Orange Tablecloths Main Playing Area | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:45am } \\ & \text { to } \\ & 10: 15 \mathrm{am} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| GCC Rookies Pairs Welcome Assistance with System Cards and How it all Works etc | Fuscia Tablecloths Main Playing Area | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:45am } \\ & \text { to } \\ & 10: 15 \mathrm{am} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| GCC Novice Pairs Welcome Assistance with System Cards and How it all Works etc | Maroon Tablecloths Main Playing Area |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 45 \mathrm{am} \\ & \text { to } \\ & 10: 15 \mathrm{am} \end{aligned}$ |
| SOCIAL AND OTHER ACITVITIES |  |  |  |  |
| Bridge Widows Mt Tamborine Trip \$5.00pp | Bus Leaves From Lobby Air on Broadbeach | http://www.tamborinemtncc.org.au/things-to-do-on-tamborine-mountain/ |  |  |
| Bridge Widows Springbrook Trip \$5.00pp | Bus Leaves From Lobby Air on Broadbeach | 11:00pmto $2: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ http://mmw.dancingwaterscafe.com |  |  |
| Bridge Widows Tweed Regional Gallery and Margaret Olley House Trip \$5.00pp | Bus Leaves From Lobby <br> Air on Broadbeach | http://wmw.artgall <br> ery.tweed.nsw.go <br> v.autheGallery 11:00 <br> to $4: 00$  |  |  |
| Zephyr Foundation Charity <br> In Support of This Year's Charity <br> Collections Before Play - All day at Admin | Doors Leading to Playing Venue | All DayRaffle Draw <br> Under N Sign <br> After Morning <br> Session |  |  |
| Bridge Vid Demonstration with Pete Hollands and Laura Ginnan See Bulletin for Details | Rooms 10, 11 and 12 Upstairs at the Convention Centre | Bridge Vid features video lessons, commentated play, Triple Dummy 1:15pm podcast, online live course promotions and much more. to $1: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |  |
| Directors Get Together | With Jan Peach Rms 10/11/12 Upstairs | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Starting } \\ \text { 8:30am } \\ \text { Finish 10:00 } \end{array}$ |  |  |
| Dress Up Day - Emerald | Come Dressed in Something EMERALD Lobby Outside Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dress-Up } \\ \text { Parade } \\ \text { 2:30pm } \\ \text { to } 3: 00 \mathrm{pm} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Bridgemates Meet Ron Bouwland Developer and Owner of Bridgemates | Paul Lavings Bridge Books Stand | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 09:30am } \\ & \text { to } \\ & 10: 00 \mathrm{am} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Free Breakfast for Shoe Shoppers | "In Her Shoes Store" Ground Floor Oasis Shopping Centre | $\begin{gathered} 8: 00 \mathrm{am} \\ \text { to } \\ 10: 00 \mathrm{am} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |


| Event | Date | Website / Contact / Venue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Autumn Nationals (ANOT) | Thursday $28^{\text {th }}$ April to Monday $2^{\text {nd }}$ May 2016 | Entries: ANOT.organiser@gmail.com Jinny Fuss 0474-074-005 <br> Ridley Centre, Adelaide Showground |
| Australian National Championships and Butler Pairs Chermside, Brisbane | Saturday $25^{\text {th }}$ June to Thursday $7^{\text {th }}$ July | Entries: anc16@qldbridge.com <br> Charles Page 0449-758-046 <br> Venue: Kedron Wavell Services Club |
| Coffs Coast Gold Congress | Tuesday $9^{\text {th }}$ August to Sunday $14^{\text {th }}$ August | Entries: ian@australiawideconferences.com.au Ian Doland 02-6654-1104 <br> Venue: Opal Cove Resort |
| Territory Gold Bridge Festival Pairs and Teams | Wednesday $31^{\text {st }}$ August to Sunday $4^{\text {th }}$ September | Entries: tgbf@abf.com.au <br> Lisa Hambour 0419-801-461 <br> Venue: Hilton by Doubletree Hotel Darwin |
| Spring Nationals <br> Open Teams, Restricted Teams Dick Cummings Open Pairs Restricted and Novice Pairs Linda Stern Women's Teams Bobby Evans Seniors Teams | Wednesday October $19^{\text {th }}$ to Thursday October $27^{\text {th }}$ | Entries: sn@abf.com.au <br> Marcia Scudder - NSWBA 02-9264-8111 <br> Venue: Canterbury Park Racecourse, Sydney |
| Hans Rosendorff Memorial Weekend Congress <br> New Format Women's Swiss Pairs Event | Saturday $17^{\text {th }}$ October To Sunday $18^{\text {th }}$ October | bina360@hotmail.com <br> Robina McConnell 0400-943-367 or 08-9586-2768 <br> Venue: West Australian Bridge Club, Swanbourne Perth |

## BRIDGE BATTLE OF YOUTH V. EXPERIENCE! WEDNESDAY NIGHT, 24 FEBRUARY

During the Gold Coast Congress, the Gold Coast Bridge Club is hosting a short bridge competition against youth players. Some serious bridge and some fun.

