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## PAIRS QUALIFYING SESSION TWO

Barry Rigal

The first round of the evening featured two of the top seeds taking on one another. Zoli Nagy declared the first deal, and the defenders had the chance to make him find a nice play.

| Dealer: North | A A 107 |  | West |  |  | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark$ K 83 |  | Lilly | Klinger | Nagy | Mullamphy |
| Brd 1 | - Q 10865 |  |  | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| Open Prs Qual 2 | ¢ 54 |  | 2* | Pass | $2 V$ | All Pass |
| AQ 83 |  | A K 5 |  |  |  |  |
| - Q J 962 |  | - A 10 |  |  |  |  |
| -K97 |  | - A J 4 |  | Makea | le Con | acts |
| \& 76 |  | \& K J 10932 | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | AJ9642 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 a |
|  | $\checkmark 754$ |  | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -32 |  | 1 | - | 1 | * |
|  | - A Q 8 |  | 4 | - | 4 |  |

David Lilley had already done well for his side by stopping low. Nagy (East) won the spade lead in hand (Klinger putting in the ten) and returned the suit, ducking Mullamphy's nine. After some thought, Mullamphy exited with a third spade. Nagy ruffed away the ace, led a diamond to the king and a club to the jack and queen. Mullamphy returned a diamond and Nagy won in hand, cashed VA and played a top diamond. Mullamphy ruffed, and had reached this ending



Zoli Nagy

He chose to cash \&A and play a spade, but declarer could ruff high and lose just one trump trick further for +110. Had Mullamphy played a spade before cashing \&A, declarer would have had to be very careful. He must discard dummy's club, rather than ruff in, since if he ruffs low North overruffs, and if he ruffs high, North discards a diamond. When in with the VK North puts his partner in with the club ace for a fifth spade, to promote the $\mathbf{~} 7$.
$2 \vee$ making +110 was a very disappointing $52 \%$ for E/W. A remarkable number of the field had let through 3NT - even when declared by East, on a spade lead. When West was declarer the diamond lead is entirely understandable, and declarer can win in hand and go after clubs, while guessing the spade position. (South shifts to the 19 , and North ducks, but West ducks the second round of spades and blocks the suit.)

On the next deal Klinger did well for his side.

Dealer: East
Vul: N-S
Brd 2 Open Prs Qual 2
AQ9 8

- KQ10752
- 43
\& J 2

AK7
$\checkmark 643$

- A Q 109
\& 8653

AA532
-A J
-KJ72
*K Q 7

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

Against an unopposed auction to $4 \boldsymbol{V}$, with dummy having shown a strong hand with diamonds, and declarer having shown long hearts and no extras, Klinger (North) led $\forall A$ and another diamond, and when declarer rejected the finesse, he was held to ten tricks. Of course a club lead for a spade shift achieves the same thing, but an initial spade lead is fatal, and on a heart lead declarer can make 11 tricks if he reads the position (not that he necessarily would). Again, +420 was only marginally over average, but it was considerably better than conceding 430 or 450.

On the third deal Matt Mullamphy was a fraction unlucky. Holding:
A Q 6
-AKQ 32
-KJ

* AK 87

Would you open 2NT if your range was 20-22? What if it was $21-22$ ? Personally you'd get a resounding 'No!' from me in either case, but it is more tempting not to upgrade to a $2 \%$ opener if your 2NT call starts at 21. Mullamphy opened 2NT and played game facing:

A AJ 974

- J 6
- A 93
\& 1096


Matt Mullamphy

Alas for him, with the spade $\uparrow$ K 8 onside the no-trump slam was cold as the weather. And $7 \square$ was also makeable for the perfectionists amongst us, via the ruffing finesse in spades; and yes, one pair (Nicky Strasser-Michael Whibley) did bid to 7V. 6NT would have been worth $77 \%$, 3NT+3 was worth $33 \%$,
For the next round I watched Hugh McGann/Fiona Brown take on Thomas and Dibley. The first two deals were quiet enough (a very dull game and a partscore brought home elegantly by McGann for +110 in 1a on a 4-3 fit with +130 easy in diamonds on a 5-4 fit...truly minors are for children these days). It hardly mattered - since their opponents had a comfortable heart partscore they still earned a $77 \%$ board.
This was the third deal of the round.

| Dealer: East | A K 98 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | -A10543 |  | Thomas | McGann | Dibley | Brow |  |
| Brd 6 | -1086 |  |  |  | 1* | Dou |  |
| Open Prs Qual 2 | \& K J |  | 24 | 39 | Pass | 4\% |  |
| A 2 |  | A J 107654 | Pass | 5\% | Pass | 6\% |  |
| - K J 9876 |  | $\bullet$ Q | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| - J 532 |  | -KQ94 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& 103 |  | \& 72 | - | 6 | - | 6 | NT |
|  | A A Q 3 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | A |
|  | $\checkmark 2$ |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A 7 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& A Q 98654 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\%$ |

Fiona Brown did very well, I thought, to bid 4\% not 3NT over 3v. Once partner raised clubs slam had to have a play, she thought, with any spade finesse a heavy favourite to work (or for her LHO to lead spades if it did not). After a spade lead she was careful to play for the overtrick by setting out to ruff hearts at once (a line that
would bring home 13 tricks if hearts were 4-3. Not today, of course, but the idea was right. And a well-earned $87 \%$ result to go along with my approbation. I know which l'd prefer to have...

For the third round Pauline Gumby and Warren Lazer were playing against Andre Korenhof and Carol Hoogenvorst. Gumby went down in a partscore without doing anything terrible where she had been given a chance by the defenders, and then I thought the partnership did well to get to the best game (in practice if not in theory).

| Dealer: West | A 109872 |  | West | North | East | South Lazer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark 109$ |  | K'hof | Gumby | H'voorst |  |  |
| Brd 8 | - A Q J 5 |  | Pass | Pass | 1 | $1 \checkmark$ |  |
| Open Prs Qual 2 | - K 10 |  | Double | 1NT | 2\% | 3NT |  |
| AKQ6 4 |  | A A J | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| - J 32 |  | $\checkmark 75$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -107 |  | -98643 |  | Makea | le Contra |  |  |
| \& J 965 |  | \& A 832 | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A 53 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKQ 864 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -K2 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | - |
|  | * Q 74 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\%$ |

E/W did a lot of bidding, but their opponents blew them aside, and after a diamond lead Gumby was playing for overtricks once hearts behaved nicely. This was a $64 \%$ board for N/S; quite a few of the E/W pairs led diamonds against $4 V$ and conceded 450 - or worse.

On the third board Gumby suffered the embarrassment of losing two tricks in the play when her opponents trumps meanly split \& 854 and $\& \mathrm{Q}$ - and she played for the $4-1$ break. This turned an average plus into a near zero (critical, since the pair narrowly missed out on qualifying).
For the next round I moved to watching perennial contenders John Wignall and Mike Scott of New Zealand. They were taking on Wendy Ashton and Paul Gosney and a well-timed nudge by Scott generated a favourable position for his side here.

| Dealer: East | A 1072 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vul: Both | VKQ32 |  | Wignall | Ashton | Scott | Gosney |
| Brd 10 | Kass | Pass |  |  |  |  |

A nicely judged $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ call by Scott. North's $3 \boldsymbol{V}$ call looks absolutely normal - the only reason for not making it would be if Paul Gosney normally bids your cards for you -and that would never happen... As it was, the defenders took their five winners (after a heart lead, ducked, Gosney played back hearts and Scott shifted to spades, of course) and got a $77 \%$ result for so doing.
On the next board the defenders took their ruff against $4 V$ to hold it to 10 tricks for close to average (the ruff was from three small but in taking the ruff it facilitated declarer's ability to draw trumps from an eight-card fit).

Gosney-Ashton won the round on the last deal; and since Mike Scott may be older than me but certainly has the air of a formidable contender in the boxing-ring I'm not going to criticize his bidding, other than to say that his first action might not meet with universal approbation - see Brent Manley's column in today's bulletin.

## SOME MORE OF THAT "I HAVE SOME SPACE TO FILL" HUMOUR

Every calendar's days are numbered.
A lot of money is tainted - Taint yours and taint mine.
A boiled egg in the morning is hard to beat.
He had a photographic memory that was never developed.
A midget fortune-teller who escapes from prison is a small medium at large.


Reaching 3NT on the E/W cards is hard to do - though I think you'd like to be there, despite the paucity of high cards. Even if you do not achieve that feat, playing a spade or club partscore shouldn't be beyond anyone should it. And yes, l'd overcall 1A as East; sue me. +110 in hearts scored N/S 87\%.


On the next round, an intriguing single-dummy problem was thwarted at the table I was watching when Michael Wilkinson (playing with Sue Crompton) reached $4 \checkmark$ from the South seat.

He was sunk on a top club lead. Try 4『 by North (after 1A-[2४]-Dbl-[Pass]-4『) the last call being an admitted underbid. Or play $4 \checkmark$ from South on a diamond lead. Either way you win the $\forall$ at trick one.

You take $\checkmark$, lead VK to find the bad news that East has a heart void, and play low from dummy then play a low heart to the ten. Now you lead a spade towards your hand, covering West’s card, and East is in. His best play is $\leqslant K$ - and you simply discard a low spade! Whatever he does next you can arrange to ruff a spade high in the South hand and draw trumps ending in North with ten winners. The same line of ruffing out spades works if East returns a spade at trick five.
When South was declarer on a diamond lead, finding the most testing defence was not easy. Quite a few defenders as East won the spade to underlead in diamonds for a disastrous -450 . Of course if you are playing partner for the $\diamond Q$ you might as well lead the king yourself. Here is the complete layout.

| Dealer: East | A AJ9632 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | -KQ J 6 |  |
| Brd 14 | - A |  |
| Open Prs Qual 2 | \& K 4 |  |
| A Q 7 |  | A K 105 |
| -9853 |  | - --- |
| -982 |  | -KJ7653 |
| \& Q J 62 |  | \& A 1098 |

A 84
-A10742
-Q 104
\& 753

| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 2 | - | 1 | NT |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | 4 |
| - | 4 | - | 3 | $\downarrow$ |
| 4 | - | 4 | - | $\vdots$ |
| 2 | - | 2 | - | 4 |

Bob McPhee playing with Marina Darling really rubbed it in to his opponents on the next board.

