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## VALE MARION COOKE

Last night Queensland Bridge lost one of its icons, Marion Cooke. A representative player, administrator, tournament organiser and tireless worker for the game of bridge, Marion succumbed to her recent illness on Wednesday evening, thereby breaking a promise to her family that she wouldn't pass away during her beloved Gold Coast Congress.
Happily for those who knew and loved her she was surrounded at the end by members of her family including Kim and others who drove up after play to be with her.

Marion was the matriarch of the Cooke, Ellaway and Goulding families, which really meant that in some ways she was the matriarch of the Gold Coast Congress. Many members of those families are included in the Gold Coast Congress, an event that I regard as the best Tournament on the bridge calendar.
Yes, she was the mother of Kim Ellaway, the Congress Secretary, but but was also the mother of Nicola Goulding who operates the coffee service and the mother in law of Ray Ellaway and Geoff Goulding, Grandmother of caddies, floor managers, scorers..
Marion commenced board dealing in 2000 when the Gold Coast Congress required just 12,000 boards to be dealt. When the QBA took on the GNOT she assisted the Coffs Harbour Congress with their board dealing which, combined with the growth of the Gold Coast Congress means somewhere around 50,000 boards annually.

One thing her family all agree on is that she would want them all to continue to work at this year's tournament and she would be most upset if her passing interfered in any way with any of her family completing their involvement in the game she loved.
Marion will be remembered as a loving person who was committed to Queensland as well as the game of bridge. Rest in Peace.

## TEAMS QUALIFYING SESSION EIGHT

Barry Rigal
From my position between adjacent tables I was able to keep an eye on two matches, those of leaders Kanetkar versus Zhou and Nunn versus Coutts.
It is always difficult to judge whether one side simply has all the decisions (so that the same side will have problems at the other table) or whether a pair is simply having a bad game. While I was watching it seemed like East/West were perpetually under the gun here - and so it proved, since their datum scores were -26 and -37 . But in one case their teammates more than covered them...
The set started with three of the Easts in fourth chair and favourable vulnerability being faced with a minor suit opener. Looking at:

- 1098
- AKQ762
- 85
\& 52
How high would you go? Matthew Thompson elected to bid 2『, his counterpart chose 3 ${ }^{\boldsymbol{v}}$. Dummy provides a whole load of nothing and 4-2 trumps mean you are held to six tricks. Zhou/Tian made 2NT for 120 the other way, while $2 v$ was allowed out for down one in the other room, so Zhou and Nunn each had 2 IMPs.
Board 16 was a quiet 3NT in Kanetkar-Zhou, but far more interesting in our other match:

| Dealer: West <br> Vul: E-W | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet 92 \\ & \bullet Q 642 \end{aligned}$ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 16 | - A 72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Tms Qual S8 \& J J 106 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K Q 1065 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -K107 |  | $\checkmark 985$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q J 9 |  | -10543 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| -53 |  | -9842 | - | 4 | - | 4 | NT |
|  | - AJ4 3 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | - |
|  | - A J 3 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -K86 |  | - | 2 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& K Q 7 |  | - | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |

When our two Wests opened 14 North stretched to double, and each South sat it out in an attempt to exploit the vulnerability. Both defenders led an intellectual trump, Nunn the nine, Tom Jacob the two. Declarer's best bet is to try to score a diamond before the defenders can get clubs going. McGann passed the $>J$ (the $\checkmark$ Q might be better?) round to South, who played three rounds of clubs. When declarer played a second diamond North won to lead a fourth club, letting South pitch his diamond. McGann ruffed and led a diamond, which South could ruff to endplay West with trumps. At the end declarer had to guess hearts for down 500. In the other room 14x escaped for down one, so Jacob had 7 IMPs. (for the record just four pairs managed to get 14 x for 800 . It certainly looks easier after a heart lead and club shift?

| Dealer: North Vul: None | $\bullet 9875$ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 17 | -10954 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Tms Qual S 8 | \& Q J 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 64 |  | - A <br> -KQ102 <br> -A8732 <br> \& 873 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 763 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& K Q } 6 \\ & \& \text { AK } 104 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | NT |
|  | - K J 1032 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | - J 984 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\bullet$ |
|  | - J |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ |
|  | ¢962 |  |  | - | 4 | - | 4 |

All four of our E/W pairs then missed their best game here, all playing suit contracts with no success, while 3NT comes home when the bad break in diamonds is compensated for by finding the hearts lying well enough. With a datum of 220 we can assume slightly more than half the field got this one right.

| Dealer: South | ¢ 2 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 19 | - Q 7432 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Tms Qual S8 | \& J 843 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -Q109764 |  | ¢ A 85 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A Q 1064 |  | - J 9732 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K |  | -965 |  | Makea | le Con | cts |  |
| ¢ A |  | ¢92 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ K J 3 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | ¢ |
|  | -K |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 108 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& K Q 10765 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | - |

Nunn took the lead here, when both E/W pairs bid to four of a major, and N/S saved in $5 \downarrow$, but McGann took the push to 5 (hearts were never bid at his table) while Glenn Coutts and Nick Jacob defended 5 down one undoubled.

In 5 on a club lead McGann won his $\$$ at trick one and crossed to the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ then had a legitimate guess as to whether to play his LHO for 1165 or 1264 pattern. He guessed right to play a second trump rather than take the heart finesse, and when 9 K fell singleton he had 650 and 12 IMPs. The datum was E/W +350.
In our other match Qin/Lu played $4 \bullet$ after Gumby/Lazer never got diamonds in, while Kanetkar/Neill reached 60 - and their opponents saved for 500 in $7 \& x$.
On the next deal a fit jump by McGann looked a good idea at the time after: Pass-(1\&)-2 -(Double). He bid 3 with both sides vulnerable on:

- K Q J 8
-K3
-J 9532
\& 94
To get his side to $4 \checkmark$ down one facing a singleton spade - and with par on the deal being $3>$ for +110 . Not to worry: his teammates defended 5 down 200. Both E/W pairs recorded small positives here in our other match.

Kanetkar then put two consecutive 12 IMP swings on the board. The first came when they bid these cards to 3NT (as did both tables in our other match).

| Dealer: North | - A 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A J 92 |  |
| Brd 21 | -KJ742 |  |
| Open Tms Qual S8 | \& 94 |  |
| -KQ95 |  | - J 10732 |
| - 863 |  | -K1074 |
| - A Q 63 |  | -108 |
| \& 73 |  | -52 |
|  | ¢ 84 |  |
|  | - Q 5 |  |
|  | -95 |  |
|  | \& AKQ J 1086 |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | $\uparrow$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| - | 3 | - | 3 |  |
| - | 5 | - | 5 | 4 |

Zhou/Tian played $5 \boldsymbol{\$}$ on a top spade lead. Say you win and lead a low trump to your ace. Which red suit should you play next? If you take a heart finesse and it succeeds you are certainly not home. Admittedly, if the $\checkmark 10$ falls in three rounds and clubs split or the same player has long clubs and four small hearts, you have a discard. Playing on diamonds by leading to the jack looks better. Whenever both honours are right you are home, and you can fall back on the heart finesse if the $\checkmark Q$ but not the $\checkmark A$ is onside. This line was not found at the table, so $5 \&$ went down one. (a datum of +400 suggests two thirds of the field brought home game here).

| Dealer: East | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet 982 \\ & \bullet \text { QJ73 } \end{aligned}$ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 22 | - J 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Tms Qual S8 ¢ K 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K J 3 |  | © A Q 1075 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 8 |  | -K1095 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\text { A } 963$$\& 762$ |  | -K8 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \& $A$ Q | 6 | - | 6 | - | NT |
|  | - 64 |  | 7 | - | 7 | - | - |
|  | -642 |  | 6 | - | 6 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - Q 752 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& J 1043 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | 4 |

On the next deal only six pairs in the field attempted the grand slam that looks to be on the club finesse. Half the field played game when West did not deem his hand worth a $2 / 1$ response, or else East shirked his responsibilities to drive to slam when he found an opening bid and spade fit opposite. Kanetkar/Neill bid to 64; none of our other featured E/W pairs managed it. However Kanetkar/Neill spoiled their record by bidding slam off two keycards on the next deal (their second such effort of the set). This time the opponents elected to defend.
With six deals to go it was $32-18$ to Kanetkar, with Nunn leading 15-7. This was the last real opportunity for swing - and again all our four E/W pairs did not distinguish themselves.

| Dealer: West | - J 643 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - Q 986 |  | 10 | Pass | 24 | Pass |  |
| Brd 24 | - K 84 |  | 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |  |
| Open Tms Qual 58 | ¢ 63 |  | 3 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |  |
| ¢ 5 |  | ¢ A K 2 | 4NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - AKJ 742 |  | -10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - AJ 105 |  | - Q 732 |  | Makea | le Con | acts |  |
| \& Q 9 |  | \& K J 875 | 2 | - | 2 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ Q 10987 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | ¢ |
|  | - 53 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -96 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | 4 A 1042 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | 4 |

Playing $2 / 1$ the East hand apparently produces a big problem because after $10-2 \$-2 \checkmark$ East wants to show the spade stoppers (and a raise to 3 might lead to missing 3NT) but also wants to raise diamonds. Matthew Thompson's choice of 2NT then 3NT over 3V might not be to your taste, but when McGann bid 4NT surely he was supposed to bid $5<$ ? 4 NT went down three on a spade lead, while in the other room $5<$ on a spade lead went down two. It is not easy to make the game, but if you play a club at trick two and South ducks the ace you can pitch dummy's losing club on the spades and ruff out hearts. If South takes the ace and presses on with spades the clubs are set up so you can simply draw trumps.

The defence to $4 \checkmark$ is far from easy to find, by the way. When North leads his doubleton club, South must hop up with the ace and shift to diamonds, and now declarer cannot duck a trump without losing a ruff. Of course if he plays trumps from the top North scores both his 9 Q-9. In our other match $6 \checkmark$ went down three while $5 \%$ went down one - for 3 IMPs to Kanetkar. The final score here was 35-23 to Kanetkar, while Nunn won 20-10.

