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WINNERS OF 0-50 DUPLICATE


Winners N/S - Warren Moore and Gary Jenkins
Winners E/W - Gordon Stone and Gwyneth Jenkins
Wednesday morning saw a strong turnout of 27 tables for the 0-50 Masterpoint Pairs. Both winning pairs scored $59 \%$ - no mean feat at any level of the game. These players are the future of our Novice, Restricted and Intermediate tournaments and eventually Open (we hope). So welcome to the world of Tournament Bridge and we hope you enjoyed the experience.

## TABLE COUNT

Tables count to the end of play was 5484 versus 5323 last year


Meegs Boutique Dots and Dashes Theme Prize to Ros Warnock Valerie Isle Cassie Morin Helen Arentz

TEAMS QUALIFYING ROUNDS 3 AND 4
Barry Rigal
Justin Howard brought this to the bulletin's attention.


Consider the deal as a single-dummy problem. (Just look at the N/S cards if you want to test yourself). You play $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ as South on an unopposed sequence after you show a strong balanced hand and partner transfers to spades then offers a choice of games. You win the diamond lead in hand, capturing East's queen, lead a low
heart to the king and ace, and play a low spade to the jack and queen. West wins his $\forall \mathrm{K}$ and, somewhat to your surprise, plays a third diamond. In which hand do you ruff it, and what is your plan?
ANSWER: Ruff in hand, pitching clubs from dummy, and cash the \&A. When East shows out (no huge surprise there) do not try to cross to dummy in hearts. Instead, first cash \& A K. As the cards reveal, the fall of the $\& \mathrm{Q}$ lets you pitch dummy's hearts and avoid the risk of the ruff. Today your precautions are necessary. If the club queen doesn't fall, you would need the second round of hearts to live. But you might as well take your extra chance.

| Dealer: East Vul: N -S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK } 642 \\ & \bullet K 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | West | North | East Pass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { South } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 18 | -Q 1075 |  | Pass | 1^ | Pass | 1NT |  |
| Open Tms Qual R4 | * A K Q |  | Pass | 2* [GF] | Pass | 24 |  |
| - 53 |  | A Q J 87 | Pass | 3NT | All pass |  |  |
| $\checkmark 9742$ |  | - J10865 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -K64 |  | - A 8 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| -10942* |  | -6 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A A 109 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 932 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | - |
|  | \& J 875 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\%$ |

Andy Hung, a fertile source of material for this bulletin (thanks Andy!). provided this mea culpa, but I'm not sure he did anything wrong. He went down in 3NT as he played along straightforward lines and didn't see the squeeze possibilities partly because West led an attitude low heart. So he placed West with the heart length and East the spade length. He won the heart king and tried to sneak a spade through East, which didn't work when East split his honours. Hung won and passed the spade ten to East, who played back a heart, tangling declarer's entries irremediably.
The winning line is to play four rounds of clubs at once, to squeeze East in three suits. The best play would be to win the heart in hand with the queen, unblock dummy's top clubs (East discarding a diamond) and play a low spade. East plays the queen, for South's ace, and playing the club jack now will squeeze East. He cannot pitch his diamond ace, and if he discards a heart you can play on diamonds and lose only two hearts and two diamonds. If he pitches a spade, you duck a spade and take three spades, four clubs and two hearts.
If East doesn't play a spade honour at his first turn, you put in the spade nine and you can still try for spades 33 later, if need be.


## OPEN TEAMS QUALIFYING ROUND FIVE Barry Rigal

For the first round of the second day I would watch Julian Foster and David Weston take on new Oz Internationals Michael Courtney and Paul Wyer. The cards set huge problems for both E/W pairs, and with both N/S pairs playing extremely well, there were two pairs of unhappy campers coming back to score up.

Dealer: North
AK 1095
Vul: None ----
Brd 1
-A Q J 65
Open Tms Qual R5 \& A 962
A Q J 62
$\checkmark 109$
-9 3
\& J 10843
かA874
$\forall A J 82$
$\bullet 872$

$\bullet K Q$

A 3
VKQ76543
K 104
\& 75

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weston | Courtney Foster | Wyer |  |
|  | 1 | Pass | $1 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | $\uparrow$ |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| - | 3 | - | 3 |  |
| - | - | - | - | 0 |

Some people will have strong feelings as to whether it is sacrilege, or winning bridge to double $1 \star$ as East. Put me in the doubling camp. Minors, as they say, like vulnerability, are for children. And Bobby Wolff has persuaded me that quick and dirty is the way into such auctions.
Carter doubled 1 and Hirst jumped to 4V, buoyed by the double fit, he thought. Foster sedately passed, and Wyer was allowed to buy the hand uncontested in $2 \downarrow$. With eight tricks the limit, Carter had first blood at 5-0.

| Dealer: East | AK4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A Q 62 |  |
| Brd 2 | -107 |  |
| Open Tms Qual R5 | *AK 873 |  |
| か J 862 |  | A Q 53 |
| - KJ 8 |  | $\checkmark 10973$ |
| - K Q J |  | - 862 |
| * Q 64 |  | \& J 105 |

```
* A10 97
\bullet
* A 954 
&92
```

| West | North East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weston | Courtney Foster | Wyer |
|  | Pass | Pass |