Dealer: South
Vul: N-S
Brd 15
Open Prs Qual 2
A A 102
-AJ753

- 1092
\& 96

AK 943

- 109862
- 86
\& 52

He played $4 \checkmark$ as West after passing initially then responding $2 \checkmark$ after Wilkinson's $1 \uparrow$ overcall, and was raised rather pessimistically to game. He won the spade lead and made a very nice play for overtricks at trick two when he ran the $\$ 9$, trying to retain trump control. Wilkinson won and played back a spade, and now the 5-0 trump break held declarer to ten tricks - still good for a $64 \%$ result as slam going down was not uncommon. Note that 6 is cold...but not easy to bid!

| Dealer: West | $\text { A K Q J } 64$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark \text { A } 109$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 16 | - 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Prs Qual 2 | ¢ A K 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 85 |  | A 10732 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J5432 |  | $\checkmark$--- |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J 4 <br> * Q J 108 |  | - AK Q 107532 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \& 9 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A A 9 |  | - | 5 | - | 4 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ K Q 876 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -86 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | * |
|  | \& 7654 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\%$ |

Even when East pre-empts in diamonds, $6 \checkmark$ is not a terrible spot. Julian Foster as East had overcalled $4 \diamond$ over 1 A , and when defending $6 \downarrow$ he carefully overtook David Weston's lead of $\downarrow$ J to play another diamond. The question of whether to take a first round heart finesse here is maybe closer than it looks, but today the 5-0 split made this irrelevant. Down one was worth only $27 \%$ to Haffer/Newman, who were still on their way to a $63 \%$ game and a qualifying spot.


Haffer was at the helm again, this time in 1NT. He ducked the heart lead and won the second, led a spade to hand and led a diamond to East's $\forall$ A, won the spade return and ducked a club to East, for nine tricks. This scored extremely well for him at $77 \%$ - since had Weston joined in with $2 \vee$ I don't think N/S can reasonably do better than play 3* for +110 .

On the next board you might argue that David Wiltshire and Peter Hollands got what they deserved - but some would argue they scored considerably more than that...

| Dealer: East | A AKQ 8 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - J 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 22 | - A Q J 93 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Prs Qual 2 | \& 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A 6432 | A J 107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark \mathrm{K} 7$ |  | - A Q 62 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 107654 \\ & \& K J \end{aligned}$ |  | - K |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
|  |  | \& A Q 752 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A 95 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\wedge$ |
|  | $\checkmark 10985$ |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 82 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | - |
|  | \& 109863 |  | 1 |  | 1 | - | $\%$ |

The North cards might pose a problem for some after hearing a natural $1 \approx$ to your left, and a natural 1 to your right. Not for Wiltshire who found the 'obvious' strong no-trump overcall. It is all in the eye of the beholder, one supposes.

The defenders untrustingly led a club, and West won two clubs as declarer pitched a heart, then shifted to a spade. Wiltshire won the ace, and tried the $\forall$. Good news! Now he had seven tricks but he did not know it. Instead he ducked a diamond to West as East pitched an encouraging heart (yes in retrospect the aJ might have hit partner rather harder over the head). Back came a wooden spade and Wiltshire ran for home with no fewer than eight tricks - but only an average sine the field had been defeating various N/S contracts at 100 a pop.

On the next board our heroes were, as the Americans say "Out in Left Field" again - meaning taking views that the rest of the room might be unsympathetic to.

| Dealer: South | AKQJ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark$ AK2 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| Brd 23 | - A Q J 106 |  | Double | Pass | 44 | Pass |  |
|  | -32 |  | Pass | 5 | Pass | Pass |  |
| A A 1043 |  | A97652 | Double | R'dble | 54 | Pass |  |
| $\checkmark 6$ |  | $\checkmark 5$ | Pass | Double | All Pass |  |  |
| -K983 |  | - 74 |  | Makeab | le Contra | acts |  |
| \& AJ85 |  | \& K Q 1096 | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A 8 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - Q J1098743 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 52 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | -7 74 |  | 2 | - | 2 |  | $\%$ |

Hollands led a top heart against 5Ax, and shifted to diamonds when left on lead. Wiltshire cashed two diamonds and played a third, with declarer valiantly ruffing with $\uparrow 9$ to hold the loss to 800 . Well done - up to a point, Lord Copper. Still $94 \%$ for the adventurers. It was time for their luck to run out, and so it did.

| Dealer: West | A Q J |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\bullet$ Q J |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 24 | - 42 <br> \& A K Q J 1083 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -95 |  | A 108632 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 8432$ |  | $\checkmark 7$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 10873 |  | -KQJ96 |  | Makea | le Con |  |  |
| \&97 |  | -6 6 | - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | A AK74 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - AK 10965 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 5 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |
|  | * 42 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\%$ |

I wish I could give you a sensible auction here to $6 \boldsymbol{V}$ - but reaching $6 *$ wouldn't be terrible either. Our boys (thanks to a decided overbid by North who had jump rebid 3NT over a response that showed hearts) got to 6\&, but then South played his partner for the diamond stop he had promised, and converted to 6NT...wouldn't you think looking at AK/AK in the majors that partner rated to have a stop in ONE of the three suits where he had promised a guard? That was $98-2$ for E/W and I can't help thinking that N/S were lucky to get 2 . We shall see whether $N / S$ can reproduce this form in the ' $A$ ' final today - at the very least it should be good reporting!

## TO BOLDLY GO - PAIRS QUALIFYING SESSION 2

## Brent Manley

You don't generally find a lot of intermediate players in an open pairs game, the reason being that it's a lot tougher in the open field for the less-experienced players. This is especially true in the USA, where you almost never find new players outside the comfort of their own games.

So what were intermediate players Fran Gaunt and Jamie McFall of Coffs Harbor doing in the open game on opening day of the Gold Coast Congress?
"I quite enjoy it," said Gaunt, who works as a nurse when she's not playing bridge. According to McFall, it was his partner's idea to move up to gain valuable experience.
The two were average in the first session - sitting 49th East-West out of 99 pairs - thanks in part to this board.



The only lead to defeat the contract is a trump: South can remove both of dummy's ruffers and leave McFall a trick short because of the bad club break. Holding a singleton in the suit his partner doubled, North can hardly be faulted for leading a spade. McFall won the opening lead with dummy's AA, cashed dummy's clubs and the $\vee$ A and ruffed a heart to hand. He then played a low club and ruffed with dummy's 9 , not caring if South overruffed. Plus 1370 was good for $97 \%$ of the matchpoints.

The two finished the session in 49th place out of 99 East-West pairs.
They did not fare as well in the second session on Saturday, but they had their moments, including this one against one of the top players in the field. Interestingly, it again involved a contract of $6 \checkmark$ played by McFall.
Fran Gaunt and Jamie McFall

| Dealer: South | A Q 42 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 96$ |  | McFall |  | Gaunt |  |  |
| Brd 19 | - 43 |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| Open Prs Qual 2 | \&KQJ 653 |  | 1 | 2\% | 20 | 24 |  |
| A AK J |  | A 53 | Pass | Pass | 4 | Pass |  |
| $\checkmark 3$ |  | -KQJ852 | 6 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - AK 862 |  | -Q975 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& A 872 |  | \& 4 | 4 | - | 4 | - | NT |
|  | A 109876 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | A |
|  | - A 1074 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J10 |  | 6 | - | 6 | - | $\checkmark$ |

Gaunt's jump raise of diamonds provided the impetus for McFall to come alive with his 19-point hand. With diamonds going 2-2, there was nothing to the play and McFall was soon claiming plus 1370 again for an $89 \%$ score.

On the following deal, Gaunt took advantage of an error by declarer to earn another good score for her side.

| Dealer: East Vul: Both | AK 95 |  | West McFall | North | East Gaunt | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 26 | - J 109 |  |  |  | Pass | 14 |  |
|  | \&J87532 |  | Pass | 24 | Pass | 34 |  |
| A 72 |  | A A J 3 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| - J 95 |  | -Q1072 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -K632 |  | -Q8754 |  | Makea | Cont |  |  |
| \% K Q 64 |  | \& 10 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A Q 10864 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - AK 843 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
|  | * A 9 |  | - | 3 | - | 4 | ¢ |

Few North-South pairs made it to game - with that weak hand, North was never going to accept a game invitation - but the majority of those who played spade partials took 10 tricks.

McFall started with his A2, ducked by Gaunt (playing her ace or jack would not have made a difference). Declarer cashed her high hearts, discarding a diamond from dummy, then made the fatal error of playing a
spade to dummy's king. Gaunt won with the ace and accurately continued with her third spade. Declarer lost the trump ace, two hearts and a club. Minus 140 helped McFall and Gaunt to $75 \%$ of the matchpoints.

Assessing their game among the "big boys," Gaunt said the second session was "a hard slog, but we'll be back tomorrow." Added McFall: "It's worth the challenge."

## OPEN PAIRS FINAL SESSION

Barry Rigal

For this session I decided I would simply sit at one table and watch the world move around me, rather than focus on the pairs at the top of the table at such an early point in the event.