## TEAMS QUALIFYING SESSION TEN

## Barry Rigal

While Kanetkar had opened a small lead at the top of the table, no one else was sure to be in the top six at the end of this match. One big loss would undo all of the two days' previous hard work. I would have the pleasure of comparing Tony Nunn and Sartaj Hans, South at the two tables in my range of vision as Nunn played Kanetkar and Milne played Hinge. Both Milne and Nunn broke on top with a 13 IMP pick up when they bid these hands to slam:

| Dealer: South | ¢KQ J 32 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A 63 |  |
| Brd 15 | - K |  |
| Opn Tms Qual S10 | ¢K Q 94 |  |
| ¢A10876 |  | ¢ 5 |
| - 1087 |  | - Q 92 |
| - J 5 |  | -109873 |
| \& J 82 |  | ¢ 7653 |
|  | ¢94 |  |
|  | -KJ54 |  |
|  | - A Q 642 |  |
|  | \& A 10 |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 6 | - | 6 | NT |
| - | 5 | - | 5 | - |
| - | 5 | - | 5 |  |
| - | 4 | - | 4 |  |
| - | 5 | - | 5 | 4 |

On a heart or club lead declarer looks to be well placed. When you play spades towards dummy twice and the suit goes pear-shaped, you need the round suits to behave, and they do.
Both leading teams competed to precisely the right level on a part-score on the next deal (you can make eight tricks in your nine-card fit, or defeat the opponents at the three-level). Then they followed that with another double-digit swing.


I much prefer Kanetkar's action to Haughie's, even though Hinge's second call was far from obvious. You cannot hope to stop Simon, you can only hope to contain him...the defence to $5 \times$ was straightforward enough. Heart lead and trump shift for a second heart and club play, and that was down 800.

4@x would have cost only 300 - as would 5 \&x. 50 x was hardly the world's most elegant spot. After a top diamond lead Ware rose with the $\downarrow$ A, finessed in hearts then led an innocent low club to the four and king. That was all the help Ware needed: he led a top diamond to pitch his second club and used the $\mathbf{7 7}$ as his entry to dummy to pitch his third spade on $\$ 10$ and lead up to $\mathbf{~} K$ for his 11th trick.
Since each of the other tables had played undoubled on the E/W cards for down 150, both leading teams had their third consecutive swing. Nunn led by 27 IMPs, Milne led by 30. On the next deal there was no swing when Hinge took an anti-percentage line in 3NT while Lee/Hung were toiling in their 6-1 spade fit. Both other tables played with the odds with singleton facing KQ10xxxx to lead to the ten initially, which worked perfectly with AJ9 tripleton onside.
Board 20 was a death-trap for everyone, but more so for some than others.

| Dealer: West <br> Vul: Both | ¢ A 10542 |  | West Kanetkar | North Ware | East Neill | South Nunn |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 20 | -K943 |  | $2$Pass | Pass <br> 3NT | Pass | 30 |  |
| Opn Tms Qual S10 \& J 76 |  |  |  |  | Pass | 4 |  |
| -KJ9873 |  | - Q 6 | Pass | Pass | Double | All |  |
| $\bullet 3$ |  | - Q J 62 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 1062 |  | - A 5 |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
| -109 |  | \&A8543 | - | 2 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | ¢ --- |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |
|  | - AK 109875 |  | - | 3 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 87 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - K Q 2 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | 4 |

All four tables reached $4 \bullet$ here after a pre-empt from West. Hans and Lazer were not doubled and went down 200, Cormack was doubled and went down 500. Tony Nunn played 40x on the auction above - (what do you think of that 3NT call by the way)?
When Kanetkar led the $\$ 10$ Neill ducked smoothly, making it clear to Nunn that Neill wasn't seriously contemplating giving his partner a club ruff. And given that hearts clearly weren't breaking, I would have done exactly what Tony did at trick two, namely play back his remaining club honour. You can see how if Neill had eg a 2-5-3-3 pattern he would have to give dummy the lead sooner or later or give up his heart tricks. Now declarer is coming quite close to making! Of course this line was a catastrophe at the table when Kanetkar got a ruff with his singleton trump, and that made the penalty 800 for 12 IMPs.
Nunn and Hinge then picked up a small partscore swing before Ware was weighed in the balancing seat and found wanting while Beauchamp made no mistake.

| Dealer: East | ¢ J 876 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\bullet 6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 22 | - AK 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Opn Tms Qual S10 | \& K Q 109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ 10 | $\text { AK } 9543$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J 97542 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 3 |  | - 64 |  | ak | C |  |  |
| \& 8654 |  | \& A | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | ¢ Q 2 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | ¢ |
|  | - A 10 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 10872 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& J 732 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | 4 |

Beauchamp heard 14 come round to him and passed it out. Well done him. Ware heard the auction go 1p-Pass-1NT-pass-2 - -Pass-Pass back to him and doubled. And let he who is without sin cast the first stone...l would have done the same, I admit. Neill found a nice 2 call, and over 3 from Nunn Kanetkar re-evaluated his working zero count and jumped to 4 V ! I must ask him whether he is a follower of the school of TTASL (Teach Them A sharp lesson; when they reopen you in part-score you must double them or bid game, when in game, you must double them or bid slam). Ware doubled 4t to tell his opponents they couldn't do that to him. He was wrong and that was 790 - in the other room 5 escaped undoubled for 150. It was 37-24 now for Nunn. Hung and Lee bid to $4 \bullet$ in less dramatic fashion to gain 11 IMPs, to lead 48-7.

| Dealer: South | - Q 92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -9543 |  |
| Brd 23 | -KQ9542 |  |
| Opn Tms Qual S10 | \& --- |  |
| ¢ K 5 |  | ¢ J 10 |
| - AK 82 |  | -J1076 |
| - A 106 |  | - J 7 |
| \& A 52 |  | \& K J 1094 |
|  | ¢A87643 |  |
|  | - Q |  |
|  | - 83 |  |
|  | \& Q 863 |  |

Two of our four tables (both in the match Kanetkar-Nunn) defeated $4 \checkmark$ on a club lead by taking the two ruffs. Cormack-Kozakos mistimed the defence to let it through, and Hans led a low spade as South against 40 after a lead-directing double from Beauchamp. Naturally Hinge misguessed at trick one. Beauchamp won his queen, and should have exited in trumps (he knows this will beat the hand unless declarer has solid clubs). He actually took some time to return a spade, and now Hans felt ethically constrained to play a third spade, so the diamond loser went away on a ruff and discard.

The rest of the set was relatively quiet, with Kanetkar gaining one small swing, Milne two small pick-ups, but the last deal saw Nunn cement their win.

| Dealer: West | ¢ K 62 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A 10642 |  |
| Brd 28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } 84 \\ & \& 65 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ¢ 1083 |  | ¢AJ974 |
| - J 83 |  | ---- |
| -K106 |  | - 9532 |
| \& K 943 |  | \& A J 108 |
|  | * Q 5 |  |
|  | -KQ975 |  |
|  | - A J 7 |  |
|  | \& Q 72 |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| - | 3 | - | 3 |  |
| 2 | - | 1 | - |  |
| 4 | - | 4 | - | 4 |

After Neill opened 19 as West, Nunn doubled, Kanetkar raised to $2 \Phi$ and Ware jumped to 4 - a sporting effort. Indeed even when dummy showered down with real extras, the final contract looked hopeless. However Neill led a low diamond to trick one and Kanetkar put in the ten. We've all done worse.

Declarer of course still has no legitimate play for the contract but when after drawing trumps Ware led a spade towards the queen the sight of the ace was enough to gladden his heart.
Game had gone down in the other room (both rooms played $3 \checkmark$ for 140 in the other encounter) so Nunn had 12 IMPs to win 50-29 while the other match finished 59-7 for Milne.

## INTERMEDIATE ROUND 11 - A CLOSE ONE

## Brent Manley



Angeline Christie, Shayne Palfreyman, Sonia Palfreyman and Trevor Fletcher (seated)

If it's true that a tie in a competitive endeavour is like kissing your sister, two foursomes in the Restricted Teams were spared the experience by the slimmest of margins.
In a tight match, the Phil Houlton team (Coffs Harbour) defeated the Trevor Fletcher foursome (Gold Coast) 2524.

Houlton and his wife, Bambi, played with Rod Binsted and Judy Scholfield. Fletcher and his partner, Angeline Christie, played with Shayne and Sonya Palfreyman.

A couple of bidding decisions helped the winners swing the balance.Things started with a game swing on this deal:

| Dealer: North | ¢ 743 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - 95 |  | Phil | Fletcher | Bambi | Christie |  |
| Brd 1 | - K 102 |  |  | Pass | 1 | Pass |  |
| Int Tms Qual S11 | \& A Q 1075 |  | 19 | 24 | Pass | Pass |  |
| ¢ A Q 62 |  | ¢ K J 10 | 24 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - Q 1072 |  | - A J 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 754 |  | - Q 863 |  | Makea | le Con | acts |  |
| \% 6 |  | \& K 92 | 2 | - | 2 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ 985 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | ¢ |
|  | - K 863 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 9 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& J 843 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | 9 |

Fletcher's $2 \$$ bid seemed to short-circuit the Houlton auction and they missed the game. Phil played well, calling for dummy's queen on the lead of the $\$ 2$. He then cashed three rounds of trumps, ending in hand, and played his singleton club. Fletcher went up with the ace and exited with the 99, ducked to Christie's king. Phil was soon claiming plus 170 , but it was a 6 -IMP loss.

At the other table:

| West <br> Sonya | North | East <br> Shayne | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1ヵ | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass |  |  |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

South started with a low spade to dummy's queen. At trick two, Shayne ran the 10 to South's king. A low club went to North's queen and Shayne's king. With nine tricks in the bag, Shayne did not fool around looking for overtricks. Plus 400 was good for a 6 -IMP gain.

On the following board, Bambi managed nine tricks after the defenders started off with their best suit.


Bambi's 3NT showed no four-card major and a maximum for the 15-18 range.
Christie started with a low club to the 9 and jack. She won the $\& A$ and played the $Q$ from hand. Fletcher won the $\uparrow A$ and continued with the $\& Q$, ducked by Bambi. She won the club continuation and cashed four rounds of hearts then exited dummy with a low diamond. Fletcher took the $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$ and played a club to Christie's 10. She exited with a spade, but Bambi - with six tricks already in - put up the king and claimed with two diamond tricks.

On this deal, Fletcher bid aggressively to game and came close to making it.

| Dealer: North | ¢ --- |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - 8 |  | Phil | Fletcher | Bambi | Christie |  |
| Brd 9 | -KQ J 87 |  |  | 14 | Pass | 10 |  |
| Int Tms Qual S11 | \& AQ 7643 |  | Pass | 2 | Pass | 34 |  |
| ¢ A 32 |  | ¢ Q 10965 | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |  |  |
| - A Q 105 |  | - J 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 1094 |  | -6532 |  | Makea | le Contra |  |  |
| \% 82 |  | \& 95 | - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | ¢K J 874 |  | - | - | - | - | ¢ |
|  | -K97432 |  | - | 1 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ---- |  | - | 1 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& K 10 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | 8 |

Bambi started accurately with a club, taken in dummy with the king. Fletcher pulled trumps and played the $\checkmark$ to Phil's ace. Fletcher ruffed when Phil tried to cash the $\uparrow$, but Fletcher could not find 11 tricks from the illfitting hands. He had to settle for 10 tricks and minus 50 , but it was still a small swing because North at the other table was even more optimistic in bidding to 6and going down two.