1NT Double All pass

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

It is never a great idea to sacrifice against your opponents no-trump game in no-trump, but for sure it is best to do so at the one-level, and at favourable vulnerability! Courtney led a low club against 1NTx and Weston won in dummy to lose the heart finesse. Courtney cashed out the clubs, and Wyer pitched a heart and two diamonds, declarer a spade then the VK. When Courtney exited with $\$ 10$ declarer came to two diamonds and a spade for down three and -500 . The winning defence was to lead $\uparrow \mathrm{KK}$. When it held, Courtney could then have cashed $\vee$ A and played a second spade for down four. The difference turned out to be quite expensive, since 3NT made 600 in the other room on a club lead (there is no defence to the game if declarer ducks an early heart and gives up a club), then sets up diamonds or spades according to what suit the defenders attack. It was 5-3 now to Carter.
(P.S. Our teammates heard the auction go: pass pass 1\&. Christine Duckworth passed, then passed out Brian Callaghan's reopening double. When East didn't run she was allowed to lead three rounds of trumps, then ruff out the diamonds for a cool down 1100!).

| Dealer: West | AKJ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - AJ9754 |  |
| Brd 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \quad \text { J } 975 \\ & * 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| AQ97532 |  | A 1064 |
| $\checkmark$ Q |  | $\checkmark 10862$ |
| - Q 4 |  | -K102 |
| \& Q 1092 |  | \& A 87 |
|  | A A 8 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 3 |  |
|  | - A 863 |  |
|  | \&KJ543 |  |

I thought Paul Wyer was a worth a 4* cuebid over 3NT, but he has seen enough of Michael Courtney's bidding to take nothing for granted. Courtney received a spade lead to $4 V$ and immediately led a club to the jack - playing Weston to have something more like a hand than a foot (how many boards has he played
against him?). Weston won the $\& Q$ and shifted to $\forall Q$, trying to be the hero - but a simple spade return sets the game (because it sets up cashable winners in the spade suit whereas the diamond play only establishes one trick).

Now Courtney had a relatively easy chance to make the game: win the $\star$ A, ruff a club, cross to the VK and ruff another club, then play three rounds of hearts, giving East his trump trick but leaving the defenders just one diamond winner. After a transposition, this was exactly the line Phil Gue played in the other room, and he had brought home ten tricks. The subtle difference from what Courtney did was that he crossed to the AA to remove his own entry to the clubs. Now when he played $\vee A$ and $V K$ then led a winning club, Foster could ruff and exit in spades, with two diamond winners to come.
With the datum N/S +620 this was clearly a rather harder hand than it might look for declarer, since on the surface of it the club guess brings home 10 tricks without raising a sweat.
It was 16-5 to Gue now, with the next board potentially swinging large numbers of imps each way.


In the other room Hutton doubled 4A and East did well to pass - in a sense though, had he removed to 4NT E/W would have played $5 \vee$. The defenders led a top heart and could (should) have shifted to clubs to take the ruff. +200 and +50 gave Carter 6 imps when, if everyone had done perfectly, Gue could have collected 12 imps. 16-11 now for Gue.

| Dealer: South | A K J 10 |  | West | North | East | South Wyer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - K 73 |  | Weston | Courtney Foster |  |  |  |
| Brd 7 | - 5 |  |  |  |  | $1{ }^{1}$ |  |
| Open Tms Qual R5 | \& K J 9 8 5 4 |  | Pass | $2 v$ | 3 | Pass |  |
| ヘQ8532 |  | A A 96 | Pass | 4* | 4* | All pass |  |
| $\checkmark 1094$ |  | $\checkmark 62$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & \& \quad \text { Q } 1032 \end{aligned}$ |  | - AKQ 10843 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \& 7 | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A 74 |  | 1 | - | - | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - A Q J 85 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 962 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
|  | \& A 6 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\%$ |

On this deal the reverse of my comments from the previous deal applies. Courtney's $2 v$ raise looks remarkable to me (it is surely closest to a limit raise with four trumps or the like)? Foster thought he had eight tricks in his own hand and was disappointed - but not as much as he would have been had he been doubled. In the other room Hirst-Gue bid smoothly to $4 \vee$ after a $2 / 1$ auction (which would have been equally fine by me - after all who wouldn't open the North cards?). After a diamond lead Hirst guessed spades and came home with 11 tricks in a canter for a gain of 8 imps to make it 24-11 now to Gue.

After a quiet partscore deal, the most interesting declarer play problem of the set came up.

## DIRECTOR'S TIP - HESITATION

Hesitation is not an infraction in itself. An infraction occurs when their partner is influenced by the hesitation in the action they take.

Hesitation generally reduces the options available to partner. They may not take any action that is suggested by the hesitation where other logical alternatives to that action exist.

| Dealer: North | A K 65 |  | West | North | East | South Wyer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 96$ |  | Weston | Courtney | Foster |  |  |
| Brd 9 | -K8532 |  |  | Pass | 1 V | Pass |  |
| Open Tms Qual R5 | \& Q 43 |  | 14 | Pass | 30 | Pass |  |
| A 109732 |  | A A J 4 | 4 | All pass |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 4$ |  | -AQ108752 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 4 |  | -6 |  | Makeab | le Cont | acts |  |
| \& K J 985 |  | \& A 7 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A Q 8 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | A |
|  | - K J 3 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -Q J 1097 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 1062 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - | \% |

Spades looks a far and away the easiest game to play, but nobody did anything stupid for Foster to play 4V. After a top diamond lead, should you finesse spades or hearts? Most played on hearts but I can see the case for either approach. Foster lost the heart finesse, ruffed the diamond return, played ace and another heart, and Wyer forced declarer again. Foster took a long time now, but after cashing off a few trumps, he played the top clubs and finessed in spades and had to go down one. Let's revisit the ending:

```
A K 6 5
* ---
*
& Q4 }
A A J 4
\(\vee 2\)
\(\&--\)
\(\& \quad 7\)
A Q 8 
```

A 1097

- ---
---
\& K J 9

In this position you will note that North has still to make a discard. He does best to pitch a club, perhaps, but now if declarer leads a low spade to the ten and king, a spade exit will probably persuade declarer to rise with the ace, and now the club finesse is no longer necessary. Maybe South must shift to a low club from his remaining doubleton?
l'd back declarer in this ending, but frankly the game of bluff and double-bluff is far too complex for me (and with Michael Courtney as my opponent l'd probably do best to shuffle my cards and let him pick one).