In the first round this challenging defensive problem came along:

| Dealer: South | A $A 5$ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | -10965 |  | Nunn | Wyer | Mundell |  |  |
| Brd 3 | - J 954 |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| Open Final 1 | \& A 96 |  | Pass | Pass | 1a | Pass |  |
| A 1042 |  | AKJ873 | 24 | Double | Pass | 3 |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK 83 |  | $\bullet$ Q 2 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| -108 |  | - A Q |  | Makeab | le Contr | acts |  |
| \&J1072 |  | \& 8543 | - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | A Q 96 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | A |
|  | - J 74 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -K7632 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& $K$ Q |  | 2 |  | 2 | - | 4 |

Havas got to declare 3 after remaining silent with almost the best hand at the table till the end. Nunn led a top heart, and when his partner followed with an encouraging two he had to decide if he should give her the ruff or shift. He chose to play a club - and that was a disaster in a different way, when declarer unblocked her club honours, crossed to the $\uparrow A$ and pitched a heart on the clubs. Had Nunn shifted to a spade at trick two then East will get in with either $\uparrow K$ or $\vee A$ and must play $\vee Q$ for West to overtake and give his partner a ruff. Not the easiest defence to find. And note that if West gives his partner the ruff at trick three (as happened when Ashley Bach was declaring 3*) the spade loser goes away. East cannot attack spades profitably and declarer pitches one spade on the clubs and one on the hearts. 3 was beaten twice when West obediently led a spade to the first trick. East won the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and shifted to $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ - easy game bridge!

Dealer: East
Vul: E-W
Brd 6
Open Final 1
A. 107

- K 4
- Q 5
*KQ108542

AA 65

- J 962
- 109843
\& J

AK 932

- A5 3
-K72
\& 973

```
A Q J 84
- Q 1087
- AJ 6
かA 6
```

West North East South

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

Say you declare 3NT here on an unrevealing auction (1NT-3NT) and South innocently leads a fourth highest, the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} 2$. When North wins the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} A$, the possibility of a diamond shift looms - if not large at any rate small...a diamond shift looks right when partner has $\forall K$, whereas when partner has $\uparrow Q$ or $\uparrow K J$ you had better continue spades. And it keeps partner happy to return their suit, doesn't it? (plus we should say, David Stern one of the Editors, shifted to a diamond - thereby providing the first correct play by an Editor this tournament).

So anyway...at one table, Terry Brown led a spade against Taufik Asbi; Avi Kanetkar won and continued spades. Brown took his $\AA K$ and cashed $V$ A before the rats got at it... and declarer claimed. By contrast when Rajeev Khandelwal was declarer, South took his aK and played a third spade. Declarer cashed the spade winners, pitching the $Q$ and a low heart from dummy, then ran clubs. In the two-card ending South came down to the bare red-suit honours, and declarer dropped the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ to make 11 tricks for virtually all the matchpoints. By rejecting the finesse he was ensuring himself at least an average with a nice upside.
The third round was the tale of two three no-trump games.

| Dealer: West Vul: None | A K J 105 $\sim$ K 63 |  | West <br> U.Harper | North Cornell | East South Del'Monte Bach |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 8 | -K83 |  | Pass | 1\% | 14 | 24 |  |
| Open Final 1 | \& K 2 |  | Pass | 3NT | All pass |  |  |
| A 7 |  | A Q 9863 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - AQ9 7 |  | - J 102 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -QJ64 |  | - A 952 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \&10853 |  | \& J | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A A 42 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | A |
|  | $\checkmark 54$ |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -107 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& A Q 9764 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\%$ |

Cornell's jump to 3NT was based on the extras he had over his typical opener...enough said. Del'Monte did extremely well to go passive with $V$ J here. Everyone ducked this trick with more or less enthusiasm, and Del'Monte continued with $\vee 10$. Had Harper ducked this, or shifted to a top diamond, the defence should obtain +100 . In fact she tried to dislodge dummy's entry to the clubs by winning $\vee A$ and playing a spade. Cornell won $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$, then led $\uparrow \mathbf{J}$ covered all round. Now he cashed three top clubs and the winning spade, the VK, and threw Del'Monte in with a spade. The defenders had two spades and two hearts, but at trick 12 Del'Monte had to lead away from his $\uparrow K$ for declarer's eighth trick and an $81 \%$ board for Cornell.

| Dealer: North | AKJ7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\bullet 92$ |  |
| Brd 9 | - Q 73 |  |
| Open Final 1 | \& Q J 942 |  |
| A A 9852 |  | A Q 64 |
| - AQ 1074 |  | $\checkmark$ K 853 |
| - 4 |  | -86 |
| \& K 7 |  | \& 10863 |
|  | A. 103 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 6 |  |
|  | - AKJ10952 |  |
|  | $\because A 5$ |  |


| West | North <br> U.Harper <br> Cornell | East <br> Del'Monte Bach |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1NT |

The battle of chicken between Bach and Del'Monte ended in a complete knock-down victory for the latter. Del'Monte trusted his partner enough to bid on to game with his two working honours, and no one was prepared to sacrifice against that. With the club and spade honours onside, Del'Monte racked up 620 and almost all the matchpoints.

| Dealer: South | \& Q 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vul: None | Q 105 |
| Brd 11 | J 764 |
| Open Final 1 | \& A 72 |

AK 863

- A 64
- 9

かK 8643

```
A 107
* K }8
-K Q108 32
& 109
```

A AJ 954
-J932

- A 5
* Q 5

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

At the table I was watching, North heard his partner opened $3 \diamond$ and delayed sacrificing in $5 \star$ till his opponents knew it was their hand. So they could double and collect 500 for every single one of the matchpoints. By contrast when Ashley Bach opened $2 *$ Michael Cornell jumped to $4 *$ and ended the auction for -100 and all the matchpoints. A third position: imagine you play 4A after hearing South pre-empt; how should you play on a diamond lead? The answer is to win $\uparrow A$ and ruff a diamond, lead a club to the queen, a spade to the king and a second spade, intending to finesse maybe? When the queen pops up, you win the AA and lead a club, covering South's ten and end-playing North. That player can lead neither a club nor a diamond, and is out of spades, so must play a heart. When they lead a low heart you put in the nine and hold your heart losers to one. (And yes, if North has underled $\vee \mathrm{K}$ Q x good luck to him!)

| Dealer: North | AK 95 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -AJ864 |  |
| Brd 13 | - K Q |  |
| Open Final 1 | \& 1065 |  |
| A 86 |  | A A Q J 42 |
| -K1097 |  | $\checkmark 32$ |
| - AJ 9854 |  | -10762 |
| \& 3 |  | \& Q 4 |
|  | A 1073 |  |
|  | -Q 5 |  |
|  | - 3 |  |
|  | \& A K J 9 8 72 |  |


| West | North | East | South <br> Cooper |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | George | Barda | Karwur |  |
|  | 1NT | 2A [1] | 2NT [2] |  |
| Pass | 3\& | Pass | 3A |  |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | Pass |  |
| Double | Pass | Pass | 4\& All Pass |  |
| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| - | 4 | - | 1 |  | NT

[1] Spades and a minor
[2] Clubs weak or strong
So near and yet so far.
Renee Cooper had heard Joe Barda show spades and a minor, so she 'knew' clubs were not splitting for declarer. Thus she felt she could afford to double 3NT, and now Karwur could not stand the heat, and retreated to $4 \%$. The defenders accurately led a diamond and took their three spade tricks - all that for an average! Precisely one pair bid to 3NT and while a few made partscore $5 \%$ or $4 \longdiv { 4 }$ down 200 was not uncommon. The weak no-trump, burying the hearts, had done its job well.

| Dealer: North | A 82 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - Q 109 |
| Brd 17 | -Q9543 |
| Open Final 1 | \& Q 72 |
| A K Q J |  |
| -8632 |  |
| -K1076 |  |
| \& 64 |  |
|  | A A 10543 |
|  | $\bullet 7$ |
|  | - A J 8 |
|  | \& J 953 |

I thought Matthew Brown, playing with Vicki Bouton, did very well here. He reached $4 \checkmark$ after David Weston had overcalled 1A. He won the club lead in hand with \&A (routine deceptive technique, but to emphasize, if you win the king you tip off South as to who has the ace). Next he cashed VA and before committing himself in trumps he led a spade up. South took the ace and returned a club, and when declarer won the lead cheaply, he knew South had long clubs, at least five spades, and since North had not pre-empted in diamonds South surely had at least three diamonds. That made the percentage play to cross to dummy and finesse in trumps. +450 was worth an $80 \%$ board with +420 only a $33 \%$ score

| Dealer: East | A J 65 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A 10742 |
| Brd 18 | - AK |
| Open Final 1 | \& 654 |
| A 1074 |  |
| - K Q 3 |  |
| - 8654 |  |
| \& A J 2 |  |
|  | A AKQ 92 |
|  | $\bullet$ J 8 |
|  | - 72 |
|  | \& Q 1093 |

## A 976 <br> -AKJ54 <br> - 2 <br> \& A K 108

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


| West | North | East | South <br> Pass 1A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass 2A |  |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{d}$ | All Pass |  |


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

After six rounds GeO Tislevoll and David Appleton were right at the top of the table. This board didn't hurt. Appleton led a diamond against 4A and declarer won as Tislevoll played the three. A trump to hand saw declarer lead a low heart. Appleton split his honours, and Tislevoll played the six (using upside down carding) then followed with the five when declarer led back to his $\vee \mathrm{J}$ and Appleton's king. Appleton had now seen his partner follow with a low diamond at trick one - on what looked like a suit preference position not an attitude or count position, and echo in hearts with the smallest of the three high-lows possible. So Appleton underled his
club ace, and the defenders cashed out their three winners in clubs. Five pairs got it right, earning themselves an $80 \%$ result in the process.

| Dealer: South | か J 64 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 9$ |  | Kanetkar Foster |  | Brown | Weston |  |
| Brd 19 | - Q J 76 |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| Open Final 1 | ¢KJ1086 |  | 14 | Pass | 2\% | Pass |  |
| A AKQ9 3 |  | A 875 | 2 | Pass | 34 | Pass |  |
| - A J 5 |  | $\checkmark$ Q 1087 | 4 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |  |
| -10543 |  | - AK | 5\% | Pass | 5 | Pass |  |
| \& 9 |  | * A Q 32 | 64 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  | A 102 |  |  | Makea | le Con | cts |  |
|  | - K 6432 |  | 6 | - | 6 | - | NT |
|  | -982 |  | 6 | - | 6 | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | \& 754 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | - |
|  |  |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\%$ |