- 7.00 pm Dinner - Pizzas, fruit and ice-cream. Note Congress bridge finishes at 6.30 pm that day.
- 7.30 pm to 9.00 pm . "normal" bridge.
- Optional 9.00 pm to 9.30 pm (or later!) - Special fun bridge (with some drinks and nibbles provided). For example:
> Speedball where you must bid, play and score up hands in 2 minutes; or
> Crazy Pairs after the auction, open an envelope to find special rules for that hand, e.g. 2s beat aces FREE for youth players or members of the Gold Coast Bridge Club. ONLY $\$ 10$ for others, which includes
- The standard 2 -hour session ( $11 / 2$ hours normal bridge and 30 -minutes of fun bridge).
- The pizza dinner
- Drinks and nibbles.

If you would like to attend, please contact us before the event, as places for non-youths are limited. The club (phone 5538 2905) is located 1.6 km north of the Convention Centre at 2883 Gold Coast Highway, Surfers Paradise.

Paul Brake Gold Coast Bridge Club Tel 0414117482 or paul.brake95@gmail.com

DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| 216 x |  |  | $20 \div$ |  |  | $3 \div$ |  | $6+$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $360 \times$ |  |  | $90 \times$ | $10 \div$ | 2* | $18+$ |  |  |
|  | 2* |  |  |  |  |  | 15+ |  |
| 3- |  | 1- |  | $36 \times$ | 8 | $24 \times$ |  |  |
| 5- | $9+$ |  |  |  |  |  | 14+ |  |
|  |  | 5- | $32 \times$ |  | 5- | 45× | 2- |  |
| 10+ |  |  | $21 \times$ |  |  |  | 17+ |  |
|  | $8-$ |  |  | $90 \times$ | $18+$ |  |  |  |
| 42x |  | $6+$ |  |  |  |  | $2 \div$ |  |

YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION
DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| 4 | $\sqrt{2 \div}$ | $\frac{3-}{2-}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} 35+ \\ \mathbf{5} \end{array}$ | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | ${ }^{8-}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6 | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 672 x \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | 4 | 3 | ${ }^{5-}$ | 7 | 9 |
| $\underline{2-}$ | 8 | $\begin{array}{r} 36 x \\ \mathbf{9} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 x \\ 3 \end{array}$ | 7 | $4 \div$ | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| $8$ | 4 | 1 | 2 | $1-5$ | 6 | $\begin{gathered} \left.\begin{array}{c} 1334 x \\ 9 \end{array} \right\rvert\, \end{gathered}$ | 3 | 7 |
| 3 | 17 | 8 | 4 | ${ }^{8-}$ | 9 | 6 | ${ }_{5}^{6+}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 16+ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10+ \\ 20 \end{array}$ | 3 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 19+ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $8$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13+ \\ \mathbf{5} \end{array}$ | 7 | 1 | 4 |
| 7 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 2 | $4 \div$ | 1 | 6 | $11+$ <br> 3 |
| $\sqrt{3-} 5$ | ${ }_{1}^{6 x}$ | 6 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 49 x \\ 7 \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{6-}{9}$ | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 240 x \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | 4 | 8 |
| 2 | ${ }^{9} 9$ | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | ${ }^{2-}$ | 6 |

DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION
DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

## SERVICES

If you are in need of a doctor or medical assistance you can contact Kim Ellaway through the Administration Desk or alternatively contact the Broadbeach Medical Centre on 07-5531-6344, Suite GO1, 2681 Gold Coast Highway Broadbeach. Their after-Hours is handled by Chevron After Hours Medical Service 07-5532-8666.
Please note that they do not Bulk Bill.

# TABLE COUNT <br> TO THE END OF PLAY TUESDAY NIGHT 3,863 

(Last Year 3,700)


THE $56^{\text {TH }}$ INTERNATIONAL CELEBRATION of BRIDGE


FRI 17TH - SAT 25 TH FEBRUARY Gold coast convention centre - broadbeach



GOLD COAST
congress


ENQUIRIES - KIM ELLAWAY
+61733518602 +61412064903 manager@q/dbridge.com qldbridge.com/gcc