Since $4 \checkmark$ down one gained 7 IMPs (they played 3NT down four in the other room after West bid 3NT over 4V and East passed it) Gue actually now led 31-13.

There was one more big swing, when Carter-Hutton bid to the better game here:

| Dealer: North | A 8743 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -A6 |  | Hutton | Gue | Carter | Hirst |  |
| Brd 13 | -KJ865 |  |  |  | 1\% | Pass |  |
| Open Tms Qual R5 | \& 87 |  | $1 *$ [ $V$ 's] | Double | 1NT | Pass |  |
| A 6 |  | A AKQ 5 | 3NT | All pass |  |  |  |
| - J10532 |  | $\checkmark 97$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 7 |  | - Q103 |  | Makeab | le Cont | acts |  |
| \&KQ642 |  | \& J 953 | 2 | - | 2 | - | NT |
|  | A J 1092 |  | - | - | - | - | 4 |
|  | - KQ 84 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 942 |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& A 10 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | 9 |

Weston-Foster had an inelegant auction to $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ down a trick. Hirst led a top spade against 3NT, and Carter played it well, winning in hand to lead a club to dummy and a diamond to Gue's king. Gue needed to cash the VA now, but when he played a second spade, declarer knocked out the \&A and after a third spade declarer claimed nine tricks. The match finished 31-25 for Gue.

## OPEN TEAMS QUALIFYING ROUND SIX

Barry Rigal
Desperate times breed desperate measures, and there can be few moves as desperate as pressing your author into service for a second match - his second in as many days, no less.

This time I was making Marshall Lewis, and based on his pairs bidding I could see one would need to be a real soldier to field Marshall...

We would play against John Newman and Joe Haffer, and we encountered a wild set of deals, on which imps would be distributed like confetti.

We struck the first blow, albeit a small one, on the first board by missing our cold 3NT (with a combined 20 HCP) to defend 3a down 300 - we hadn't yet warmed up our doubling cards. Teammates conceded a club partscore in normal fashion.
The next deal tested partnership faith and agreements:
Holding a 6-3-0-4 13-count you open 1A, hear 1NT to your left, and $2 \star$ from partner; of course...but you dimly recall that as the match was starting Marshall had told you 'transfers after their 1NT overcall'. You unconfidently alert the 2 call and RHO enquires, then doubles. Maybe it is wisest to pass but you do fit hearts after all, so you bid $2 \boldsymbol{V}$ and now 3 to your left comes back to you. Do you tempt fate and bid again? I did, and partner broods on this (oh dear!) and bids 4 V . RHO also broods but passes and there you are. After the $\downarrow \mathrm{A}$ lead this is the full deal:

| Dealer: North Vul. None | $\text { A } 1064$ $\vee \mathrm{A} 3$ |  | West | North <br> Pass | East | South 1NT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 17 | -KJ65 |  | 2* | Double | $2 \vee$ | $3 \vee$ |  |
| Open Tms Qual R6 | \& 10653 |  | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |  |
| $\uparrow$ |  | AKQJ875 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 986542$ |  | - Q J 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -109743 |  | - | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ A 8 |  | *KJ42 | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A A 932 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 10 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A Q 82 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | * |
|  | \& Q 97 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\%$ |

You merrily crossruff diamonds and spades, establishing the latter as discards for the former, and emerge with 10 tricks in the form of two spades two clubs three diamond ruffs and three trumps in dummy. Easy game who needs high-cards? Since teammates had played 2NT down one, that was 9 imps to the good guys.
After an entertaining flat board (3NT down one after nice defence by Jenner-O'Shea/Doecke while our opponents did well to get out for down one in 4 on a $4-4$ fit splitting $5-0$ ) it was time to spill more blood.
AKJ76
-AJ1032
-K
\& 1063
Another routine auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lewis | Newman | Rigal | Haffer |
|  |  |  | 14 |
| Pass | 2NT | 4NT | 5\% |

Double ?
Newman looked with disfavour on his minimum hand, but I think partner should have a club void for this auction and your cards are working overtime. I'm not sure if this is right or wrong, but Haffer could not bid on over $5 \uparrow$ and that was 11 imps away. The field was split, with roughly $1 / 3$ of them bidding slam here.