Avi Kanetkar and Terry Brown conducted a nice auction here, and played the hand well too.
Brown set trumps with his 3A call then used Keycard and checked for the trump queen. Kanetkar won the trump lead and took an early heart finesse, then unblocked diamonds and repeated the heart finesse. When North ruffed and exited with a second trump, Kanetkar won in hand, ruffed a diamond, crossed to the heart ace, and caught North in a show up squeeze. A reasonable alternative is to unblock diamonds before taking the heart finesse, then ruff a diamond, draw trumps, and use the club ace to repeat the heart finesse. But that gives up on the play for an overtrick - although on the lead of $\boldsymbol{V 9}$ to trick one it might well be a sensible play?

| Dealer: South | A 109 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - J 8 |  | Kanetkar St'ski |  | Brown | Wu |  |
| Brd 23 | - AK9653 |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |
| Open Final 1 | \& Q 76 |  | Pass | 2 | 4 | Pass |  |
| ^Q 752 |  | A J 3 | Pass | Double | Pass | 5 |  |
| $\checkmark 65$ |  | - AKQ109742 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| - 82 |  | - J |  | Makeab | le Cont | acts |  |
| \& A 10932 |  | \& J 4 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A AK 864 |  | - | 2 | - | 3 | A |
|  | $\checkmark 3$ |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - Q 1074 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& K 85 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | 8 |

Lorraine Stachurski and Mindy Wu bid to 5 here and Lorraine timed the play carefully.
The defenders led a top heart and shifted to spades. Stachurski won, drew trumps and then played a spade to dummy and ruffed a spade, ruffed a heart and ruffed a spade. She could play a club to the king and ace, and still had the 10 as an entry to dummy to pitch her club loser on the fifth spade. Had Brown led two rounds of hearts at once, declarer must take the risk of drawing one trump then playing on spades before taking out the last trump. Not such a big risk when the $\downarrow$ J appears...but you never know.

| Dealer: North Vul: E-W | $\text { A } 10862$ $\text { -K } 84$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 25 | - J 8 |  |
| Open Final 1 | *6542 |  |
| A Q J 9 |  | AK5 |
| $\checkmark$ A 72 |  | - Q J 65 |
| - K 103 |  | - A974 |
| \& J 1093 |  | \& $A$ Q 7 |
|  | A A 743 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1093$ |  |
|  | - Q 652 |  |
|  | *K 8 |  |

The South hand poses the classic matchpoint problem at trick one on the Auction 1NT by East and 3NT by West: do you go active with a spade or diamond lead, or passive with a heart lead. Since l've gone on record sneering at leading from a broken four-card suit I should point out that my choice of the heart ten leads to -630
and a $20 \%$ result, and Waldvogel's spade lead led to -600 and a $70 \%$ result. The looker-on may see most of the game, but that doesn't mean they'd always get it right...

Cornell/Bach, Waldvogel's opponents, got it all back and more on the next deal by bidding accurately to 4n and guessing the play. Some of the field did too much, some misguessed the trump suit with K-10-9-8-4 facing A-6-3.

| Dealer: East | $\text { A } 7$ |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 26 | $\begin{array}{r} 974 \\ * K 64 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK } 10984 \\ & \bullet K J \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A A } 63 \\ & \vee 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - AJ 63 |  | - K Q 8 |  | Makea | le Con |  |  |
| \& $A 5$ |  | \& Q J 10982 | 2 | - | 2 | - | NT |
|  | A Q J 52 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - AQ 83 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -1052 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | - |
|  | \& 73 |  |  | - | 4 | - | $\%$ |

After the defenders led two rounds of hearts Cornell realized he could not afford the standard safety play of winning VK and running the 110 since if a third heart came back he would have to commit to ruffing in the three-card hand and pitching a club from dummy - thereby losing out if the club finesse worked and the spades didn't break. So he led to the AA and up to the long hand, and when South split her honours he had time to shift his attention to clubs and retain control.

## COMMON ERRORS AND HOW TO AVOID THEM

## Brent Manley

During a tournament at a hotel, a man walked into the ladies' room between rounds. When he realized what he had done, he apologized profusely. One of the women in the room had the perfect response: "That's all right. It's the mixed pairs!"

## POOR SIGNALING, PART 2

In yesterday's column, the discussion centred on signalling attitude as a defender - playing a high card to encourage continuation of the suit led, low to discourage. You can, of course, signal encouragement with low cards. Consider this scenario (you are East):

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | $\begin{aligned} & \text { North } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | East Pass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { South } \\ & \text { 1A } \end{aligned}$ |
| Pass All Pass | 2^ | Pass | 4^ |

Partner starts with the VA (ace from A-K) and declarer plays low from dummy. You must play the $\geqslant 5$ and hope partner has the $V K$ and that he plays it next. If he does, he will note that you played the 5 then the 2 (high-low) to indicate that you want the suit continued. Partner may not know why you want the suit continued (you might have started with VQ-5-2), but he will cooperate and play a third heart. You ruff with the A6 and if South must follow suit, your trump ace will take the setting trick. The full deal might be:
The defence would be easier if you could trade your $\mathbf{~} 5$ for South's 9 or North's 10, either of which is more attention-grabbing to partner. In that sense, you were lucky that partner held the $\vee 4$ and $\mathbf{V}$. When you played the 5 and declarer followed with the 7 , the 2 was still missing. It was possible from the sequence of plays that you had the 2, so partner took his best shot, hoping your 5 was the start of a signal to keep playing hearts. If partner had switched to a suit other than spades, declarer would have been able to discard one of his hearts on a diamond honour and the game would have been made. You did note, of course, that if partner had played a spade at trick two, you would have been able to win and return the $\mathbf{V} 2$, clearly indicating that you wanted a ruff.



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
$Q$ Make sure to sign up for Premium Membership

- to get access to all RonklingerBridge.com Ronks to offer. shift to hearts. If declarer has any heart losers it is unlikely they can disappear. East can ask for a club with a suit-preference $\$ 2$ or suggest a trump switch in this case with the $\$ 10$.


## Answer: Thrust!

When partner knows precisely the cards you hold, then there is no point giving count. You can use the cards held to send the relevant message to partner. That applied on this deal from a National Teams' Championship.
Which card should East play on the $\downarrow$ A ? It is clear from the bidding that South has at most one diamond. There can be no urgency to

Normally suit-preference signals do not relate to the trump suit, but the danger for the defence here is that declarer will ruff club losers in dummy. East therefore signalled with the $\$ 10$ and West shifted to a trump. East won and returned a spade. Declarer continued with $\AA A, \AA K$ and a club ruff. South still had to lose a heart and a club for one down.


## JOIN US IN THE SPIRIT OF THE OCCASION BY DRESSING IN OUR 2015 THEME Dots and Dashes WEDNESDAY!!!

This year we are judging you in groups of four (need not be same team) as opposed to pairs or individuals (mind you we would still like you to dress up even if your slack teammates don't and just maybe we will have some spot prizes for great individual efforts!).

The judging will take place on Wednesday afternoon and any team interested needs to register at the Bridge Administration Desk. They can do this any day but will then have to take their registration slip with them to have their photo taken in the foyer at the GCCC sometime Wednesday morning (or up to start of afternoon session). Anne Russell will be there to snap you and we would like all contenders to then parade around the foyer so we can appreciate your efforts.
Once again Sally Elliot for Meegs Boutique will be judging and providing vouchers as prizes. We will also offer book vouchers for those who prefer. This will be finalised that afternoon.


## MONDAY NIGHT $23^{\text {RD }}$ FEBRUARY FROM 6:00PM

The Trivia night will be held at Grumpy's Barefoot Bar - Steak \& Seafood Grill on Victoria Avenue, Broadbeach Mall, Oasis Shopping Centre Broadbeach (5538-0806) commencing 6:00pm for a 6.30pm start (larger capacity and better lit than last year)

Once again our hosts will be Jac \& Bill Rossiter-Nuttall who did such a good job last year.
A bridge menu is attached and I hope all players will avail themselves of these specials and arrive at 6:00pm to give time to order their meal and drinks ready to start play at 6:30pm.
There will be a fee of $\$ 5.00$ per player with all proceeds going to Friends of Youth Bridge Fund but to be specifically used to facilitate youth attendance at the Gold Coast Congress (Objective: have an apartment for the week where youth players can stay free of charge).
You can enter as teams of between 6 and 8 people and may include friends who may not be bridge players. We can accommodate a maximum of 25 tables so please register AND PAY at the Bridge Administration desk at the GCCC before 2:00pm Monday. If you do not have a full table there is no problem, simply write down your names and we will "marry" players to make up teams.
at the Bridge Administration desk at the GCCC before 2:00pm Monday. If you do not have a full table there is no problem, simply write down your names and we will "marry" players to make up teams.

The members of the winning team will receive prizes including wine or chocolates

## USE OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES OF ANY TYPE STRICTLY PROHIBITED

 OFFENDER AND THEIR TEAM LIABLE TO DISQUALIFICATION \$15 Trivia Menu SelectionCalamari Fried calamari served with chips and a petite garden salad, tartar sauce and lemon Chicken Schnitzel Crumbed chicken fillet with chips and a petite garden salad
Linguini Bolognaise AI dente pasta with homemade bolognaise sauce topped with parmesan cheese and a slice of garlic bread Fish \& Chips Battered fish fillet with chips, a petite garden salad, tartar sauce and lemon Vegetarian Options Linguini Sicilian Linguini tossed with garlic, onion, roast capsicum, Olives, fresh herbs and Napoli sauce Greek Salad Lettuce, tomato, cucumber, onions, olives and feta cheese drizzled with balsamic Vinaigrette

PIZZA MENU
Margarita - Tomato Basil Cheese $\star$ Meatlovers - Bacon Ham Salami Chilli Onion \& BBQ Sauce $\bullet$ Hawaiian - Ham Pineapple Cheese


NEED TRANSPORT HOME FROM THE GOLD COAST CONGRESS? OR DO YOU WANT TO SHARE A TAXI TO THE AIRPORT
If you are looking for a "ride" home after the tournament you really should visit the travel desk outside the Administration Office where players can exchange offers of a ride with people needing one.