The big swing came on board 10 at the Fletcher table


Christie finished with 10 tricks for +130 , resulting in an 11-IMP loss because of what happened at the other table.

| West <br> Sonya | North | East <br> Shayne <br> Pass | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  |  |  |
| $1 \downarrow$ | Double | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Getting to game was the key for North-South. Shayne might have given declarer pause by starting with a spade, but from his perspective, he had an entryless hand and a partner who opened the bidding. Only someone looking at all the cards would start with a spade. Further, declarer can always make game no matter what the lead.
After Shayne led the 99, declarer had no difficulty making overtricks for an 11-IMP gain.

## CRIME OF THE CENTURY?

## Brent Manley

The clear-cut winner of the defence of the year award for 2016 can be announced already. It will go to president of the Alcatraz Bridge Federation (sorry, I mean Australian ...or do I?) Bruce Neill with best supporting award going to Avi Kanetkar.

| Dealer: West | - 86 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - A 108762 |  |
| Brd 8 | $\begin{aligned} * & \text { K } 102 \\ \& & \text { A Q } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| -93 |  | - J 42 |
| -KJ 9 |  | - 53 |
| - 843 |  | - A 96 |
| -KJ 632 |  | \& 109854 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Vul: None
Brd 8

- 93
- 843
\&KJ 632

West North East South

```
- AKQ1075
-Q4
\& 7
@ 86
    A
    & AQ
-53
* A }9
&409854
```

| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 5 | - | 6 | NT |
| - | 6 | - | 6 | $\dagger$ |
| - | 5 | - | 5 |  |
| - | 6 | - | 6 |  |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | 4 |

Before I tell you what happened, consider the fate of here. Declarer has a losing heart when the king is not singleton - but he also has a club finesse to take on which the heart loser can be discarded. Can you construct a sequence of plays whereby a highly competent declarer could fail to take 12 tricks?
Give it your best shot...it is hard to find a losing squeeze option isn't it? Well, Ziggy Konig and Jim Wallis bid to 64 - a sensible auction such as 1 -2NT-3-4-5 would do the trick.

Avi Kanetkar put the $P$ J firmly on the table, giving declarer an additional winning option - but one that no sensible person would ever take. He rose with ©A and drew trumps, but in the process on the third round Bruce Neill as East revoked, discarding the $\mathbf{~ 5}$. He caught his revoke in time but the $\boldsymbol{\$}$ was now on the table as a major penalty card.

This gave Ziggy an additional option．Instead of relying on the club finesse he led a second heart，the queen himself，knowing Bruce who，from the opening lead held the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ ，would have to follow with the $>5$－a penalty card．So he made this play－but when Kanetkar produced the $⿴ 囗 十 一$ and led a diamond to his partner＇s $\downarrow$ A the barefaced robbery had been completed and the thieves had got clean away．

## CRIME OF THE NEXT CENTURY？

Brent Manley

The scene：Youth Week playing in a minor event was Ally Morris playing her four year old son Jules．
Medical student Lakshmi Sunderasan playing with Rachel Rich has Ally to her left，Jules to her right．

It is already clear to Lakshmi that Jules＇main delight in the game is winning tricks．Each trick won is regarded as a personal coup．

```
* KQ 10 4
-752
```

So when Lakshmi is faced with the suit combination on the left，what might look like a $50-50$ guess is more of a $100 \%$ guaranteed suit combination．She gains the lead and leads to the king in dummy，comes to hand and leads to the queen．Jules wins the ace and leads to Ally＇s jack．Down one，and out－psyched by a four year old！


Lakhsmi is confident Jules will have a great future as a bridge player．．．or as a con artist．

## YOUTH VERSUS MATURITY

## Sophie King

On Wednesday the Gold Coast Bridge Club hosted around 40 youth（ish）players for dinner and some fun bridge．It was a fantastic night and we＇d love for this event to become a regular fixture on the Gold Coast Congress calendar．Big thank you to all the GCBC members for your warm welcome and for playing bridge with us．Special thanks to Di and Paul for organising this event，you＇re really spoiling us during this congress！

Now onto the bridge！We started with a qualifying round of matchpoint pairs．After＂as many boards as we can fit into an hour＂，the top two pairs in each direction qualified for the four board board－a－match final to determine the overall winners，Cliff Wake style．The two youngest players of the night，Jules and Xan，were appointed team captains and selected their teams．Jules chose Nick and Vicki and well as Max and Chelsea．On Team Xan were Stevie and Shane，Jack and Sophie．With the other players kibitzing and cheering us all on，we settled down for a high－stakes final．（The GCBC very kindly offered some prize money which we were all keen to win－thank you！）．

At our table，local boy Jack and I faced off against Nick and Vicki．There were some awesome shapely hands during the event that gave us interesting bidding problems．This was my favourite，occurring on board 30 in the final．Sitting West as dealer Nil Vul I held：

| A | West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| -5 | 14 | 4 | $5 \uparrow$ | Double |
| - AKQ85 | ？？ |  |  |  |

\＆K108432
What is your action here？
A few people I polled liked a 5 NT bid here if it meant minors－the proviso being that this could be ambiguous unless you had your system sorted．Then you get to 6 or 7 clubs when partner shows up with good 5 card club support in addition to his killer heart suit．

However，we had no agreements and more importantly this was a youth event，so I redoubled with gusto， because you know，redoubled contracts are fun．（The technical term for this bid being the＂Yay！redouble＂）． Jack held his nerve and made his contract and +1000 ．At the other table South bid only 3 and West came in all guns blazing with $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ ．North，looking at two trump tricks（and playing BAM）doubled and took the contract one off．One board to Team Xan．

| Dealer: South | ¢ 76 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: All | - J 105 |  |
| Brd 23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 7543 \\ & \& \text { Q } 32 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| - 10543 |  | ¢ A |
| -K97 |  | - 862 |
| -K J 9 |  | - Q 10862 |
| \&1096 |  | \& AK 84 |
|  | ¢K Q J 982 |  |
|  | -AQ43 |  |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | \& J 75 |  |

Board 23 swung on a difference of style. At both tables South opened 14 and North bid 1NT. As East, I was feeling cowardly and passed.

South then bid $2 \boldsymbol{*}$. North chose to correct to $2 \boldsymbol{4}$, not willing to pass and miss out on game when partner has a few more values. Nick played well to finagle two overtricks for an excellent BAM result. At the other table, East overcalled 2 over North's 1NT. South made a takeout double, which North was happy to leave in for penalties. Because really, why play a contracted if it's not doubled or redoubled? Alas, East comfortably racked up 8 tricks for a convincing BAM win. One board all.

| Dealer: South | - A Q J 10985 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Nil | -K94 |  |
| Brd 27 | $\begin{array}{r} 63 \\ +22 \end{array}$ |  |
| ¢ 3 |  | - K 7 |
| - A Q 108 |  | - J7632 |
| - AK 82 |  | - Q 74 |
| \& Q 987 |  | \& K 105 |
|  | - 642 |  |
|  | - 5 |  |
|  | - J 1095 |  |
|  | \& AJ643 |  |

On board 27 Nick brought out a super-youth pre-empt of with the South hand. Jack passed, hoping for a reopening double from me. With the North hand, Vicki, with expert coaching from Jules, bid 34. I passed and Nick showed his spade support by raising to $4 \uparrow$. With the king of trumps off-side though, the contract went one down.

At the other table South chose not to open and the auction proceeded:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Double | Pass | $4 \bullet$ | All Pass |

l'd be tempted to raise spades on the South cards here, even if only to make opponents' lives difficult, but pass here was the winning action. Teamies could be fairly sure that at our table 49 would be bid (this being a youth event and 4 always being the best contract ever) and so may have deliberately chosen to take a swingy action in BAM. In the play, South led the jack of diamonds, declarer winning in dummy and taking the losing heart finesse. North promptly led his singleton club to the ace and received a club ruff to take the contract one off. Two boards to one, to Team Xan.

| Dealer: East | - A 86 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Nil | - J 84 |  |
| Brd 29 | - AK5 <br> \& 8632 |  |
| - J 95 |  | - K 10 |
| -10962 |  | - Q 75 |
| - Q 10863 |  | -J942 |
| - 5 |  | \& AKQ J |
|  | - Q 7432 |  |
|  | - AK3 |  |
|  | - 7 |  |
|  | -10974 |  |

On the last board, North at both tables opened a weak no trump and East doubled to show penalty interest. At our table, South chose to bid $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ which was passed around to me. I doubled and partner very sensibly pulled to $2 \vee$. I however had had a glass of wine and was very enthusiastic about my hand sol bid 3 which was cracked. The defence didn't cash their tricks in time and one ran away on dummy's clubs, so Jack made his contract. Jack did well to stay calm in a bad contract and look for opportunities to make and was rewarded for his tenacity.
At the other table, South redoubled to show values and West ran to $2 \downarrow$. This was passed to South who has a hard choice here between either bidding his ratty spades or doubling in the hope that partner has 4 hearts or 3 spades. Unfortunately South made a takeout double, which was the wrong option on this hand. North, having to choose between two 3 card suits, bid his hearts and they played in $2 \downarrow$. This was not a happy contract, going down 3. Luckily, we had them covered, and Team Xan won the board.
The final result was 3 boards to 1 to Team Xan, who celebrated by playing aeroplane with Stevie. Thanks to everyone who played in the event and to the lovely kibitzers who made the final that much more exciting with their cheering, heckling and laughter.

THE KILLING LEAD
Spotted by Felicity Beale, Reported by Peter Buchen
Dealer: South
Vul: Both

- K
- Q 854
- KQ 854 -K 75
Teams Qual S4
- J 7
-A 10963
- A 6
-4 10942

- 1065
- J 72
- 1093
\& A Q J 6

| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | - | NT |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | - | 2 | - |  |
| - | 3 | - | 3 |  |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | 4 |

At most tables the bidding went all pass. The datum in both the Open and the Seniors was +110 to NorthSouth. so more declarer's were making than going down. At one table West led $\$$ A and with those strong diamonds in dummy, East gave a $3 \diamond$ suit preference signal for clubs.
West persisted with another diamond won by South with the jack. He now crossed to dummy with the $\boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathrm{K}$ and tried to sneak a heart through, but West won and switched to the $\%$. East overtook, gave West a diamond ruff and the club return defeated the contract by one trick. That was good defence, but not perfect. Declarer after winning the $>J$ could have played $₫ A, \leftrightarrow Q$ and conceded a trump trick to East who could not gainfully play clubs.
Deep Finesse tells us that can be defeated - can you spot the perfect defence?
There is only one card to lead in the West hand that beats the contract and that is the six of diamonds. Now the defenders can handle any manoeuvre by declarer. Just goes to show what a fascinating game bridge really is and who said never underlead an ace against a suit contract? Well spotted Felicity.