The boards quietened down (at least in terms of imps scored) but then our opponents were set an awkward defensive problem in the bidding and play.

| Dealer: South | A Q 97 |  | West | North | East | South Haffer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark 108$ |  | Lewis | Newman Rigal |  |  |  |
| Brd 23 | - AK J 843 |  |  |  |  | 19 |  |
| Open Tms Qual R6 | \& 98 |  | Dbl. | 2 | Pass | 27 |  |
| A 8543 |  | A A 102 | Pass | Pass | 3\% | All |  |
| $\checkmark$ K J |  | $\checkmark 95$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q1096 |  | - 75 |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
| \& AK 4 |  | \&1076532 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | A K J 6 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | A |
|  | -AQ76432 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -2 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& Q J |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\%$ |

Into the valley of death...when Haffer led a his singleton diamond to the ten and jack it certainly wasn't clear what to do next. Newman cashed a second diamond, and then had to lead a low diamond to kill the discard. When he shifted to a spade that allowed me to draw two rounds of trumps and ruff out the $\downarrow$ K, with the $\uparrow 4$ as entry. A spade switch would work here, but not if the $\uparrow J$ and $\uparrow 2$ are switched. Teammates had played $3 V$ and stolen an overtrick for +170 for 7 IMPs in. A surprising percentage of the field were allowed to make $4 \checkmark$ when West did not manage to cash his clubs before the rats got at them.

The next deal was not my finest hour. I suspect quite a few players in the field were faced with an equivalent position to mine:

| Dealer: West | $\uparrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark$ KQ6 |  |
| Brd 24 | - A 10987642 |  |
| Open Tms Qua | \& A J |  |
| AKJ643 |  | A A 85 |
| - J 10972 |  | $\checkmark$ A 854 |
| - |  | - K J 3 |
| ¢ 1095 |  | ¢K 83 |
|  | ^ Q 10972 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 3$ |  |
|  | - Q 5 |  |
|  | *Q7642 |  |

In my defence, I can say that finding $\diamond$ Qx in dummy AND a singleton heart AND partner with not just zero defensive tricks but strongly negative defence for his invitational jump was unlucky (though as we have said, when it is Marshal Lewis all bets are off). We did at least beat $4 * x$ a trick, not much compensation when we were cold for $4 \boldsymbol{V}$. However teammates rescued us, by racking up 510 in an almost identical fashion in $4 * x$ on the disastrous if natural VA lead. As many pairs made game in doubled diamond contracts as made the heart game. The datum was $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+90$.

| Dealer: North | 97 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vul: E-W |  |
| Brd 25 |  |

Open Tms Qual R6 \& AK Q J 532

| A A 102 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark 10853$ |  |
| -K53 |  |
| \& 864 |  |
|  | - 83 |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q9 4 |
|  | -QJ10874 |
|  | \& 107 |

AKQJ654
-KJ6

- A 62
\& 9

| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |  |
| - | - | - | - | NT |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | $\uparrow$ |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | $\uparrow$ |
| - | 1 | - | 1 |  |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | $\AA$ |

After we started writing up the set, we got a call from Michael Cornell, ever the laziest of analysts, asking how to beat 4n. it looks fairly easy, doesn't it? Lead a diamond, win the VQ after declarer draws trumps, clear the diamonds, and wait for partner to underlead in clubs to allow you to cash out. Since three tables (where Glen Campbell/Robert Harvey, Diane Wilkinson/Val Acklin and Lech Kaszubski/Chris Dibley were defending) did beat $4 \uparrow$ after the $\downarrow$ lead l'm assuming that the play must have gone in exactly this fashion. And if I'm wrong please don't spoil my dreams!

## BARRY＇S PROBLEMS

## Barry Rigal

| All <br> North | A 43 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bullet 97$ |  |  |
|  | －AJ87543 \＆J 2 |  |  |
|  | $*$ $*$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK } 1065 \\ & \vee A K 1062 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Pass | Pass |  |
| 14 | 2 | 24 | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Opening Lead $\mathbf{\$}^{\mathbf{7}}$ |  |  |  |

Against three no－trump West led a high club spot to his partner＇s ace for a shift to the spade nine，covered by the spade 10 and won by the spade jack．

Back came a club to the jack and queen and your king．How should you play the diamonds？


#### Abstract

ANSWER At the NEC tournament a field of 64 teams reduces to eight using a Swiss Teams formula，with a knock－out event to follow．The field normally includes up to 16 of the world＇s stronger teams and a contingent of local Japanese squads． In today＇s deal game was bid and made seven times－－eight if you count the result of three spades doubled making nine tricks by one East－West pair．David Bakhshi of England as South was one of the careful declarers who brought home three no－trump by a nice exercise in counting．


North，David Gold，did not consider he had enough for a vulnerable pre－empt；however，his delayed route into the auction persuaded his partner to take a shot at the no－trump game．
West led a high club spot to the club ace for a shift to the spade nine， covered by the spade 10 and won by the spade jack．
West now went back to clubs，persuading declarer that the spades were 4－3 and that West also had five clubs，or East would surely either have continued the suit at trick two or put in the queen at trick one．

That being the case，Bakhshi cashed the heart ace and king，and when West showed out he knew to take the diamond finesse against West rather than to play for the drop，since West had to have three diamonds to make up his 13 cards．

| All | ค 43 |
| :---: | :---: |
| North | $\checkmark 97$ |
|  | －AJ87543 <br> －J J 2 |
| ヘ A Q J 2 | － 987 |
| $\checkmark 8$ | ヤQJ543 |
| －Q 106 | －9 |
| \＆97653 | \＆A Q 108 |
|  | AK 1065 |
|  | －AK1062 |
|  | －K2 |
|  | ＊K 4 |