## BARRY'S PROBLEMS

## Barry Rigal

| All East | A J | 72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ K | 765 |  |
|  | - A |  |  |
|  | \& 8 |  |  |
|  | 4 $\checkmark$ $\times$ | Q 96 |  |
|  | -K | 8 |  |
|  | \& J |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  | Pass | 1a |
| Pass | 3¢ (1) | Double |  |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| (1)Limit (9-11) Raise in Spades |  |  |  |
| Opening Lead \&6 |  |  |  |

Counting is one of the most important exercises at bridge, but sometimes you have to combine the exercise with a fair amount of inference and conjecture. The inference about what the opponents have or have not bid may be critical.

Declarer plays four spades after East had the chance to double an artificial club call. On a club lead to the ace East found the accurate switch to the diamond jack, threatening to set up a winner for the defenders in that suit. What now?

## ANSWER

The 1999 World Junior Teams were held in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. In the semi-final match between Israel and Italy, a match won comfortably by the latter, (the eventual tournament winners) both tables made four spades, but the Italian declarer Antonio Mallardi had the tougher task.
Declarer won the diamond in hand and drew two rounds of trump. Now it looks to be a blind guess as to how to play the hearts, but there were inferences from the fact that West had led a low club that he did not have two of the top three honours in that suit. Since East, a

|  | AJ872 <br> -KJ765 <br> -A 73 <br> -8 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| A 53 | - 10 |
| $\checkmark$ A 1098 | $\checkmark$ Q 4 |
| -Q64 | - J 1052 |
| ¢K 1076 | * A Q 9543 |
|  | ^AKQ964 |
|  | $\checkmark 32$ |
|  | -K98 |
|  | \& J 2 | passed hand, apparently had six decent clubs to the ace and queen, and the diamond jack, he had no room for the heart ace or he would have opened the bidding. So Mallardi led a heart to the king for his 10th trick. In the other room East had pre-empted in first chair so the heart guess was considerably easier to work out.

## MUSINGS

Bill Hirst
Without a doubt the Gold Coast Congress is my favourite "Holiday" congress on the bridge calendar. For the past four years my wife and I have been invited to stay with friends in Queensland the Sunday before the congress. I play in the Arana Teams as a threesome with Therese Tully and Richard Wallis and our regular teammates Tony Jackman, Meta Goodman. Everybody at Arana is friendly and hospitable and should you have the opportunity to play I would strongly recommend it.
With England having been thrashed by Australia in the Opening ICC World Cup Cricket Match, my teammates took pity on me and let me play all seven of the eight board matches - their mistake!
Some hands came up each of which offers a point of interest that I thought I would share with you.
You hold
$\rightarrow A Q x x$
$\forall x$

- Axx
* K Q J $10 x$

You Partner
1\% $1 V$
1^ $2 * \quad[2 \star=$ fourth suit game force]
??
I believe that the secret to good bidding is that where one member of the partnership can fully describe his hand then it is his partner who is in control of the hand. But therein lies the question how best can you describe your hand and let partner take control?

In England most players with whom I play tend to bid 2NT to show a diamond stopper with minimum values and jump to 3NT to show the stopper with additional values. I personally like 3* with this type of


Bill Hirst
hand as I think it shows a good hand with a diamond feature and uncertainty regarding best final contract and not necessarily a 4-0-4-5 shape.

On the hand Richard bid 2NT which I felt showed a minimum hand and holding the following hand I jumped to 6NT, severely underselling our combined holding and the availability of 14 tricks! We lost 13 IMPs when our opponents bid to 7NT at the other table.

```
A \(A Q x x\)
    A \(K x x\)
\(\vee x\)
- Axx
    \(\checkmark A K Q x x\)
    - KQx
*K Q J 10 x
\& \(A x\)
```

The difference of opinion on the hand lay in Richard's belief that 3NT would have been fast arrival showing a minimum hand whereas 2NT showed the better hand - certainly a treatment played by some partnerships.
I asked Margaret Bourke her opinion on the bidding methods and she offered her method of 2 NT being strong or weak with relay enquiries to ask which type of hand - sounds good to me. She did however like the idea of the $3 *$ bid on my hand with the intended meaning.

1. You hold
```
A J
-AKQxxxx
- Q
\(\% A x x\)
```

Partner opens $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ and it is your bid. Is $4 \checkmark$ natural or a cue bid agreeing spades? Have you discussed this with your partner?
$4 V$ is easy when partner held the following hand:
A K 98 xxxx
$\checkmark 10 x$

- A 9 xx
\& ---
Therese not unreasonably bid 4A and I could not find a way to make it - another 13 IMPs away.
Now I should say that I originally submitted two hands to the Bulletin Editors (now collectively known as the Marquises de Sade when they asked me for some more of my sufferings - so here goes.

2. You hold

A A 98

- AK5
- Q 53
\& K Q 87
After two passes what do you bid? Now somewhere in the distant past I had read that good 14-15 HCP hands with plenty of queens, jacks and tens often play better in no-trumps than some sharp 17-18 point hands heavy with aces and kings but without those intermediates. Unfortunate thing when my memory works at the wrong time, just as it did here when I downgraded this 18 point hand and opened 1NT which everybody (unfortunately for me) passed and on which I made 10 tricks on this layout.
Now why am I feeling sorry for myself? Well the other table and in fact most of the room were in 3NT making and we lost another 10 IMPs on this board.

I think that double dummy I can make 3NT on any defence (Ed. confirmed by Deep Finesse) if I drop the id on the second high club - not impossible if West wins the first round with the ace as
he would be likely to duck with any holding other than \＆A J or ace bare．A spade finesse then the fourth club will squeeze West in three suits but I would need to read the ending perfectly．Of course when you are only in 1 NT the your declarer play doesn＇t need to be so perfect then again neither does the defence！

But hold on a minute！This is the Arana Teams not the final of the Bermuda Bowl，so why are so many declarers making 3NT？I can see that they will arrive easily in 3NT after South opens $1 \%$ and rebids 2NT over partner＇s 1ヵ response．

Let＇s watch over West＇s shoulder．He leads the V6，fourth best and sees it go low from dummy VQ from partner and declarer ducks．Fearing a possible blockage in the suit after returning the fourth best $\vee 3$ ，most defenders sitting east played the $\vee 10$ ．West，after winning the \＆A feared that declarer still held the VA9 and who wouldn＇t when thinking partner＇s carding suggested VQ103，switched to another suit giving declarer the tempo to establish his winners．Should the defence have done better？I think so：
－Both defenders know that declarer held 18 or 19 points balanced（well not in my case ©）
－East is $90 \%$ sure that the spade finesse is working（he doesn＇t know about the 110 ）
－It is unlikely that declarer would duck the first trick holding VAJx or VAJxx
I feel that South is much more likely to duck with 『AKx or 『AKxx rather than 『AJx or VAJxx in which case there is a lot of merit in return the＂normal＂fourth highest heart－V3．This would result in west almost certainly continuing with a low heart upon winning the \％A．

Had enough？Well I did but here is the last offering in my tales of woe．
3．You hold
$\rightarrow$ A 2
－AQJ1053
－ 7643
＊Q
Partner opens $1 *$ you respond $1 \checkmark$ and partner bid 1A and you drag out the dreaded（see 1 above）fourth suit game force 2\％．Partner raises to 3＊and your call after the following auction

| Partner | You |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 *$ | $1 \%$ |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \dot{*}$ |
| $3 \%$ | ？？ |$\quad[2 \dot{*}=$ fourth suit game force $]$

Instinct tells me to bid $4 V$ but do I want to be in $4 V$ opposite a void and knowing I likely have a nine card diamond fit？What about 3NT－not much good if partner has a heart void and only one entry to my hand． Well after some thought I temporise with $4 \diamond$ in the hope that we can find the right place to play．Partner raises to $5 \diamond$ holding：

AKJ98
$\vee 2$
－AJ 92
＊K J 92
I should have followed my instinct when 5 failed by three tricks while $4 V$ would have made．Where did we go wrong？My view，for what it＇s worth，is that over $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ ，fourth suit game force，partner could have considered 2NT rather than 3＊suggesting that he in fact held at least one heart．
Oh well this just confirms my long standing theory that bridge is an easy game－well double dummy at least． We ended up finishing fourth and congratulations to the winner Magnus Moren，Neville Francis，Tony Hutton and Pranjal Chakradeo．

> TBIB INSURANCES
> Come and visit the TBIB stand in the foyer to discuss all your insurance needs including Travel Insurances Renewals－enter the Lucky Door prize． Our team will be present an hour before \＆after play each day


At age 12, Jack Luke-Paredi already sees himself as a bridge player for life. Just two years into his bridge career, he realises that there's something to learn every time he plays. Asked if he plans to keep playing, he responds, "That's the intention."

The precocious seventh-grader was introduced to bridge in an after-school program at All Saints Anglican School in Gold Coast and he now plays regularly at the Gold Coast Bridge Club.

Jack says he likes bridge because "it's really fun and challenging."
At the Gold Coast Congress, Jack is playing with 17-year-old Angus Gray, a Brisbane resident and recent graduate from high school, The two started playing together after being introduced by Paul Brake, who is involved with the Queensland Bridge Association youth movement.
Gray says his young partner has potential. "He's a wonderful player. I'm the let-down in the partnership."

Jack says his favourite part of bridge is playing the dummy. "lt's easier," he says.

TOMORROW'S ANOTHER DAY - PAIRS NOVICE FINAL D
By Brent Manley


When you're just starting out in bridge, it's easy to become discouraged until you realize that a bad game does not a bad player make. The best players in the world are capable of a string of poor results that add up to a train wreck of a session.

Two players from Singapore attending the Gold Coast Congress were encouraged to learn about that aspect of the game and headed into the Novice Pairs Final D on Sunday with some optimism about their chances.

Savi and Raja Bawajee (pictured) finished the first session on Sunday below average, but they did score well on several boards.

This one occurred in the first round.