## PETER PAN(G)

By Peter Ventura, Sweden



Having worked for the EBL and WBF as a bulletin co-editor for a number of years in European and World Championships I feel compelled to make a contribution to the bulletin, since I know how hard David, Barry and Brent are working.
Here I am in Australia for the first time ever. The reasons are various. The Gold Coast sounded tempting and combined with bridge it would be even greater. However, foremost it is because of my wife's 30th birthday on Friday. Pang, as her name is, and I, named Peter, hence many says Peter Pan $(\mathrm{g})$, we left Sweden, with plenty of snow and several degrees below zero, to celebrate her here on the other side of the globe.
Secondly, playing here at the Congress would be good training for her birthday, as she started to play bridge just a few years ago.

She is well gifted but sometimes I doubt if a lifetime is enough to teach your wife to play bridge.

On top of that, wisely or not, I presented her with a completely new bidding system for this occasion. She is learning step by step and is now on the second page of my ten-page pamphlet.
We mostly do Walk-Ins. On Wednesday she had to deal with one of our new gadgets on the very last board.

| Dealer: East | ¢A1054 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - A 7 |
| Brd 30 | - 86 |
| Hol Prs 2-2 | ¢97543 |
|  | ¢ K Q |
|  | - K J 9 |
|  | - A Q J 5 |
|  | \& AKQ J |

Sitting South, Pang opened 2\&, any strong hand with $22+$. I responded 2NT, showing two aces, one ace and two kings or four kings. From her hand, she could tell I held the first alternative. Well, with all aces and high cards nothing less than grand slam would be a decent approach, she thought, and simply raised to 7NT. That was a quick auction, reaching grand in just three bids!
The lead was the $\$$, won by dummy's queen. I counted my winners: five clubs, three spades, two hearts and one diamond. Two successful diamond finesses would lead the way to thirteen tricks, but how to get to the hand twice? The heart ace, yes, but overtaking the spade would not gain anything. Well, I had to start somewhere, so cashing four club tricks seemed as a good idea. On the clubs East discarded heart six, heart two, discouraging, then $\downarrow 3$. West pitched the $\vee 4$ on the fourth club.

In the book 'I Love This Game', Sabine Auken wrote about the 'little fifth', where an opponent's easiest first discard is a low card from a five card suit. This looked a bit the same, but with three heart discards from East and one from West it was more likely the heart suit to be $4-4$ and the queen with West. What if....East had 10xxx? By playing the heart jack, forcing West to cover the queen, only one entry would be needed for the diamond finesse since the heart ten would drop later under the king.
No sooner said and done, I asked for the heart jack, and I was entirely correct, West covered and I won the ace. On the last club played from hand both defenders discarded a small diamond, dummy too. I cashed the ace of spades and finally some good news - East followed with the jack! The spade ten was a winner and now twelve tricks were in the basket... but stop! What to discard from dummy on the last spade winner? Which red suit would produce the crucial trick? Keep the $\downarrow$ Q or keep $\downarrow \mathrm{K}-9$ playing for the ten to drop?

East seemed to hold on too tightly to the diamond suit, so I closed my eyes and took the diamond finesse in the three cards ending. Yes - the diamond king was onside; +1520 ! This was the whole deal.

| Dealer: East | -A 1054 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\bullet \text { A } 7$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 30 | $86$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ¢ } 932 \\ & \bullet \text { Q } 1054 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\vee 8632$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -102 |  | -K9743 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& 1086 |  | \$2 | - | 7 | - | 7 | NT |
|  | - K Q |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | - |
|  | - KJ 9 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\bullet$ |
|  | - A Q J 5 |  | - | 5 | - |  | - |
|  | \& AKQ J |  | - | 7 | - | - | $\pm$ |

One of the opponents was almost in shock, "I can hardly remember when I saw anyone bid a grand slam and never in my life have I seen it the way you did it"!
Not surprisingly the grand was bid and made only at two tables, so this board contributed significantly to our place as runner-up. Well done, darling, and happy birthday!

## MUSINGS

Attesting to the lifetime joy that bridge can provide, there are four members playing at this year's GCC who were members of the victorious South Australian Open Team which won the 1971 Australian National Championships. With ages on winning the Championship in brackets were David Lusk (25), David Middleton (22), Zolly Nagy (24), and George Smolanko (22). Not playing here are Robbie Robertson NPC, John Horowitz, Tex Wundke.

## RANDOM RAMBLES

Michael Courtney
The Pairs Final was exciting throughout, but I kicked it off with a heartbreaker:
Dealer: North
Vul: None
Brd 1
Open Prs Final 1
\& A K 10
A J 85
A 104
\& 1095

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { QQ9542 } \\ & \bullet \text { Q43 } \end{aligned}$ |  | West Michae | North Fischer | East <br> Astrid | South <br> Tutty |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - J 95 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| \& KQ |  | 1NT | Pass | 24 | Pass |  |
|  | - 63 | 2 | Pass | 3 | Pass |  |
|  | -K1097 | 3NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  | -KQ 32 |  | Makea | Con | Pas |  |
|  | \& 842 | 2 | - | 2 | - | NT |
| - J 87 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| -62 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\bullet$ |
| - 876 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | - |
| \& A J 763 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | 4 |

My hand, West had very strong suggestions of playing no-trumps. Especially the good spot cards, controls and 4333 pattern.

North led a spade to the jack and my king. It appeared certain that those in four hearts would only ever make ten tricks and those who misguessed hearts would fail. By contrast, if I guessed hearts I would have good lines for ten or even eleven tricks. I led the heart jack to the king and called for a low club. The ten fell to the queen. Fischer exited with the diamond five so I won dummy's king. A second club would work very well now if South ducked, but I decided to run the heart ten. Fischer had no difficulty reading the layout now and won the heart queen and played the club king. It was four clubs later that I realised 3NT had a downside that $4 \checkmark$ did not. Misguessing the heart leads to going one down in four hearts - IF they remember to take their clubs. But when clubs are $5-2,3$ NT can fail by TWO tricks after hearts are misguessed, -100 earnt zero matchpoints. But what goes around comes around.
Playing in the second session of the finals you are sitting South on this set of three boards

| $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \text { Q J } 983 \\ & \bullet K \text { Q J } 72 \end{aligned}$ | West 1 | North Double | East 4. | South Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -42 | 4 | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| * 6 |  |  |  |  |

Partner leads the diamond king, and you see dummy come down with 5-5 in the majors as the lead is taken by West's ace. West next cashes the \&A and ruffs his club, then plays dummy's $₫ Q$. You should be ready for this. Which spade do you play? And why?

| Dealer: West | - - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - A953 |  |
| Brd 16 | $\begin{aligned} & -K \text { Q } 1083 \\ & \& K \text { Q } 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| - A 7642 |  | - Q J 9 8 3 |
| -1064 |  | -KQJ72 |
| - A J 9 |  | -42 |
| - A 8 |  | \% 6 |

© K 105
$\bullet 8$

- 765
-4 1075432
The spade ten is an excellent gambit. No-one would jettison their sure trump winner thus. West might now rise spade ace to guarantee the contract against any 2-1 trump break, for he does not wish to suffer a heart ruff. That is exactly what he does suffer however. Indeed that 10 has the suit-preference for the heart ruff embedded within it.

Not that this was the real hand today. Yes, I suppose I have to show you the real hand.

| Dealer: West | ¢ K | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - A 95 | Astrid | Travis | Me | Melbourne |
| Brd 16 | -KQ1083 | 24 (8-11) | Double | 4¢ | All Pass |

## Open Prs Fiinal 2 \& K Q J 9

-A 7642

- 1064
- A J 9
\& A 8

```
© Q J 983
*K Q J 7 2
* 42
& 6
```

| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
| 5 | - | 5 | - | $\uparrow$ |
| 5 | - | 5 | - |  |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | $\&$ |

Travis-Melbourne would have been amongst the pre-post favourites, I suppose. I think Barbara has won three times out of four starts and Howard five times out of six or seven. Barbara of course led her shorter, stronger KQ combination but that was dummy's shortage.

Astrid won the club ace, ruffed a club and led the spade queen, when Howard followed with the ten Astrid decided to dodge the heart ruff and rose with the ace. The king fell and she had 12 tricks; had trumps been 3-0 she would have played on trumps and made 10 tricks.

It is not really fair to just show one board, though. On the next deal of the round I think I misplayed the hand. I began with some advantage for our opponents had agreed to make polish leads, especially low from a doubleton. Howard felt the nine a little large for that treatment so he led that card.

| Dealer: North Vul: None | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ↔ A Q J } 54 \\ & \bullet \text { Q } 84 \end{aligned}$ |  | West <br> Astrid | North <br> Travis | East <br> Me | South <br> Melbourne |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 17 | - Q 65 |  | Pass | 14 | 1NT | Pass |  |
| Open Prs Fiinal 2 | \& 95 |  | Pass | Pass |  |  |  |
| ¢ 86 |  | ¢K1032 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -10962 |  | - K 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K 84 |  | - A 32 |  | Make | le Con | acts |  |
| \& Q 1062 |  | \& A K J 3 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ 97 |  | - | - | - | - | ¢ |
|  | - A J 53 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 1097 |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 874 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | 4 |

Barbara played the spade jack over the nine. I won the king and cashed four clubs ending in dummy. Barbara guessed to discard two hearts when Howard signalled values there. So I played on hearts and +150 was inevitable. North has to discard spades to have a shot to hold declarer to seven tricks.

| Dealer: East | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ¢ Q } 86432 \\ & \bullet \text { A } 10865 \end{aligned}$ |  | West Astrid | North <br> Travis | East <br> Me | South <br> Melbourne |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 18 | - J 9 |  |  |  | 1NT | Pas |  |
| Open Prs Fiinal 2 | ¢ --- |  | 24 | Pass | 24 | Pas |  |
| - 7 |  | ¢ K J 109 | 34 | Pass | 3NT | All P |  |
| $\bullet 74$ |  | - K |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 8632 |  | - AK Q 7 |  | Make | le Con | acts |  |
| \& AK 9732 |  | \& Q J 105 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ A 5 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\pm$ |
|  | - Q J 932 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -1054 |  | 4 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 864 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | 4 |

I was quite excited: two good boards in and a nice nineteen to finish. What to open is an issue which I resolved by bidding no-trumps because they score more (ed: I hadn't realized the decisions were so easy... why didn't we all think of that?). By my lights Astrid's sequence to $3 \$$ was terminal, so I should make a simple raise. Still it does sound as though she has long clubs and four hearts so I went back to my first theory.