## EYES ON THE PRIZE

## Brent Manley

As the 72 squads in the Restricted Teams at the Gold Coast Congress sat down to play on Wednesday，the team captained by Jeanette Weaver was fielding a 14 －year partnership（Weaver and Lori Neville）and the winners of the Restricted Pairs Final C－relatively new partners Leslie Treasure and Kelly Barber．
The team was formed at the Peninsula Bridge Club in Warriewood（Sydney area）．The foursome started off Wednesday with a 33－20 victory，featuring some nice play at both tables．

This one was one of their swings．

| Dealer：North | － 952 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul：N－S | －J 6 |  |
| Brd 5 | －AJ743 |  |
| Rest Tms Qual R5 | \＆J 83 |  |
| A 73 |  | A 4 |
| －AK9742 |  | $\checkmark$ Q1053 |
| －KQ5 |  | －1096 |
| ＊K2 |  | \＆A10954 |
|  | ＾AK Q J 1086 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 8$ |  |
|  | －82 |  |
|  | \＆Q 76 |  |


| West | North <br> Barber | East | South <br> Treasure |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2レ | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $\mathbf{2 \uparrow}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | - | NT |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | $\uparrow$ |
| 5 | - | 5 | - | $\varnothing$ |
| - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | $\dot{\%}$ |

Apart from her strong spade suits，Treasure＇s hand was not that good and the vulnerability was not favourable， so she went quietly．Barber led a spade，taken by Treasure to switch to the $\downarrow$ ．West put up the king and

Barber won with the ace. The $\$ 8$ looked like a singleton, so Barber made the reasonable play of returning the suit. Dummy's $\uparrow 9$ held and declarer was soon claiming 11 tricks for plus 450.
At the other table, Weaver and Neville had a more difficult assignment.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Neville |  | Weaver |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1^ |
| Double | 2 | $3 \vee$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| $5 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

South led two high spades, the second ruffed by Weaver. She pulled trumps in two rounds then cashed the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and played a club to the ace. When she ruffed a club in dummy and both opponents followed she had two winning clubs in hand. She returned to her hand with a trump and tossed two of dummy's diamonds on the good clubs. She lost only a diamond and a spade for plus 450 and a push. Had she gone down on a different line of play, the team would have lost 11 IMPs .
On the following board, Neville was aided by the defence, but she had embarked on the winning line of play anyway and didn't need the assist.


North led a low diamond and Neville took the $\uparrow 9$ with ace. At trick two she played the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} 10$ and ran it to South's queen. South returned the $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0}$, covered by the jack, queen and ace. Neville now had a handful of good clubs, so she didn't need to risk another finesse in spades, although it would have been successful had she needed it.

After winning with the \&A, Neville started on trumps, playing the $\vee$ A and continuing with the $\vee 10$. The defenders got only the two trump tricks and the spade. Neville had plus 620.
At the other table, the opponents didn't reach 4V, stopping in three and making only nine tricks for plus 140. The difference was worth 10 IMPs to the Weaver team.
There were other swings for the Weaver team, including this one early in the match.

| Dealer: East Vul: N-S | A K 4 |  | West | North <br> Barber | East | South <br> Treasure |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 2 | -107 |  |  |  | Pass | Pass |  |
| Rest Tms Qual R5 | \& AK 873 |  | 1 | Double | Pass | 14 |  |
| AJ862 |  | A Q 53 | Pass | 2\% | Pass | 2NT |  |
| -KJ 8 |  | -10973 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| -KQJ |  | - 862 |  | Makeab | le Con | acts |  |
| \& Q 64 |  | \& J 105 | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A A 1097 |  | - | 4 | - | 3 | 4 |
|  | $\checkmark 54$ |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 9543 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 92 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | 9 |

West started with the $\leqslant$, ducked by Treasure. She won the diamond continuation and played a heart to dummy's queen, then a spade to her ace. At trick four, she played the $\uparrow 9$ and ducked in dummy. East won and played a spade to dummy's singleton king. The $3-3$ club split was a welcome sight to Treasure, giving her four clubs, two spades, two hearts and the $\forall A$ for nine tricks and plus 150 .

At the other table, North landed in a contract of $5 \boldsymbol{*}$, which can be made if declarer makes all the right moves in the play. It did not happen on this occasion, however, and the contract was two down for minus 200. That was 8 IMPs for Weaver and company.

On this board, the Weaver team benefited from a bidding accident.

| Dealer: West Vul: None | A AKJ2 <br> $\checkmark 75432$ |  | West | North Barber | East | South Treasure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 8 | - J 105 |  | Pass | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
|  | - 2 |  | Pass | 24 | Pass | Pass |
| A 1086 |  | AQ73 | 3\% | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $\bullet$ J 9 |  | $\checkmark$-KQ |  |  |  |  |
| - 632 |  | - Q 987 |  | Makea | Con |  |
| \& K Q 1083 |  | \& A 75 | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | A 954 |  |  | 1 | - | $\wedge$ |
|  | $\checkmark 1086$ |  | - | 2 | - | 2 |
|  | - AK 4 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | \&J 964 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 8 |

Barber did well to balance, pushing the opponents up one level. West's $3 \%$ bid was normal with her good club suit. Unfortunately for East-West, Barber and Treasure always have five tricks against 3*: three diamonds and two spades. The Weaver team was plus 50.

At the other table, Weaver opened the East hand with a $15-171$ NT, which was followed by two passes. North balanced with a bid of $2 \downarrow$, which apparently was meant to indicate possession of the major suits. South was not on the same page, however, and $2 \diamond$ became the final contract.
Deep Finesse indicates that North should make seven tricks in $2 \downarrow$, but declarer - no doubt upset at the developments in the auction - wound up three down for minus 150. That was 5 IMPs to Weaver. The team finished the day in 24th place.