Dealer: West
Vul: N-S
Brd 12
Novice Prs Final S1 \& K 5
AAJ9543

- AJ 9
- 1054
\& 6
^Q 6
- KQ 74
-KQJ87

| West | North <br> Raja | East | South <br> Savi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | 2 |
| 2A | 2NT | All Pass |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 2 | NT |
| 2 | - | 2 | - | $\uparrow$ |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | $\vdots$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| 2 | - | 1 | - | $\AA$ |

East would have done much better to lead partner's suit, but she started with the $\% 9$, covered by the ten. On the run of the diamonds, West pitched a couple of spades. Perhaps fearful that East had the VA, Raja declined to lead up to his $\vee$ K Q 74 while in the dummy with the $\forall A$, but after cashing the diamonds, he led a low heart to dummy's 110 and West's jack. Unwilling to break spades, West cashed the VA and exited with a heart. Raja took his two winners in that suit and played a spade to the king and West's ace. The AQ took the ninth trick for plus 150 and all the matchpoints.
Three boards later, another cold top was in the offing for Raja and Savi.

| Dealer: South Vul: N-S | $\text { A A J } 85$ |  | West | North Raja | East | South Savi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 15 | -106432 |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |
| Novice Prs Fin | \& 52 |  | Pass | 14 | 2 | 27 |  |
| ヘ 942 |  | A Q 107 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| $\checkmark 752$ |  | - A J 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J 7 |  | - AK985 |  | Makea | le Con | acts |  |
| \& A J 976 |  | \& Q 4 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | A K 63 |  | - | - | - | - | A |
|  | -K10864 |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - Q |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& K 1083 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\%$ |

Savi's rebid of her five-card suit would not be everyone's choice, but it worked out well on this occasion.
West started with the $\diamond$, taken by East, who exited with the $\uparrow 9$, Savi ruffed, played a heart to dummy's queen and East's ace. Savi discarded a club on the third round of diamonds as West ruffed.

Apparently alarmed by Savi's club discard, West cashed the \&A, giving South an undeserved club trick. She then played a spade to dummy's ace, ruffed a diamond with the VK and put the $\$ 10$ on the table, ruffing with dummy's 9 , which was good enough to drive out the trump ace. East erred by returning the $A Q$, eliminating the losers in that suit. Savi finished with eight tricks for plus 110 and another 100\% score.

On the following board, Raja resisted the temptation to lead his singleton against a 4^ contract, and it paid off for him when declarer took the wrong view in the heart suit.

| Dealer: South Vul: E-W | A J 64 $\bullet 9$ |  | West | North Raja | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 19 | -QJ76 |  | 14 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |  |
| Novice Prs Final S1 \& K J 1086 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 875 \\ & \vee \text { Q } 1087 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| A AKQ 93 |  |  | 3NT | Pass | 4a | All Pass |  |
| - AJ5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -10543 |  | - AK | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& 9 |  | $\%$ A Q 32 | 6 | - | 6 | - | NT |
|  | A 102 |  | 6 | - | 6 | - | 4 |
|  | -K6432 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 982 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 754 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\%$ |

Instead of leading his singleton heart, which would have picked up the whole suit for declarer, Raja started with his fourth-best club, the eight. Declarer eyed this suspiciously, eventually going up with the ace. He pulled trumps and could have entered dummy with a diamond to take a heart finesse. Instead, he played a low heart from hand: 9, 10, king. Declarer won the diamond return in dummy and ran the hearts, pitching a diamond from his hand, but he still had to lose a diamond at the end. Minus 450 for the Bawajees was good for $86 \%$.
This board, later in the session, represented another good score for the Singapore pair

| Dealer: East Vul: N-S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A K Q } 9865 \\ & \vee 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | West | North Raja | East | South Savi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 2 | -1062 |  |  |  | Pass | Pass |  |
| Novice Prs Final S1 \& A Q 3 |  |  | Pass | 14 | $2 \vee$ | 2NT |  |
| A A 10 |  | A 742 | 30 | 34 | Pass | 4A |  |
| - 732 |  | -QJ965 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| - 97 |  | - AK 8 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& J 9764 |  | \& 52 | - | - | - | - | NT |
| A J 3 |  |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | 4 |
| -K104 |  |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
| -QJ543 |  |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
| \& K 108 |  |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\%$ |

Raja was too high at 4A, but the opponents let him off the hook. East started with a high diamond, getting the 9 from partner. Another high diamond allowed West to complete the echo. Instead of giving partner a diamond ruff, which would have led to down two, East switched to the VQ, which held. Another heart forced out the ace, which Raja ruffed. He played a low spade to dummy's jack, ducked by West. Now the VK was used for a
diamond discard. Raja still had to go down, losing to the trump ace, but East-West were cold for 3V, so minus 100 was worth $79 \%$.

2015 VICTOR CHAMPION CUP BRIDGE FESTIVAL
 Bayview Eden Hotel 6 Queens Road, Melbourne Victoria

Swiss Pairs Events 10.30am 4th June - 5th June
Women's, Seniors, Open, Restricted, and <200 MP
Swiss Teams 10am start 6th June - 8th June
Open \& Restricted
New for 2015 - A less than 200MP COMBINED Pairs event
Plus Prizes in All Events Walk-In Pairs on Wednesday 3rd June at 8pm. An ABF Gold Point and Playoff Qualifying Points Event

For more details and to enter visit the website: www.vba.asn.au/vcc

| GOLD COAST CONGRESS 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Monday 23rd February | Tuesday 24th February | Wednesday 25th February | Thursday 26th February | Friday 27th February | Saturday 28th February |
| OPEN EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open Pairs Championship <br> Open Teams <br> Weekend Matchpoint Swiss Pairs Monday Butler Swiss Pairs Ivy Dahler Open Butler Swiss Pairs Friday Teams | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { 1:000pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \\ \text { 9:00am 1/2 } & \text { 1:00pm 2/2 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R1-R4 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | Q\|F Teams S/F Teams <br> 9:00am 2x12 <br> Brds 2:00pm 4x10 <br> Brds <br>   <br> 10:00am 1/3 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 3$ <br> 10:00am 1/3 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 3$ | 9:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final <br> 10:30am 3/3 |
| SENIORS EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seniors Pairs Championship <br> Seniors Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R1-R4 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final |  |
| INTERMEDIATE EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  | All Are Dinner <br> Invited Dance |
| Intermediate Pairs Championship <br> Intermediate Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \mathrm{F} 3 / 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R1-R4 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ \text { 4× } 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ \text { 4×12 Brds Final } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 7:30pm Bookings <br> for are <br> 8:00pm Essential |
| RESTRICTED EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restricted Pairs Championship <br> Restricted Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Restricted Butler Swiss Pairs | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R1-R4 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final <br> 10:00am 1/3 2:00pm 2/3 | 10:30am 3/3 |
| NOVICE EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Novice Pairs Championship <br> Novice Teams <br> Friday Novice Pairs | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R1-R4 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start 4x12 Brds Final 10:00am 1/2 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 212$ |  |
| ROOKIE PAIRS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rookie Pairs - Single Session Events |  |  |  | 10:30am 1/1 |  |  |
| UNDER 50MP PAIRS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 50 Masterpoint Pairs |  |  | 10:30am 1/1 | 10:30am 1/1 |  |  |
| MIXED TEAMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seres/McMahon Mixed Teams |  |  |  |  | 10:00am 1/2 2:00pm 212 |  |
| WALK-IN PAIRS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holiday Walk-In Pairs - Play 1, 2 or 3 Sessions | 1:00pm 3/3 | 20:30am 1/3 | 10:30am 2/3 | 10:30am 3/3 | 10:00am 1/3 2:00pm 2/3 | 10:30am 3/3 |
|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday |



## FAMILY BUSINESS <br> Board Dealing - Marion Cooke



On $1^{\text {st }}$ March Marion Cooke officially retires as the Queensland Bridge Association Board Dealer. You probably don't know that Marion is the mother Kim Ellaway (QBA Manager) and Nicola (the Coffee Chicks). She is also the grandmother of Michael Ellaway (coffee and ex-caddy), Alex Ellaway (ex-caddy), Ben, Daniel and Philip Goulding (senior caddy, scoring staff and caddies in 2015).
Marion commenced board dealing in 2,000 when the Gold Coast Congress required just 12,000 boards to be dealt. Then the QBA took on the GNOT and helped 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. In 2014, for the Gold Coast Congress, Marion dealt 31,674 boards which will increase to 33,000 this year
Lest you think that board dealing is just sitting at a machine and dealing you should know that the boards need sorting if they don't arrive in order, cards removed are carried to the dealing area and then when completed carried to a storage area awaiting pickup.
Retirement as the QBA Board Dealer means

- Marion could possibly play in the GCC but Kim's dogs need babysitting so perhaps not for a while yet;
- The home will be converted to just that - a home - rather a storage locker for cards and boards;
- $\quad$ She will get her life back and do what she loves most after her family - PLAYING MORE BRIDGE.

Kim McCusker, a Floor Manager at the Gold Coast Congress. Has been appointed as Marion's replacement.
The GCC wish Marion well in her retirement and look forward to seeing her as a player at the Gold Coast Congress.