Here Melbourne shone. He led his fourth highest heart and we were down like a stone. +660 was a very common result after the heart queen was led. What can North do but encourage? He has no entry and the queen may be from QJx or the like.

## STRENGTHEN YOUR GAME

Getting the most from your conventions - Part 7 Brent Manley
Eddie Kantar was giving a lecture at Leisure World, a large retirement community in California. Kantar started off, "They said I could choose any topic, but they did have one request: 'Please don't mention drop-dead bids.'"

As mentioned yesterday, there are lots of schemes for competing against 1NT openers, weak and strong. It's beyond the scope of this series to try to cover all the bases, so the focus will be on two widely used methods: DONT and Hamilton (also known as Cappelletti and, in Great Britain, Pottage).
DONT, devised by Marty Bergen, stands for Disturb Opponents' NoTrump. The convention has wide appeal because it's easy to remember. In DONT:
Double = One-suited hand, usually six or more cards (five-card suits not recommended)
$2 \%=$ Clubs and a higher ranking suit, ideally with nine cards between them (5-4)
2- = Diamonds and a major suit (5-4 or better)
20 = Major suits (5-4 or better)
2. = Spades (six or more recommended)

A double followed by spades shows a stronger hand than a direct bid of $2 \boldsymbol{4}$.

## Responses

After double, 24 asks overcaller to name his suit. Overcaller passes if his suit is clubs. In response to the twosuited bids, advancer (partner of the overcaller) bids the next higher suit if he doesn't like the suit named. For example, 1NT - $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ - Pass - 2 indicates that advancer doesn't like clubs. Generally, advancer passes or raises if he likes overcaller's suit.

Over the double, a bid of a suit other than $2 \boldsymbol{q}$ shows a long suit and is to play. Similarly over 2\&, $2 \boldsymbol{2}+$
If advancer has a strong hand - which would be the case mostly against a weak 1NT - he can pass to covert the double to penalty or bid 2NT to show an opening hand or close to it. This could be important if the doubler's side is vulnerable. Plus 500 would be poor compensation for bidding and making a vulnerable game.
Note: If opener's partner takes action over the double, advancer can double for takeout. For example, if opener's partner bids 2 as a transfer to hearts, double by advancer indicates at least three-card support for spades, diamonds and clubs. It does not show values in the transfer suit or the suit named naturally.

Another good use for DONT is to help your side escape from a doubled 1NT overcall. Suppose your LHO opens 14 and partner bids 1 NT ( $15-18$ is recommended). RHO now doubles for penalty (usually with $9+$ HCP) and you're looking at

- 54 - Q 765 J 1042 \& J65

If you pass, which says you are happy with 1NT doubled, it will probably be bloody. You belong in a suit contract, but which suit? Playing DONT runouts (you are running from 1NT doubled), you bid DONT style: 2\& shows clubs and a higher suit ( $4-4$ or better); $2 \checkmark$ shows diamonds and a major and $2 \checkmark$ the majors. If you have one suit (minimum of five), redouble to tell partner to bid $2 \boldsymbol{\mu}$ (just like your double of an opening 1 NT will be followed by 24 most of the time so partner can find out about your long suit). You pass if your suit is clubs and bid your suit if it's not. If your LHO bids, partner is off the hook. If your LHO doubles, partner must run if he doesn't like your first suit.

Hamilton
Many partnerships prefer this method against weak 1NT openers because of the chances for penalties. In general, a double of a 1NT opener shows a good 14 HCP. It is not a penalty double. It simply shows high-card strength. A penalty double of 1NT would feature a long, strong suit and an entry, something like

```
-KQJ1097 ヤA543 K5 \& 8 .
```

Other bids:
2\% = A one-suited hand. Advancer bids 2 to find out which suit. If advancer bids a major suit, it shows length and strength in that suit.

2 = Major suits ( $5-4$ or better)
20 = Hearts and a minor (5-4 or better)
24 = Spades and a minor (5-4 or better)
Caution: Do not double a 1NT opener with "their range" or even the "top of their range." Some 1NT openers are as weak as 10-12. It would be folly to stick your neck out with a 10-point hand or even 12 HCP. Stick to a solid 14 HCP or better to avoid disaster. Yes, it is annoying when an opponent bothers you with a mini-1NT, but keep a cool head and maintain discipline. Partner will appreciate it.

## CORRECTIONS

It was erroneously reported that I reported Gary Khema and Gary Malinas were the winners of the best Queenslanders in the Open Pairs Championship. Of course the winners of that award were was Neville Francis and Magnus Moren. Apologies to all concerned.

## BUILDING A BETTER MOUSETRAP

## Barry Rigal - Splinter Raises

Even if we play Jacoby 2NT - or the equivalent - as responder you still need a way to describe your shortage, not only on game-going hands with real slam potential but also on regular openers, and even on light but shapely hands that you want to play game on, even if you can't guarantee making it.

The simplest method is to take the light forces to game with side-suit shortage out of the 2NT response. There are two ways to do this. One is to use all double jumps as game-going values with shortage in the bid suit. Then a jump to 3NT is a good raise from one to four, perhaps limit-raise values (or a little less) with a fifth trump and a singleton. Facing a 1 opening, I couldn't imagine staying out of game with:

- K J 762
- Q 105
- 2
\& K 864
Since even facing a dead-minimum hand opposite, it is the location of partner's honours that makes game good or bad.
The other approach is to give up on the meaning of 3NT as a good pre-emptive raise to four. Instead we can use two-tier splinters. We jump to the call directly over three of our agreed major to start to describe a minisplinter (say 9-11) in an unspecified suit. With slam interest, partner can relay for the shortage: 10-3-3NT $-4 \boldsymbol{\$} / 4 \diamond / 4 \diamond$ for short clubs, diamonds and spades respectively. Direct jumps to $3 N T / 4 \& / 4 \diamond$ are short spades, clubs and diamonds in a hand of 12-14 HCP (or 18+). In all these sequences, a fifth trump is normally worth a point or two. Splintering after using the Jacoby 2NT suggests shortage with15-17.
In response to a regular splinter, opener needs both fitting cards and a non-minimum to co-operate.
- J 4 - A875
-AK974 QJ53
- Q6 6 KJ54
\& A 8 3249
After 10-4e the West hand does not have quite enough to co-operate. With the spade queen instead of the jack maybe a jump to $5 \boldsymbol{\square}$ suggests good trumps and the club ace, while with $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{K}$ instead of the jack l'd definitely move to slam - maybe with an uncultured key-card ask.
I have devised/ (stolen) ingenious responses to Jacoby, which are certainly worth discussing; but the margin of my page is not large enough to contain them, so I will expand on them in a separate article.


## Changes In Competition

When the opponents compete after our raise, there is no basic change to the approach. Passing is the weakest action, re-raising is purely competitive and not a game try, jumps to game are natural (and do not of themselves set up a forcing pass). But one has to be slightly creative when dealing with game tries, since there may not always be the space to make the try you want.

- AK 864
$-K 8$
-A832
\& Q 6

Your plan was to bid as a game try after receiving a simple raise in spades．That will work fine if the opponents intervene in clubs．But what if they bid hearts？The general rule is that if there are two game tries
 a call of $3 \bullet$ is a non－specific game try，double suggesting extras and balanced．When they compete to the maximum level（by bidding and raising hearts in the previous auction）double is a non－specific game try， tending to be balanced since partner can pass a defensively－oriented raise．In that sequence with：
－AKJ76
－ 3
－K Q 92
－K 86
I＇d be reluctant to double $3 v$ with so little defence．I might just bid $4 \oplus$ ．
When the opponents compete to the three level，and you are on the way to game，it is easy simply to up and bid it，but there is often some merit in planning for how to deal with further competition．There are no coded slam－tries in competition．

After
16 （1中）2ゅ（3ゅ）
it may look natural to bid $4 \checkmark$ with：
－ 6
－AQ 1083
－ 92
\＆AK 1086
but do you know what to do over 4母？And equally importantly，how will you get partner to judge with his 4432 ten－count whether to bid on，pass or double．
－J 7
－KJ9 4
－K Q 93
\＆ 953
requires you to defend，but by contrast with：
－J 7
－KJ 94
－K 43
\＆Q J 53
either 4 or 5 rates to be very playable，and both contracts might make．Meanwhile with：
－ 107
－K942
－A 3
\＆Q J 753
both 4 and 5 rate to be excellent－indeed， 6 is the place to be．How to help partner to take the decision？ Don＇t bid $4 \bullet$ over $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ ，which simply bars partner from bidding on，though he can double．Bid 4\＆，which is not a slam－try but describes your additional shape，to help partner in the decision over 4¢．It does NOT set up a forcing pass．If opener makes one of these calls then doubles，this is not penalty，it shows extra values and

－ 6
－A Q 1083
－K 2
\＆AK 1086
With a hand where you simply want to get to $4 \diamond$ but set up a forcing pass in the process，bid $3 N T$ over $3 \uparrow$ ，an artificial call announcing ownership of the hand．
Responder＇s doubles in these sequences are defensive／regressive．


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


West North East South


1v Double 4

## Double All Pass

## Double showing 4 plus spades

West leads the \&A: two - jack - eight. EastWest play low-encouraging on partner's lead. How should West continue?

Solution: When you are defending against an obvious sacrifice bid, you want to beat the opponents by as many tricks as possible. There was ample opportunity to do so on this deal from a National Team Playoff:


East-West can collect six tricks if they do everything just right. On the auction it is highly likely that South has club length and East's $\& \mathrm{~J}$ is almost certainly a singleton. As you will always make the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ later, you can afford to continue with the 99 . East will ruff and switch to the $\vee K$ or the $\vee Q$. Suppose East plays the $\mathbb{K}$ and declarer takes the $\forall$, draws trumps and knocks out the \$K. West returns a diamond to East and the $\triangle$ Q shift gives the defence two hearts to go with a diamond, two clubs and club ruff. If South ducks the DK, East switches to the HQ for the same result. The $\bullet$ Q switch after ruffing the club also leads to six tricks for the defence.

If West starts with $\& A, \mu$ K and a third club, South is only two down. East ruffs the third club, but declarer can avoid the diamond loser. South can draw trumps and dump dummy's diamond loser on the fifth club.
If West starts with the A , followed by $\& \mathrm{~A}$, K and a third club, South is one down. Still, why lead the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ when you hold \&A-K-x?