## COMMON ERRORS AND HOW TO AVOID THEM

Brent Manley

In 2001, the director at a bridge club in New Mexico penalized an entire table two matchpoints for starting a board after he had called the round. Three of the players were experienced players and should have known better. The fourth was a newcomer who didn't play often. "I had only 18 masterpoints," the newcomer lamented. "Now I have only 16!"Said the director, "l'm tough, but not that tough."

## POOR OPENING LEADS

You, West, are on lead against 3NT after partner opened the bidding with 1V. You hold VQ 7 6. What is your choice? If you selected the $\vee 6$, you may wish to skip today's article.

Unfortunately, I have seen many inexperienced players start with the queen. This is disastrous when partner holds VA 10984 and declarer VK J5. Declarer is entitled to one trick in the heart suit, but the lead of the queen has given him a double stopper. If third hand plays low, declarer will win the king and later lead up to the jack. It's different if West starts with the V6. Partner can win the ace and return the suit. Declarer will probably play the jack, which will be taken by the queen. A third heart will establish two more tricks for East.

Even if declarer guesses to play the king, blocking the suit (opening leader cannot play the VQ because the PJ would then be good), West may be able to get in, cash the $V Q$ and reach partner's hand in another suit.
Say this is the layout of the diamond suit against a suit contract:
-6 5
-K732 *J 109
-Q 84
Leading the $\downarrow 2$ allows East to win the ace and continue with the $\checkmark$, trapping South's queen. Declarer takes no tricks in diamonds. The lead of the king will establish the $\downarrow$ Q for a trick declarer should not take.
As you gain experience, you will be able to recognize the rare occasion when it's right to lead the king from three or more to the honour. For now, content yourself with leading low. It will be the correct lead the vast majority of the time.

Continuing with the topic of opening leads, be sure to discuss with partner your opening lead style when he has overcalled or opened the bidding and you are leading his suit (always good for partnership harmony).

Say your left-hand opponent opened 1\&, partner overcalled 1 ( and RHO bid $1 \boldsymbol{A}$, eventually landing in $4 \boldsymbol{A}$. Here are two scenarios when you hold v8-6-3.
(1) You had enough high-card strength to boost partner to $2 \vee$ over RHO's $1 \uparrow$ bid.
(2) You didn't have enough to raise partner's overcall.

Is there a difference in what you lead in the two situations? Absolutely.
In the first situation, you should lead the $\mathbf{\vee}$, alerting partner that you have a poor holding (no honour) because you would lead low with at least one face card in the suit. Partner will use this information to help with the defensive game plan. After all, if partner knows you have a poor heart holding but raised anyway, he will infer correctly that you have high-card strength elsewhere in your hand.
In the second situation, you must lead a low heart. If you start with the V8, partner may play you for a doubleton and try to give you a ruff. That could be embarrassing if the defensive timing is screwed up or declarer gets a ruff-sluff.

## Did you know that benefits paid from Self-Managed Super Funds (SMSFs) are tax-free for the over 60s?

Retirement funding is essential and SMSFs have become a vital resource to provide an income stream throughout retirement.

Speak to Powers about how to establish and look after an SMSF with advice and structures that will save you unnecessary tax and compliance costs.

We work with you to ensure your finances can fund your retirement lifestyle. Our focus is always our clients' needs - we work as your partner, developing your SMSF structure with you and giving you the advice you need.


Contact Charles Page at Powers today to take control of your retirement.
charles.page@powers.net.au

0739062888
accountants \& Advisors powers.net.au


## Has your club discovered the benefits of Pianola?

Join James Ward, Pianola Founder, for a demonstration of Pianola's great features for managing your club and providing innovative analysis tools for players. Today (Thursday) at 2.15pm in Room 6

"I liked it so much I joined the company!"<br>John McIlrath, North Shore Bridge Club



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


Answer: A ducking good idea
The idea is to duck the lead, discard a club on the $\bullet \mathrm{A}$ and ruff a diamond, cross to VK and play $\oplus A, \AA K$, club ruff high. If clubs are $3-3$, you are home. Cross to dummy in trumps, draw the third trump if necessary and discard a spade on the thirteenth club. If West began with 4 clubs, play a heart to dummy. If trumps are 2-2, concede a club to West. West has to play a spade or give you a ruff-and-discard. If clubs are not 3-3 and the trumps are not 2-2. play for the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow A}$ onside.


## BRIDGE FOR THE IMPROVER

Ron Klinger
DIr: North Vul: N/S
North
A 875
-KQJ
-A 54
\& AK 32

South
AK 62

- A 109642
- 8
\& 764
Lead $\vee K$ against $4 \vee$ plan the play.