## BRIDGE OR POKER

Ken Berry told us about a hand which he played in $6 \%$ making where it looks like the defence have three tricks to take. The tale started with how he took seven tricks in his side suit, something which has never happened to him before. Being curious your editors looked at the hand and were somewhat surprised to see that declarer had a 4-4 club fit and a 7-2 heart fit so further enquiries seemed in order:

Dealer: East A 9
Vul: E-W VAJ108654
Brd 6

- 4
\& Q J 103

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Pass | 2NT |
| 3A | $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ | 5A | Pass |
| Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{*}$ | All Pass |  |

AK87532

- K
- A Q 32

QJ 64

- 932
\& 74
-K 98
A A 10
\& A 95
Q
- J 10765
\& K 862

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

The defence started with spades - something which increased the possible number of tricks to 11 by denying the defence a heart ruff. Remember that the South hand was dummy and East, probably still amused at the 2NT opening showing 5-5 in the minors, on winning the $\& A$ didn't appreciate the need to grab the $\star A$ allowing declarer to score one spade seven hearts and four trump tricks.

| Holiday Pairs Event 1 - Session 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | North-South | Score |  |  | Sast-West |
| 1 | Adrienne Kelly - Judy Hocking | 67.03 | 1 | Fred Whitaker - Anna Monks | 64.80 |
| 2 | Jim Wood - Paul Thiem | 57.35 | 2 | Gary Heyting - Kevin Dougall | 62.56 |
| 3 | Helen Fleet - Robert Fleet | 55.53 | 3 | Yvonne Kilvert - Neven Burica | 61.62 |
| 4 | Margaret Rex - Cherry Trengove | 52.29 | 4 | Rashmi Limaye - Judith Owens | 52.94 |
| 5 | Janette Targett - Jill Causley | 51.99 | 5 | Minnie Bragg - Chris Bragg | 52.42 |
| 6 | Alan Currie - Kaye Donaldson | 49.07 | 6 | Lesley Martin - Janette Cael | 51.36 |
| 7 | Di Dunne - Ken Nixon | 48.93 | 7 | Raymond Jones - Rita Jones | 49.12 |
| 8 | Brenda Herring - Barbara Herring | 47.47 | 8 | Michelle Behrens - Jim Skeen | 48.50 |
| 9 | Wendy Harrison - David Gillard | 46.70 | 9 | Lauren Somers - Norma Cameron | 48.31 |
| 10 | Denise Richards - Yvonne Wain | 46.35 | 10 | Malcolm Clift - Kathy Clift | 47.17 |
| 11 | George Biro - Kitty Biro | 46.27 | 11 | Diana McAuliffe - Margaret Liversage | 43.13 |
| 12 | Rick Rhodes - Maura Rhodes | 45.57 | 12 | Wandini Noal - Di Robinson | 41.22 |
| 13 | Patricia Scott - Sharon Jackson | 45.56 | 13 | Warren Males - Kathryn Males | 41.18 |
| 14 | Jean Troughton - Jennifer Finigan | 40.99 | 14 | Jennifer A Montague - Jane Hills | 36.79 |


| Sunday Rookie Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | North-South | $\%$ |  | East-West | $\%$ |
| 1 | Barbara Moni - Wendy Casey | 60.4 | 1 | Kerry Raymond - Mary Fletcher | 62.2 |
| 2 | Mary Simon - Isabel Griinke | 56.5 | 2 | Brian Goldberg - Philip Atkinson | 58.2 |
| 3 | Althea Crowley - Virginia O'Rourke | 55.9 | 3 | Chris Farr - Shellley Farr | 58.0 |
| 4 | Aspacia Adermann - Debbie Gould | 53.1 | 4 | Malcolm Mckinnon - David Whitehead | 57.6 |
| 5 | Heather Todd - John Todd | 53.0 | 5 | Marguerite Bettington - Jan Deaville | 56.8 |
| 6 | Trish Hart - Bing Wilson | 53.0 | 6 | lan Cameron - Helen Bougoure | 56.4 |
| 7 | Deanna Cruickshank - Desley Strik | 52.3 | 7 | Di Kruse - Jennifer Martin | 54.7 |
| 8 | Robert Olander - William Webster | 52.1 | 8 | Ryan Stevens - Chantelle Stevens | 53.8 |
| 9 | Barbara Love - Roger Love | 51.2 | 9 | Lucinda Fogerty - Chris Williams | 52.5 |
| 10 | Denyse Morgan - Carol Wright | 50.2 | 10 | lan Nicholson - Jennifer Nicholson | 50.0 |
| 11 | Jeff Wicks - Julie Wicks | 50.1 | 11 | Doug Dunstan - Lesley Sunterland | 49.6 |
| 12 | Yvonne Croft - June Abbott | 49.1 | 12 | Tiffany Mair - Raelene Kell | 46.7 |
| 13 | Pamela Bar Varcoe - Marie Lincoln | 48.9 | 13 | Anna Jadach - Sue Smalley | 45.9 |
| 14 | Shane Knight - Robert Campbell | 48.7 | 14 | Peter Allingham - Chris Turvey | 44.9 |
| 15 | Vicki Clark - Margaret Ashby | 48.3 | 15 | Pam Usher - Margaret Jacklyn | 44.6 |
| 16 | Nili Wood - Laurence Wood | 47.9 | 16 | Lile Williams - Sue Cheney | 43.6 |
| 17 | Robert Sharp - Susan Sharp | 44.2 | 17 | Vadnae Furminger - Kath Lansdowne | 39.9 |
| 18 | George Mclucas - Helen Mclucas | 38.1 | 18 | Pamela Bennett - Judy Mcdougall | 38.7 |
| 19 | Robert Day - Janet Mckeogh | 36.1 | 19 | Dave Harrison - Sue Harrison | 35.0 |



Winners Rookies Pairs N/S Barbara Moni - Wendy Casey


Winners Rookies Pairs E/W Kerry Raymond - Mary Fletcher

## DIRECTOR'S TIP - REVOKE

- When attention is drawn to a revoke, the Director should be called. They will determine whether it is established on not.
- If the revoke is established, the Director will determine rectification after the play of the hand is completed. There are statutory trick adjustments laid down in the laws that cannot be reduced, but the Director can award more tricks to the non-offenders if more damage has been caused by the revoke.


97 Year Old Jean Troughton playing with Daughter Jennifer Finigan against Gary Hewting \& Kevin Dougil in the Walk-In

| Weekend Matchpoint Swiss Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total |  |  | Total |
| 1 | Paul Collins - Ian Afflick | 123 | 21 | Peter Strasser - Andy Hung | 98 |
| 2 | Paul Lavings - Helen Hellsten | 120 | 21 | Ben Kingham - Phyllis Moritz | 98 |
| 3 | Charles Howard - Kerry Wood | 116 | 21 | Lucie Armstrong - Rua Freeborn | 98 |
| 4 | Jenna Gibbons - Christine Gibbons | 114 | 21 | Adam Rutkowski - Judy Marks | 98 |
| 5 | Brian Jacobson - Bill Webster | 112 | 25 | Denise Clarke - Michael Clarke | 97 |
| 6 | Ken Dawson - Andrew Slater | 110 | 25 | Ian Lincoln - Chris Williams | 97 |
| 7 | Kathy Johnson - Lois Steinwedel | 106 | 25 | Gabor Fleiszig - Janina Fleiszig | 97 |
| 7 | Pam Morgan-King - Leigh Thompson | 106 | 28 | Margaret Foster - Margaret Gidley-Baird | 96 |
| 9 | Susan Humphries - Stephanie Jacob | 105 | 28 | Wynne Webber - Meta Goodman | 96 |
| 9 | Jan Hackett - Tom Hackett | 105 | 30 | David Featherstone - John Sherlock | 95 |
| 11 | Bijan Assaee - Margaret Klassen | 104 | 31 | Ron Lorraway - Jan Dooner | 94 |
| 11 | Bev Crossman - Bruce Crossman | 104 | 31 | Bernard Nightingale - Nimal Weerasinghe | 94 |
| 13 | Tim Healy - Helen Healy | 103 | 33 | Tom Moss - Dennis Zines | 93 |
| 14 | Don Scown - Judy Scown | 102 | 33 | Gary Lynn - Peter Tootell | 93 |
| 15 | Pat Oyston - Martin Oyston | 101 | 33 | Leigh Foran - Theo Mangos | 93 |
| 16 | Denise Keenan - Dawn Swabey | 100 | 33 | Jim Freston - Eugene Gordon | 93 |
| 16 | Margaret Millar - John Millar | 100 | 33 | Dianne Mullin - Eddie Mullin | 93 |
| 18 | Paul Weaver - Terry Bodycote | 99 | 33 | Sue Pynt - Heather Williams | 93 |
| 18 | Tony Berger - Eva Berger | 99 | 39 | Ken Storr - Phaik Yao | 92 |
| 18 | Deborah Cooper - Bruce Batchelor | 99 | 40 | Sue Moffitt - Ken Moffitt | 91 |
|  |  |  | 40 | Di Coats - Janet Clarke | 91 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Leading Scores Open Final A | S1+S2 |  | Leading Scores Open Final B | S1+S2 |
|  | Mike Cornell - Ashley Bach | 58.89 |  | Pauline Gumby - Warren Lazer | 62.65 |
| 2 | Taufik Asbi - Robert Parasian | 57.25 |  | Zhenghong Xu - Aiping Zhu | 57.37 |
| 3 | Magnus Moren - Neville Francis | 57.00 |  | Tony Hutton - Malcolm Carter | 55.89 |
|  | Joan Waldvogel - Max Wigbout | 55.90 |  | Felicity Beale - Robbie Van Riel | 55.51 |
| 5 | Edward Levy - Marshall Lewis | 55.68 |  | Watson Zhou - Michael Chen | 55.28 |
| 6 | Franky Karwur - Julius George | 55.18 |  | Stephen Fischer - Marianne Bookallil | 54.63 |
| 7 | Terry Brown - Avinash Kanetkar | 54.27 |  | Joan Butts - Dave Debbage | 54.17 |
|  | Leading Scores Open Final C | S1+S2 |  | Leading Scores Open Final D | S1+S2 |
|  | Steve Boughey - Andrew Tarbutt | 60.63 |  | Jane Dawson - Kieran Dyke | 61.32 |
| 2 | Shane Harrison - Maxim Henbest | 56.69 |  | Rose Don - Michael Courtney | 57.83 |
| 3 | Anthony Burke - Peter Gill | 56.55 |  | Helena Dawson - Richard Douglas | 57.70 |
| 4 | Bill Hirst - Phil Gue | 55.40 |  | Bob Hurley - Evelyn Hurley | 57.19 |
| 5 | Patrick Carter - Julie Atkinson | 55.06 |  | Sue Ingham - Howard Melbourne | 56.35 |
| 6 | Jane Skipper - John Skipper | 54.89 |  | James Wallis - Siegfried Konig | 54.66 |
| 7 | Nicky Strasser - Michael Whibley | 53.64 |  | Paul Cruickshank - Winston Guymer | 54.10 |
|  | Leading Scores Open Final E | S1+S2 |  | Leading Scores Open Final F | S1+S2 |
| 1 | Andrew Peake - Elizabeth Adams | 61.47 |  | Annette Maluish - Hugh Grosvenor | 65.28 |
| 2 | Hamish Brown - Brett Glass | 57.41 |  | Bruce Tier - Ian Price | 61.54 |
| 3 | Judy Johnson - Joan Mccarthy | 57.34 |  | Lusje Bojoh - Julita Tueje | 56.53 |
| 4 | Christine Duckworth - Brian Callaghan | 54.56 |  | Marlene Watts - Michael Prescott | 55.81 |
| 5 | Geoff Eyles - Anne Somerville | 54.42 |  | Dee Harley - Anna St Clair | 55.54 |
| 6 | Chris Watson - Shirley Watson | 53.85 |  | Leigh Owens - Jan Smith | 53.84 |
| 7 | Nikolas Moore - Geoff Martin | 53.49 |  | Tony Allen - Kelela Allen | 53.79 |
|  | Leading Scores Open Final G | S1+S2 |  |  |  |
| 1 | Patrick Bugler - Yolanda Carter | 58.18 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Ivy Luck - Ralph Parker | 57.45 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Attilio De Luca - Susan Emerson | 56.71 |  |  |  |
| 4 | Peter Bach - Setsuko Lichtnecker | 54.93 |  |  |  |
| 5 | Kevin Steffensen - Carolyn Miller | 54.62 |  |  |  |
| 6 | Julia Hoffman - Noelene Law | 54.06 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Steve Baron - Moss Wylie | 54.02 |  |  |  |
| Seniors |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Leading Scores Seniors Final A | S1+S2 |  | Leading Scores Seniors Final B | S1+S2 |
| 1 | Richard Brightling - David Hoffman | 63.07 |  | Jan Davis - Tim Davis | 59.01 |
|  | Martin Bloom - Nigel Rosendorff | 55.61 |  | Bruce Marr - Merle Marr | 58.17 |
| 3 | Steven Bock - Helen Milward | 55.39 |  | Alison Fallon - Gordon Fallon | 56.91 |