Remember that there are approximately two thousand players at the venue, ensuring the comfort of ALL players is a challenge.

Over time the organisers have noticed that there are areas where it is particularly cold due to air pockets coming from the air conditioner.
The room sometimes leaks from condensation due to the amount of air conditioning we are using. What you CAN do to improve your personal comfort level:

- as advertised in all communication, please bring a jumper;
- we have a supply of pashminas and wraps so please just ask a caddy who will bring it to you - we do ask that you return these to the caddy at end of the session
- if it is obviously too cold for you and those around you please ask the caddy to report the table number and section to Kim Ellaway who will bring her trusted thermometer to see if it can be fixed or perhaps we can move the table.
Things you can do that will NOT improve your comfort level
- discuss the issue with a Director or the Scoring Staff
- discuss it with the Recorder


## DIRECTOR'S TIP - OPENING LEAD

The player on lead (Declarer's LHO) should select their opening lead, and place it face down on the table in front of them. Their partner should then acknowledge that it can be faced. This minimises the possibility of making an opening lead from the wrong hand.
Once placed on the table, the card cannot be changed without the Director's consent, even though it may not have been faced.


## BRIDGE FOR

 BRAIN RESEARCH CHALTENGE
## DONATE

## SAVE THE DATE $1^{\text {ST }}$ TO $7^{\text {TH }}$ MAY 2016

Bridge for Brain Research Challenge: During the first week of May, host a bridge session and donate the proceeds to Alzheimer's research at NeuRA. We are asking that all bridge clubs and players throughout Australia raise funds and/or make a donation in support of Alzheimer's research.
There is no entry fee - we are relying on the support and generosity of bridge clubs and players to use this event to raise funds and make donations. More Information: https://www.neura.edu.au/bridge

## NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH AUSTRALIA

NeuRA (Neuroscience Research Australia) is dedicated to reducing the burden that disorders of the brain and nervous system place on our community.
With this focus, we aim to advance health and wellbeing for our families and our community. We truly believe that, for those affected by devastating diseases, medical research offers the only hope.


## Bridge Vid

 Pete Hollands \& Laura Ginnan www.bridgevid.com

Bridge Vid is your one stop interactive bridge teaching website where your bridge teacher comes to you. Bridge Vid uses video teaching so that you can watch in your own time and learn at your own pace.
Bridge Vid features video lessons, commentated play, Triple Dummy podcast, online live course promotions and much more. Membership to the Bridge Vid site is \$15AUD per month.
Members can access new and past content with approximately 10 hours of new material each week. Our next short course Slam Bidding Technique will be available for members at no additional charge from February April $4^{\text {th }}$ to $22^{\text {nd }}$.
Additional services include online coaching, professional play and short courses. See the Bridge Vid site more details. www.bridgevid.com

Bridge Vid have generously donated a number of subscriptions which will be used as prizes during the GCC and there will be demonstrations Sunday 12:15pm to 12:45pm and Friday 1:15pm to 1:45pm. (Rms 10,11,12)

## YOUR TBIB TEAM



Suzanne White, Steve Weil and Terina Ngawaka

| CALENDAR OF SOCIAL AND OTHER |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## ROOKIE WINNERS



Winners Thursday Rookie Pairs N/S Debbie Gould and Peter Allingham


Winners Thursday Rookie Pairs E/W Gary and Debbie Gibbards

Thursday Rookie Pairs - 18 Tables


| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | 27 | C Richardson - A Tarbutt - S Boughey - A Boughey |  |  |  | 155.01 |
| 10 | 34 | W Zhou - Z Tian - C Qin - C Lu |  |  |  | 152.17 |
| 11 | 52 | T Strong - J Magee - A Krolikowski - R Stewart |  |  |  | 152.02 |
| 12 | 1 | W Olanski - A Kowalski - P Zatorski - E Vainikonis - A Arlovich - V Vainikonis |  |  |  | 150.50 |
| 13 | 58 | W Smith - J Abel - C Dibley - P Saavedra |  |  |  | 148.82 |
| 14 | 2 | B Ibradi - T Asbi - R Parasian - F Karwur - J George - D Hutahaean |  |  |  | 148.10 |
| 15 | 15 | H Cheval - G Josnin - J Skipper - J Skipper - J Wignall - K Wignall |  |  |  | 147.18 |
| 16 | 8 | J Coutts - T Jacob - N Jacob - G Coutts |  |  |  | 147.09 |
| 17 | 44 | T Lenart - A Stuck - P Boughey - D Badley |  |  |  | 146.94 |
| 18 | 20 | N Giura - N Hughes - P Lavings - T Leibowitz |  |  |  | 146.64 |
| 19 | 66 | D Mcleod - B Cleaver - W Adler - J Luoni |  |  |  | 146.59 |
| 20 | 21 | G Malinas - G Khemka - M Lewis - W Malaczynski - Y Li |  |  |  | 145.65 |
| Place | No. | Team | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 21 | 28 | Watts | 114 | 185 | Rose | 117.02 |
| 22 | 9 | Wyer | 115 | 103 | Ingham | 116.96 |
| 23 | 40 | Hoffman | 116 | 149 | Mcfall | 116.95 |
| 24 | 32 | Livesey | 117 | 201 | Spencer | 116.48 |
| 24 | 65 | Afflick | 118 | 128 | Kilvert | 116.35 |
| 26 | 38 | Csima | 119 | 47 | Sharp | 116.22 |
| 27 | 12 | Duckworth | 120 | 63 | Samuel | 115.80 |
| 28 | 49 | Grosvenor | 121 | 99 | Morrison | 115.37 |
| 29 | 14 | Hinge | 122 | 123 | Hanson | 115.14 |
| 30 | 70 | Berger | 123 | 138 | Lee | 115.08 |
| 31 | 31 | Lowry | 124 | 187 | Birch | 115.05 |
| 32 | 95 | Small | 125 | 64 | Smee | 114.38 |
| 33 | 77 | Smith | 126 | 191 | Cukierman | 114.34 |
| 34 | 11 | Rew | 127 | 57 | Finikiotis | 114.21 |
| 35 | 24 | Zhang | 128 | 134 | Dudley | 114.13 |
| 35 | 206 | Mill | 129 | 120 | Swabey | 113.79 |
| 37 | 37 | Baron | 130 | 119 | Power | 113.73 |
| 38 | 50 | Martelletti | 131 | 81 | Strong | 113.72 |
| 39 | 23 | Ashton | 132 | 114 | Hagan | 113.63 |
| 40 | 54 | Marler | 133 | 122 | Crafti | 112.94 |
| 41 | 6 | Burke | 134 | 127 | Woolf | 112.84 |
| 42 | 42 | Lockwood | 135 | 169 | Langston | 112.65 |
| 43 | 25 | Brown | 136 | 189 | Jackson | 112.03 |
| 44 | 17 | Braun | 137 | 112 | Tredrea | 112.00 |
| 45 | 186 | Barrett | 138 | 129 | Mcglew | 111.61 |
| 46 | 35 | Berrington | 139 | 136 | Longford | 111.57 |
| 47 | 33 | Kalmin | 140 | 76 | Mottram | 111.52 |
| 48 | 16 | Hirst | 141 | 96 | Bugeia | 110.91 |
| 49 | 67 | Steinwedel 135.80 | 142 | 85 | Lisle | 110.64 |
| 50 | 148 | Webb | 143 | 82 | Halmos | 110.01 |
| 51 | 18 | Wood | 144 | 193 | Matskows | 109.88 |
| 52 | 55 | Bailey | 145 | 184 | Watson | 109.66 |
| 53 | 30 | Sawicki | 146 | 204 | Abdelhamid | 108.73 |
| 54 | 62 | Abrams | 147 | 203 | Batchelor | 108.63 |
| 55 | 71 | Simes | 148 | 166 | Thirtle | 108.61 |
| 56 | 74 | Ridley | 149 | 140 | Lynn | 108.57 |
| 57 | 68 | Millar | 150 | 200 | Inglis | 108.49 |
| 58 | 88 | Wigbout | 151 | 155 | Silcock | 108.19 |
| 59 | 46 | St Clair | 152 | 115 | Allan | 108.16 |
| 60 | 61 | Mott | 153 | 202 | Randhawa | 107.74 |
| 61 | 107 | Fleischer | 154 | 51 | Barda | 107.34 |
| 62 | 101 | Bouton | 155 | 91 | Weathered | 107.21 |
| 63 | 41 | Kempthorne | 156 | 48 | Jeffery | 106.82 |
| 64 | 29 | Stralow | 157 | 142 | Nichols | 106.74 |
| 65 | 199 | Dormer | 158 | 160 | Quigley | 106.44 |
| 66 | 73 | Kruiniger | 159 | 197 | Ajzner | 105.90 |
| 67 | 80 | Mangos | 160 | 92 | Grahame | 105.46 |
| 68 | 60 | Walters | 161 | 105 | O'Connor | 105.36 |
| 69 | 22 | Carter | 162 | 86 | Stobo | 105.22 |
| 70 | 59 | Brockwell | 163 | 198 | Kennedy | 104.67 |
| 71 | 78 | Mellings | 164 | 205 | Moore | 104.47 |
| 72 | 45 | Strasser | 165 | 90 | Gunner | 104.27 |
| 73 | 89 | O'Dempsey | 166 | 108 | De Luca | 103.34 |


| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 74 | 178 | Morris | 127.55 | 167 | 194 | Coats | 102.39 |
| 75 | 154 | Howes | 126.41 | 168 | 150 | Boyce | 101.82 |
| 76 | 36 | Brown | 125.98 | 169 | 158 | Carroll | 101.79 |
| 77 | 183 | Cordingley | 125.75 | 170 | 170 | Wagstaff | 100.53 |
| 78 | 126 | Gilfoyle | 124.42 | 171 | 117 | Sklarz | 100.45 |
| 79 | 87 | White | 124.34 | 172 | 102 | Darley | 100.28 |
| 80 | 109 | Stewart | 124.24 | 173 | 179 | Smith | 99.89 |
| 81 | 26 | Adams | 124.01 | 174 | 190 | Boettiger | 99.79 |
| 82 | 177 | Vearing | 123.94 | 175 | 180 | Miller | 99.24 |
| 83 | 161 | Fox | 123.93 | 176 | 151 | Welch | 98.99 |
| 84 | 196 | Mcgrath | 123.69 | 177 | 175 | Mills | 98.88 |
| 85 | 110 | Valentine | 123.44 | 178 | 163 | Utzen | 98.56 |
| 86 | 72 | Chen | 123.18 | 179 | 176 | Alexander | 98.22 |
| 87 | 167 | Cook | 123.05 | 180 | 124 | Smith | 98.04 |
| 88 | 43 | De Luca | 122.97 | 181 | 147 | Birss | 98.02 |
| 89 | 93 | Frazier | 122.69 | 182 | 121 | Biro | 97.35 |
| 90 | 137 | Oyston | 122.50 | 183 | 146 | Obenchain | 97.32 |
| 91 | 69 | Howard | 122.47 | 184 | 162 | Churchill | 97.23 |
| 92 | 118 | Watt | 122.19 | 185 | 75 | Kefford | 96.60 |
| 94 | 83 | Mayers | 121.72 | 186 | 106 | Bates | 95.81 |
| 93 | 157 | Houghton | 121.73 | 187 | 173 | Mealyea | 94.55 |
| 95 | 39 | Dempster | 121.48 | 188 | 172 | Wilson | 93.68 |
| 96 | 188 | Whiddon | 121.34 | 189 | 195 | Gray | 92.45 |
| 97 | 84 | Lorraway | 121.27 | 190 | 171 | Fletcher | 91.27 |
| 98 | 192 | Athea | 121.24 | 191 | 152 | Grant | 90.29 |
| 99 | 156 | Bonnick | 121.22 | 192 | 79 | Briscoe | 89.69 |
| 100 | 130 | Marker | 120.44 | 193 | 139 | Leach | 89.17 |
| 101 | 100 | Hale | 120.01 | 194 | 168 | Kable | 88.72 |
| 102 | 174 | Rowlatt | 119.46 | 195 | 125 | Mitchell | 87.75 |
| 103 | 144 | Moffitt | 119.30 | 196 | 159 | Wood | 87.32 |
| 104 | 131 | Pike | 119.25 | 197 | 132 | Fraser | 85.84 |
| 105 | 143 | Runting | 119.10 | 198 | 182 | Clayton | 85.40 |
| 106 | 94 | Bogatie | 119.06 | 199 | 181 | Webb | 84.72 |
| 107 | 97 | Potts | 118.99 | 200 | 133 | Chapman | 84.53 |
| 108 | 111 | Kwok | 118.53 | 201 | 145 | Mcentegart | 80.46 |
| 109 | 104 | Orsborn | 118.16 | 202 | 135 | Collins | 79.46 |
| 110 | 141 | Mcalister | 118.09 | 203 | 165 | Leighton | 77.78 |
| 111 | 98 | Morgan-King | 118.08 | 204 | 113 | Kolozs | 75.82 |
| 112 | 116 | Ma | 118.01 | 205 | 153 | O'Hara | 74.67 |
| 113 | 53 | Gibbons | 117.04 | 206 | 164 | Bourke | 74.46 |
| Seniors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 1 | R Brightling - D Hoffman - P Buchen - C Hughes |  |  |  |  | 154.91 |
| 2 | 10 | A Creet - S Mendick - J Hunt - P Grant |  |  |  |  | 148.52 |
| 3 | 3 | M Bourke - N Ewart - F Beale - R Van Riel |  |  |  |  | 147.43 |
| 4 | 11 | D Stern - R Grynberg - T Moss - D Zines - S Picus - B Manley |  |  |  |  | 146.45 |
| 5 | 4 | M Bloom - N Rosendorff - S Bock - L Grewcock |  |  |  |  | 146.31 |
| 6 | 5 | A Walsh - B Mcdonald - E Havas - A De Livera |  |  |  |  | 143.20 |
| 7 | 17 | R Milward - H Milward - E Urbach - B Stacey |  |  |  |  | 142.18 |
| 8 | 6 | P Chan - R Januszke - C Lorimer - R Sebesfi |  |  |  |  | 138.01 |
| 9 | 19 | B Palmer - G Palmer - N Stuckey - C Wilson |  |  |  |  | 132.47 |
| 10 | 9 | D Mcleish - P Mcleish - B Waters - R Nixon |  |  |  |  | 131.12 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 2 | Krochmalik | 130.81 | 23 | 26 | Berzins | 109.12 |
| 12 | 12 | Robbins | 129.16 | 24 | 25 | Schoutrop | 105.87 |
| 13 | 18 | Fitz-Gerald | 128.11 | 25 | 23 | Reid | 103.49 |
| 14 | 13 | Kahler | 127.83 | 26 | 29 | Hopwood | 102.25 |
| 15 | 16 | Yovich | 127.81 | 27 | 32 | Harman | 102.20 |
| 16 | 14 | Jackman | 126.14 | 28 | 31 | Dellaca | 102.02 |
| 17 | 24 | French | 124.72 | 29 | 34 | Van Leeuwen | 98.39 |
| 18 | 7 | Arber | 123.43 | 30 | 22 | Ruddell | 97.00 |
| 19 | 8 | Robb | 122.33 | 31 | 33 | Brown | 94.34 |
| 20 | 21 | Clarke | 118.35 | 32 | 28 | Andersson | 89.20 |
| 21 | 27 | Cohen | 118.14 | 33 | 20 | Ashwell | 85.04 |
| 22 | 15 | Moses | 112.14 | 34 | 30 | Lee | 75.13 |


| Intermediate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 40 | K Blinco - T Sheedy - E Baker - C Stead |  |  |  |  | 184.01 |
| 2 | 76 | A Jonsberg - G Baker - J Lahey - C Larter |  |  |  |  | 156.84 |
| 3 | 23 | J Francis - P Sleat - S Deacon - S Filler |  |  |  |  | 153.58 |
| 4 | 15 | A Brown - F Brown - J Hansen - D Morgan |  |  |  |  | 153.21 |
| 5 | 8 | G Gosney - M Plunkett - P Nilsson - D Nilsson |  |  |  |  | 152.98 |
| 6 | 34 | D Moody - M Dale - K Balmanno - A Gulley |  |  |  |  | 146.19 |
| 7 | 33 | H Tomlinson - B Foster - D Snow - M Johnson |  |  |  |  | 144.89 |
| 8 | 19 | J Williams - K Hewings - M Pritchard - C Stone |  |  |  |  | 144.73 |
| 9 | 41 | D Wells - R Young - R Morris - A Lightbody |  |  |  |  | 144.15 |
| 10 | 25 | M Owen - S Pang - I Bailey - G Markey |  |  |  |  | 143.90 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 13 | Rohde | 142.64 | 50 | 30 | Knox | 117.50 |
| 12 | 36 | Macaulay | 141.86 | 51 | 6 | Warnock | 117.10 |
| 13 | 21 | Eldridge | 139.77 | 52 | 29 | Jackson | 116.88 |
| 14 | 83 | Purves | 138.99 | 53 | 14 | Darling | 115.64 |
| 15 | 74 | Ward | 138.44 | 54 | 82 | Koster | 115.46 |
| 16 | 53 | Tucker | 136.33 | 55 | 61 | Robinson | 115.40 |
| 17 | 52 | Jones | 136.19 | 56 | 77 | Winter | 115.34 |
| 18 | 4 | Pisko | 134.63 | 57 | 16 | Gordon | 114.49 |
| 19 | 12 | Tough | 134.21 | 58 | 1 | Krosch | 114.07 |
| 20 | 73 | Hollingworth | 133.93 | 59 | 27 | Sinclair | 113.78 |
| 21 | 85 | Walker | 132.80 | 60 | 84 | Church | 113.02 |
| 22 | 2 | Steele | 131.31 | 61 | 31 | Paris | 111.46 |
| 23 | 7 | Grant | 130.13 | 62 | 20 | O'Gorman | 110.96 |
| 24 | 10 | Romeijn | 129.71 | 63 | 78 | Greenway | 109.67 |
| 25 | 37 | Giles | 129.37 | 64 | 26 | Beckett | 108.90 |
| 26 | 5 | Johnson | 129.02 | 65 | 65 | Davidson | 108.88 |
| 27 | 58 | Goddard | 128.55 | 66 | 71 | Fletcher | 108.66 |
| 28 | 28 | Moroney | 127.99 | 67 | 35 | Campbell | 108.13 |
| 29 | 11 | Butler | 127.77 | 68 | 88 | Kennealy | 107.17 |
| 30 | 68 | Gold | 126.81 | 69 | 24 | Anderson | 106.01 |
| 31 | 43 | Murray | 126.51 | 70 | 47 | Mcnee | 105.82 |
| 32 | 60 | Delaney | 126.46 | 71 | 45 | Rogers | 105.79 |
| 33 | 57 | Mcnaughton | 126.24 | 72 | 70 | Bristow | 105.15 |
| 34 | 72 | Baynes | 126.05 | 73 | 44 | Schmalkuche | 104.72 |
| 35 | 22 | Sutherland | 125.90 | 74 | 38 | Fulton | 103.03 |
| 36 | 39 | Roache | 125.78 | 75 | 86 | Quigley | 102.95 |
| 37 | 48 | Edwards | 124.61 | 76 | 50 | Staley | 101.65 |
| 38 | 17 | Bandy | 124.34 | 77 | 49 | Houlton | 99.58 |
| 39 | 79 | Cariola | 124.29 | 78 | 18 | Howard | 97.70 |
| 40 | 64 | Carradine | 124.12 | 79 | 3 | Cooksley | 95.80 |
| 41 | 54 | Rogers | 123.39 | 80 | 80 | Bish | 92.18 |
| 42 | 46 | Bartos | 121.55 | 81 | 62 | Morgan | 90.81 |
| 43 | 69 | Hurst | 121.20 | 82 | 59 | Wozniczka | 90.23 |
| 44 | 66 | Routley | 119.13 | 83 | 63 | Scott | 87.09 |
| 45 | 42 | Featherstone | 119.11 | 84 | 51 | Kavanagh | 86.07 |
| 46 | 32 | Tuckey | 118.54 | 85 | 55 | Chesser | 85.99 |
| 47 | 75 | Holewa | 118.31 | 86 | 81 | Roy | 85.26 |
| 48 | 87 | Snelling | 118.09 | 87 | 56 | Fenwicke | 80.00 |
| 49 | 9 | Eastman | 117.97 | 88 | 67 | Mundell | 75.31 |
| Restricted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 72 | K Hajmasi - A Michl - C Christensen - P Faircloth |  |  |  |  | 169.53 |
| 2 | 3 | B Coker - I Wright - F Symons - D Upsall |  |  |  |  | 157.15 |
| 3 | 33 | R Stick - C Payne - T Thillainathan - R Currin |  |  |  |  | 156.30 |
| 4 | 19 | N Armstrong - S Luby - R Langley - C Greenwich |  |  |  |  | 155.25 |
| 5 | 8 | T Haley - L Chan - D Macneil - F Ahmet |  |  |  |  | 154.52 |
| 6 | 17 | I Pick - G Carson - A Riley - N Wills |  |  |  |  | 152.51 |
| 7 | 75 | J Stearns - D Emms - A Barry - K Elmes |  |  |  |  | 152.07 |
| 8 | 64 | C Chaffey - A Goodchild - L Scandrett - S Schon |  |  |  |  | 148.85 |
| 9 | 27 | K Hilder - D Carmichael - S Hollis - F Sommerton |  |  |  |  | 147.10 |
| 10 | 95 | B Patel - N Patel - D Mclay - S Cryer |  |  |  |  | 144.68 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 96 | Mabin | 143.92 | 54 | 18 | Clark | 117.94 |
| 12 | 22 | Irving | 143.73 | 55 | 68 | Lawson | 117.74 |


| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 77 | Wlodarczyk | 141.79 | 56 | 80 | Driscoll | 117.59 |
| 14 | 88 | Edwards | 141.19 | 57 | 70 | Hodges | 115.44 |
| 15 | 52 | Hoschke | 140.83 | 58 | 4 | Jacka | 115.39 |
| 16 | 61 | Brahma | 139.70 | 59 | 7 | Gardner | 115.31 |
| 17 | 71 | Martin | 138.66 | 60 | 59 | Junge | 115.25 |
| 18 | 46 | Trengove | 138.34 | 61 | 76 | Baldwin | 114.09 |
| 19 | 74 | Adams | 138.33 | 62 | 49 | Brake | 113.56 |
| 20 | 28 | Gray | 138.31 | 63 | 35 | Fuhrmann | 112.17 |
| 21 | 24 | Hayes | 137.75 | 64 | 29 | Smith | 111.41 |
| 22 | 36 | Nearhos | 137.50 | 65 | 11 | Treloar | 110.83 |
| 23 | 5 | Dunlop | 135.67 | 66 | 82 | Brodman | 110.03 |
| 24 | 43 | Stewart | 134.09 | 67 | 9 | Wippell | 109.56 |
| 25 | 14 | Packer | 133.43 | 68 | 78 | Verity | 109.49 |
| 26 | 85 | Jacobs | 132.40 | 69 | 47 | Sawyer | 108.80 |
| 27 | 42 | Rosetta | 131.87 | 70 | 90 | Yap-Giles | 108.36 |
| 28 | 84 | Singer | 131.02 | 71 | 81 | Gilder | 107.70 |
| 29 | 39 | Biscoe | 129.65 | 72 | 54 | Gibney | 107.59 |
| 30 | 55 | Merrin | 129.03 | 73 | 69 | Henke | 107.47 |
| 31 | 6 | Clifford | 127.93 | 74 | 13 | Rossiter-Nuttall | 106.93 |
| 32 | 51 | Fawcett | 127.60 | 75 | 58 | Van Bakel | 104.95 |
| 33 | 38 | Hall | 127.44 | 76 | 79 | Klibbe | 104.73 |
| 34 | 56 | Lawson | 126.55 | 77 | 92 | Parker | 104.21 |
| 35 | 93 | Joseph | 126.54 | 78 | 89 | Linden | 102.63 |
| 36 | 30 | Wood | 125.96 | 79 | 2 | Stuart | 101.17 |
| 37 | 26 | Howe | 124.83 | 80 | 86 | Wilson | 100.71 |
| 38 | 63 | Bennett | 124.22 | 81 | 20 | Hapeta | 100.25 |
| 39 | 1 | Green | 123.06 | 82 | 31 | Cook | 100.15 |
| 40 | 41 | Wright | 123.00 | 83 | 87 | Mitchell | 98.78 |
| 41 | 67 | Kommeren | 122.69 | 84 | 48 | Munro | 97.55 |
| 42 | 50 | Holmes | 122.41 | 85 | 53 | Devlin | 97.09 |
| 43 | 45 | Vickers | 122.34 | 86 | 25 | Perry | 96.59 |
| 44 | 83 | Mayer | 122.16 | 87 | 32 | Bardone | 94.02 |
| 45 | 91 | Adamson | 121.97 | 88 | 44 | Reid | 93.13 |
| 46 | 15 | Heck | 121.59 | 89 | 65 | Macintosh | 92.24 |
| 47 | 40 | Harrison | 121.44 | 90 | 62 | Jones | 90.33 |
| 48 | 12 | Mcmaster | 121.34 | 91 | 21 | Corney | 90.26 |
| 49 | 23 | Fraser | 120.88 | 92 | 73 | Higgins | 89.25 |
| 50 | 94 | Woodbury | 120.70 | 93 | 16 | Small | 86.48 |
| 51 | 10 | Reynolds | 119.90 | 94 | 57 | Haworth | 82.73 |
| 52 | 66 | Webb | 118.61 | 95 | 60 | Knight | 73.66 |
| 53 | 34 | Elich | 118.44 | 96 | 37 | Peever | 65.93 |
| Novice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 2 | H Van Weeren - P Clarke - C Dempster - N Grech |  |  |  |  | 163.06 |
| 2 | 30 | A Byrnes - S Parkes - U Suliman - P Taylor |  |  |  |  | 155.70 |
| 3 | 15 | L Bowen-Thomas - C Bowen-Thomas - J Conde - A Hemmingway |  |  |  |  | 144.55 |
| 4 | 1 | T Bowmaker - K Gilchrist - F Jeppesen - K Griggs |  |  |  |  | 140.93 |
| 5 | 13 | M Nilsson - C Young - G Tidey - M Hullah |  |  |  |  | 140.26 |
| 6 | 19 | D Williams - I Cameron - P Morris - C Moule |  |  |  |  | 137.51 |
| 7 | 7 | A Scott - N Mciver - A Phillips - D Nixon |  |  |  |  | 136.07 |
| 8 | 28 | S Van Kruistum - C Van Kruistum - N Smith - L Le Provost |  |  |  |  | 135.25 |
| 9 | 26 | J Carter - H Andrews - B Mikelsons - M Mcdougall |  |  |  |  | 132.30 |
| 10 | 9 | D Gaskill - J Lowe - A Marsland - H Blair |  |  |  |  | 129.82 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 31 | Reilly | 129.20 | 22 | 22 | Garside | 114.45 |
| 12 | 3 | Robertson | 127.87 | 23 | 16 | Howitt | 113.73 |
| 13 | 24 | Anderson | 127.72 | 24 | 14 | Archer | 113.67 |
| 14 | 32 | Martin | 126.55 | 25 | 18 | Hassall | 112.14 |
| 15 | 6 | Mcclintock | 124.53 | 26 | 5 | Du Temple | 111.75 |
| 16 | 4 | Weston | 124.29 | 27 | 17 | Northey | 99.55 |
| 17 | 8 | Nugent | 121.73 | 28 | 25 | Waldron | 93.76 |
| 18 | 27 | Bowra | 118.84 | 29 | 12 | Burt | 92.43 |
| 19 | 23 | Gibbens | 116.64 | 30 | 20 | Jackson | 88.23 |
| 20 | 11 | Bellis | 115.85 | 31 | 10 | Sargent | 80.61 |
| 21 | 21 | Wilson | 114.91 | 32 | 29 | Waters | 56.10 |

## GOLD COAST CONGRESS 2016 CALENDAR OF CELEBRITY SPEAKERS

Friday 26th February

| PHIL <br> GUE | Simple Ideas in <br> Competitive Bidding |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| MINIMUM \$5 Contribution to the ABF Friends of Youth Bridge Fund - |  |
| GREATER Contributions Greatly Appreciated By Our Youth Players |  |



## THANK YOU THANK YOU THANK YOU

Carmel Martin and all of the ladies selling raffle tickets and taking collections for the Zephyr Foundation are taken aback by the generosity of the bridge players at the GCC. With your help we have raised in excess of our target $\$ 8,000$ which will be used to help the children of victims of domestic violence get back to school and normalise their lives.

Thanks to Therese and Kim for 'adopting' our cause and bringing the bridge players into the 'family' of those who recognise the effects of domestic violence and have opted to make a change.

Thanks to all who participated.


DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| $2-$ |  | $480 \times$ |  | $4 \div$ |  | $3-$ |  | $11+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $90 \times$ |  |  |  | $54 \times$ |  | $49 \times$ |  |  |
|  | $18+$ | $4-$ |  | $15 \times$ |  |  |  | 4 |
| $6+$ |  | $1-$ | $2-$ | $3-$ |  | $6-$ |  |  |
| $4-$ | $126 \times$ |  |  | $10+$ | $5+$ |  | $15+$ |  |
| $3 \div$ | $3 \div$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION
DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| $\begin{gathered} 168 \times \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | 7 | $6+$ | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \div \\ 3 \end{array}$ | 6 | $4 \div$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \div \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 40 \times \\ 8 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | $\begin{array}{r} 8+ \\ 1 \end{array}$ | 2 | $\begin{array}{r} 16+ \\ 9 \end{array}$ | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 18+ \\ 4 \end{array}$ | 8 | 3 | 5 |
| 2 | 3 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 3- \\ 7 \end{array}$ | 4 | $\begin{array}{\|r} 12+ \\ 6 \end{array}$ | 5 | 9 | $\begin{array}{r} 48 \times \\ 8 \end{array}$ | ${ }^{8-}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 35 x \\ 7 \end{array}$ | 5 | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 6 \times \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2 | 4 | $1-8$ | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2 \div \\ 8 \end{array}$ | 4 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 315 x \\ 5 \end{array}$ | 1 | 2 | 9 | $3$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13+ \\ 7 \end{array}$ | 6 |
| ${ }^{1-} 5$ | 6 | 9 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 16+ \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r} 7+ \\ 3 \end{array}$ | 4 | $\begin{array}{r} 8+ \\ 1 \end{array}$ | 2 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 72 x \\ 9 \end{array}$ | 2 | 4 | $\begin{array}{\|r} 2- \\ 8 \end{array}$ | 1 | 7 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 210 x \\ 6 \end{array}$ | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \times \\ 3 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 3 \div \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 3456 \times \\ 9 \end{array}$ | 8 | 6 | $\begin{array}{r} 19+ \\ 5 \end{array}$ | 1 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 1 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 28 x \\ 4 \end{array}$ | 7 |

DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION
DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

## 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.

## CANB=RRA 2017 <br> <br> unnen <br> <br> unnen <br> <br> 10TH - 22ND JANUARY

 <br> <br> 10TH - 22ND JANUARY}QT Canberra $\cdot 1$ London Circuit, Canberra,

## ENQUIRIES

Sean Mullamphy C0401509616』not@abf.com.au
summerfestivalofbridge.com