If you take the $\forall$ A trick one, East might come on lead on the third club and lead a high spade through the ak

```
AK 62
-A109642
- 8
\& 764
K 62
```

A A Q 3
A J 1094
$\bullet 87$
$\checkmark 53$
-K Q J 96

- 10754
* Q J 10
\& 985

A 875
$\bullet K$ Q J
-A 54
\& A K 32

## Paul Lavings Briidge Supplies - Demonstration

9AM THURSDAY 26TH FEBRUARY - MAIN PLAYING AREA A demonstration by Paul Lavings of products available from Paul Lavings Bridge Supplies

- Dealer4 and Dealer4+ Australian dealing machines
- Bidding blocks + travellers
- 6 varieties of playing cards for bridge clubs
- Duplicate boards + wallets
- Super Bridge Boxes for bidding - the perfect design


## MAKE A WISH - OUR CHARITY AGAIN IN 2015

The Queensland Bridge Association would like to announce that Make-A-Wish® Australia volunteers will be fundraising at the Gold Coast Bridge Congress on Monday $23^{\text {rd }}$ February (Front Door and top of Escalator) as well as Thursday $26^{\text {th }}$ February 2015 (Front Door). The aim of Make-A-Wish Australia is to grant wishes to children and young people across Australia with life-threatening medical conditions, giving them hope, strength and joy at a time when they need them most. Well over 7,000 wishes have been granted to children with life-threatening medical conditions since their inception in Australia 28 years ago Children with life-threatening illnesses who are under three years of age receive a 'Wish Hamper' - a selection of fun and age-appropriate toys. Once they are three, they are able to apply for a wish.

- Once a child has been found to be eligible, local Make-A-Wish volunteers visit the family and ask the child to reach into their imagination and think of their one cherished wish
- Their ultimate vision is for every child in Australia diagnosed with a life-threatening illness to have the opportunity to experience the hope, strength and joy that come from a Make-A-Wish wish.

Australia
Make-A-Wish $®$ has been endorsed by the Australian Taxation Office as a deductable gift recipient, all donations of $\$ 2$ or more are tax deductible.

WE HOPE YOU WILL OFFER YOUR SUPPORT FOR MAKE-A-WISH

## SPEAKING OF WORTHY CAUSES

Kim Ellaway

As you will be aware, Two Men and a Truck are one of our major sponsors and, among other contributions, transport all of our equipment - 6 truckloads - from Brisbane to the Gold Coast and return.
Richard Kuipers, an owner of Two Men and a Truck, usually plays in the Friday Teams with Therese however this year is unable to attend both the Friday Teams and the prize giving dinner where he also sponsors the Intermediate Teams - he does promise to be back next year playing with Therese.
His daughter Catherine works in the offices of Two Men and a Truck and the event and in particular myself rely heavily on her logistical expertise to ensure the trucks are where and when we need them.
On Monday $2^{\text {nd }}$ March this year Catherine is donning an apron and taking part in OzHarvest's CEO CookOff to highlight the pivotal issues of hunger, homelessness and food waste within the community.
At the CookOff she will be cooking along with 150 other CEOs, each partnered by a celebrity chef and serving up delicious meals to 1,000 vulnerable Aussies. At the same time this will be raising much - needed funding for the Australian charity OzHarvest which provides amazing support for the vulnerable among us. You can find out more about what they do on their website www.ozharvest.org
We ask you to join Gold Coast Congress in supporting her in this worthwhile cause! Her goal is to raise $\$ 10,000$ which will allow OzHarvest to deliver the equivalent of 20,000 meals to Australians in need. Every dollar donated allows OzHarvest to deliver the equivalent of two meals and has a "Social Return on Investment" value to the community of more than \$5.68.

To donate, simply go to her fundraising page at https://www.ceocookoff.com.au/ceos/catherine-gambrellis, and click 'sponsor' or 'donate'. $\$ 5$ or $\$ 500$ or any amount you can donate will be greatly appreciated by Catherine and OzHarvest and will go a long way to help the most vulnerable people in our community.

## DEAD EYE CHARLOTTE

Charlotte Harrison from Team four in the Novice Teams is a dead eye dick when it comes to passing boards she has got it right ten out of ten times when throwing boards to the next table. Same spot every time.

## MODERN EXPERT BIDDING

## Peter Gill



It's extremely rare for top bridge experts to find consensus about anything. Sadly for upcoming players, the idea that asking an expert will find THE answer to a bridge question is a fallacy, because different experts give different answers. With so many unknowns, there's no right answer.
Bridge is a game of unknowns. You don't know what partner's cards are, and you don't know what the opponents' cards are, but you try to increase your limited knowledge of the hand, in order to make better decisions. With so much info not known, it's very easy to think about the wrong thing. Then, at the end of the hand, when all these unknowns are now KNOWN, partner might dare to butt in by telling you what you should have done. If this "post mortem" at bridge is acrimonious, it could instead be called a premortem when it leads to death-like results on the next hand(s).

Bridge described thus sounds so exhausting that it's a wonder that any of us can cope with the Decision Fatigue and mental demands which are a core ingredient at bridge tournaments. Yet the endless fascination of the game lures us all in, so here we are at the Gold Coast. For info about Decision Fatigue, google "Roy Baumeister decision fatigue" - his 2011 New York Times article is a good starting point. With Teams events starting today, try to force your brain to be alert on the last 4 or 5 boards of any 14 Board match, when opponents often tire \& give you chances to gain imps.

This meandering talk is (sort of) about what the very top experts mostly like to think about, and what matters to them, when it comes to choosing which conventions or system to play.

## GADGETITIS

A few years ago Kathy Buchen was asked to fill in for two matches at the Nationals in Canberra. She told me that it was amazing - her partner before the first match said in total: "Is it OK if we play Standard American, three Weak Twos, Stayman and Transfers over 1 NT and 2NT, and do you prefer high or low to encourage?" Then they sat down, and he seemed to be close to the best player she'd ever partnered. Her partner for the second match insisted they play almost every gadget or convention under the sun - Lebensohl, Namyats, Hamilton, Two Way Checkback et al - her head was spinning, but when they played, this expert didn't seem to be much good.