|  | Seniors |  |  | 55.22 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | Robert Milward - Les Grewcock | 54.38 | 4 | Patsy Walters - Lynne Geursen |
| 5 | Stan Klofa - Alex Czapnik | 54.31 | 5 | Lorraine Schaap - John Mottram |
| 6 | Peter Grant - Tony Marinos | 53.82 | 6 | John Luck - Terence O'Dempsey |
| 7 | Richard Wallis - Sue Picus | 53.41 | 7 | Johan Roose - Judith Roose-Driver |

## Novice

| 4 | Georgina Howitt - Ann Carter |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 | Leanne Nugent - Jenny Iliescu |
| 6 | Jenny Mawson - Cherry Barnett |
| 7 | Narelle Jackson - Jane Ackman |



## DIRECTING AT THE "TAIL-END"

By John Mcllrath

For the Pairs Qualifying together with our guest Irish Director Diarmuid (Aussie pronunciation of Dermot) Reddan we were assigned the Novice Pairs and we certainly had a lot of fun directing this section.

We decided to record all the player calls, "Director, please!", and came up with the following statistics.
In session 1, we recorded no less than 26 calls with the most common reason being:

1. Revoke, both established and non-established ones; and
2. Insufficient bids

During session 2, after dinner, the number of calls escalated when we received 36 calls. Again the major calls referred to:

## 1. Insufficient bids; and

2. Revokes.

So, can we give any advice, relating to the laws, to this group of players?
Revoke: When partner does not follow suit are you aware that you can ask partner "Having no more $\qquad$ partner?"
Whilst the revoke has occurred, it has not yet been established, so you are able to change your card, on that trick. Of course the incorrect card originally played does become a major penalty card. BUT, there is no transfer of tricks to your opponents because of the infraction.

Insufficient bids: These bids usually occur following distractions such as deciding on your bid, considering the auction to date, thinking of the impact of your call and any number of other factors.

When your opponents do make an insufficient bid, the director will offer the next player the option of accepting the bid (and treating it as legal) or offering the insufficient bidder other options which may include sanctions against partner's further bidding.

Take hand 13 from the afternoon session: Both you (North) and East pass and partner opens 1A and West bids $1 \star$ - yes, the dreaded insufficient bid ... and don't I feel stupid!!. With the following cards, should you accept the insufficient bid?

- Q 9
- 10873
-Q 97
\& Q 1076
If you accept the 1* bid (no further ruling or penalties), you could now bid 18, to show partner your 4-card major, however if you do not accept it, West may make their bid good and sufficient to $2 \downarrow$. Now you can employ the negative $X$. This will show at least a 4 -card major but less than 10 points and probably tolerance in the unbid minor suit. At the table the player did accept the insufficient bid, but chose to bid 1 NT , to me denying the other major and therefore N/S missed their 4-4 heart fit.
Try this one, you are North and on board 4 in the evening, and hold:

| A K 87 | West | North | East South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\vee 32$ |  | Pass | Pass Pass |
| J 10732 | 1NT | Pass | $2 \downarrow[$ Tfr $]$ |

* A 72

On the auction above what would you do with this hand over the insufficient $2 \checkmark$ bid?

After due consideration, North elected to treat the $2 V$ as legal, and I thought great so now she can show partner her Spade support and bid 2S. No, I was wrong ... she placed that diagonal line on the bidding pad and had therefore been thinking along other lines. East still bid 4 V .

They kept us busy and we hope they enjoyed their two sessions of qualifying bridge at this great tournament.
A NICE ENDPLAY
Barry Rigal
David Weston found a nice endplay here as West to bring home 4V.

| Dealer: East | A Q 1072 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - K 2 |  |  |  | Pass | Pass |  |
| Brd 18 | - A 1086 |  | 10 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |  |
|  | \& 964 |  | 24 [GF] | Pass | 3\% | Pass |  |
| A AK 86 |  | A J 93 | 30 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |  |
| -AJ107543 |  | $\bullet 8$ | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - K Q |  | - J 543 |  | Make | le Con | acts |  |
| \& --- |  | \& K Q 1082 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | A 54 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | A |
|  | - Q 96 |  | 4 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -972 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& A J 753 |  | 2 | - | 3 | - | 8 |

Weston set up an artificial game force with his $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ call then opted to play hearts. After a low spade lead he was in with a chance. He carefully put in dummy's nine and when it won he led a heart to his jack. North won the king and shifted to a club to the king, ruffed, Now West carefully led the $\forall Q$ from his hand,. North took the ace and returned a diamond. Weston won, cashed $\vee A$, then $₫ A$ and exited in hearts to South, leaving that player on lead with only the minors left to force an entry to dummy.

## NEC ROUND 10

After a quiet 3NT, with every card well placed for N/S, we came to a different kettle of fish.

| Dealer: South | AK10942 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: All | - AK65 |  | Dubinin | Holland | Gromov | Hallberg |
| Brd 23 | - Q |  |  |  |  | 1 * |
|  | \& 1084 |  | $2 \vee$ | 24 | Pass | 3\% |
| A Q 76 |  | A AJ5 3 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| マQJ1073 |  | $\checkmark 82$ |  |  |  |  |
| - 7 |  | -J9653 | Hackett | Drijver | Senior | Brink |
| \& A 62 |  | \& Q 7 |  |  |  | 1* |
|  | A 8 |  | $2 \vee$ | 24 | Pass | 3* |
|  | $\checkmark 4$ |  | Pass | 3NT | Pass | $4 \%$ |
|  | - AK 10842 |  | Pass | 4 | Pass | 5\% |
|  | *KJ953 |  | All Pass |  |  |  |

Brink avoided the spade lead against $5 \%$, but he had to take two top hearts at once to pitch the spade, and when he led $\& 10$ it was covered by the queen and ducked. He unblocked diamonds and played a second trump, and Hackett won to play a third trump, leaving declarer with two slow diamond losers for down one.

3NT looked a more comfortable spot, given the lie of the clubs, but West was going to be able to duck his ※A twice and leave declarer with no entries to dummy. As it was, though, Holland ducked the heart lead, and a shift to a spade to the $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\uparrow J}$ for a diamond through left Holland without any tricks at all. He elected to win $\diamond Q$ and take the top hearts, then lead a club to the king, and the roof fell in. The defenders had the whole heart suit to run plus two tricks in each black suit, and that meant 400 for Russia and 7 imps. They led 13-8.
Just for the record if declarer wins the heart lead and advances the $\& 10$, East must not cover. The defenders duck the first two clubs, and declarer cannot quite do it. If East covers the first club the diligent reader may care to work out how 3NT can be made - solution tomorrow.

DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU


YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU


DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

## SERVICES

If you stick to The Gold Coast Congress sponsoring restaurants you'll stay healthy of course. But should the need for a DOCTOR arise there's Broadbeach Medical Centre 07-5531-6344 one block south of the venue on the seaward side of the highway. Should you need after hours attention call 07-5531-1224.
Should a BABYSITTER be required call Cathie at Gold Coast Nannies 0431-301-916. All Nannies carry current Blue Card and Senior First Aid Certificate including CPR for children.
If you are feeling stiff and sore give Sue and her mobile MASSAGE team a call on 0466-284-114. Take a look at their complimentary gift offer on page 58A of Hello Gold Coast magazine and Sue's 'love it or your money back' motto.

## YOUR BULLETIN

The Bulletin belongs to the players and your editors are always on the lookout for material. This can include Well-played hand $\bullet$ Well bid hand $\bullet$ Well defended hand $\bullet$ Act of sportsmanship $\bullet$ An amusing story.

In all cases we will happily write up your submission if you simply provide the details - please include session and board number and as much detail as you can You can make a submission (1) using the Bulletin Submission Box near the Bridge Administration Desk (2) email the editors on gcb@thesterns.com.au (3) send a text to 0411-111-655 or (4) collar one of the editors onsite.