Was Kathy's judgement out? No, I told her - I know these two guys, the second one who has Gadgetitis thinks he's a real hot shot or Tier One (hereinafter T1) expert but is not, but the first one is a true expert.

If we divide up experts into T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5, the T1 experts strongly tend (almost consensus) to have a different approach from the Tiers 3,4 and 5 who thrive on Gadgetitis.

## OUR 2015 NATIONAL TEAM

The team that beat my team in the Playoff Final for the 2015 Aussie Open Team a few weeks ago comprises 3 pairs. The Queenslander Paul Wyer and his partner Michael Courtney play an absolute minimum of bidding gadgets, with very natural bidding and standard card play. One of their teammates says they were the star pair in the Playoff Finals. Their card play is world class, with Decision Fatigue not a factor. The winning team's second pair plays Precision, adding on some gadgets. Against me, one of them forgot the system in the last segment, almost costing them the match. The third pair play Standard with transfers added all over the place. They bid very well, especially their slam bidding. If you, like them, have spent years studying the intricacies of bidding conventions before rejecting those not worth playing, then perhaps - if you are a very regular partnership - this might be the way to go. One gain from their transfers is that they can often pick to play 3NT (and other) contracts from the right side, e.g. with Qx opposite Axx or the other examples mentioned in the talk. In my opinion, this pair has occasional concentration lapses in the card play - perhaps Decision Fatigue is a factor?

## THINKING STYLE OF T1 EXPERTS

If there is any consensus among the T1 experts, I think the lazier approach of not overloading with gadgets is more popular, not because laziness is good, but because we don't want to overload our brains with too many agreements \& end up with Decision Fatigue at the table. One of the more interesting things about Decision Fatigue is that those suffering from it at bridge do not even notice the errors they make, such is their fatigue. This can create a never-ending cycle of repeating errors.

In a nutshell, vast experience has taught them that the key is to be in your Comfort Zone, able to produce your best bridge as often as possible, and to minimize the inevitable mistakes that all of us humans inevitably make. No matter how good you get at bridge, you will never be mistake-free.

## CONVENTIONS

The most popular bridge book in Australia and overseas is 25 Bridge Conventions You Should Know by Barbara Seagram. The conventions in this book are the ones that most of us here at the Gold Coast play, so I have no problems with the well-written book. The sequels, which also sell well, include quite a lot of gadgets that many of us T1 Experts are happy to omit.

Here's what some T1 experts have told me about various gadgets that T3, T4 or Tears 5 experts ("Tears" because their thinking style holds them back from reaching the very top) may play:
Bergen Raises: One bridge pro: "I only play them because my clients insist I play them." Another pro: "shouldn't I raise partner as high as possible as soon as possible - if I bid 3* or 3 tover 1S, I unnecessarily give my LHO a chance to bid $3 \vee$ or make other winning moves that a direct $3 \uparrow$ bid prevents." Another pro: " In America, hardly anyone seems to play Bergen Raises anymore."

Stolen Bids (if you don't know what they are, please don't learn them): "If anyone says they play Stolen Bids, I instantly know that they're not a good bridge player."

Lavings over 1NT - Paul Lavings himself refuses to play this, mainly because it encourages a 4 point 1NT range when a 3 point 1NT range is superior, for various reasons. The 4 point range is simply too wide, making decisions more difficult. More importantly, a 3 point range forces you to decide if the middle of the 3 point range is minimum or maximum, when you are invited. This encourages proper thinking, that there are good and bad 16 counts, and upgrading or downgrading point counts is better than slavish devotion to an exact point count. A key part of becoming a T1 expert is to use points only as a guide, especially in competitive bidding where "shape rules".
Gerber: when I commentated on Bridge Base Online (BBO) Vugraph, the coordinator called it the G word that we should refrain from ever praising. The F word was Flannery. Both these methods have some support in USA, e,g. a pair of American World Women's Champions play Roman Keycard Gerber with good definitions of when $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ is RKCG and when it is not.

I almost forgot to say - don' t assume any of this is gospel - remember there's no consensus among experts. I ' m just trying to advise you of what I think the trend is among T1 experts.

## T1 AND T2 GROWTH OF MAKING BIDS "GAME FORCING"

If you don't know what "fourth suit forcing" is, please check on the Internet.
"Fourth Suit Forcing" has become "Fourth Suit Forcing to Game", almost universally in T1.
"Many pairs have switched from "'Two over One Forcing" to "Two over One Game-Forcing".
After $1 \mathrm{x}-1 \mathrm{y}-1 \mathrm{NT}$ rebid, "Checkback" is being replaced by Two Way Checkback, in which the $2 \vee$ rebid by responder over 1NT is artificial and Game Forcing
After $1 x-1 y-1 z$ rebid, a big trend in 2014 is the XYZ Convention, like Two Way Checkback, in which the 2 , rebid by responder over $1 z$ is artificial and Game Forcing, and $2 \&$ forces $2 \downarrow$.

In all four examples, there's been a recent tend towards making some bids Game Forcing. Why? Is it a better way to play bridge? Perhaps it isn't, but it's certainly an easier way to play bridge - you know you're going to Game or higher, so there's less strain on your brain. And when you're vulnerable at IMPs scoring, reaching Game with 12 opposite 12, or 12 opposite 11 seems to do no harm to one's overall results - enough of these games make, to make the whole deal worthwhile. When Vulnerable at IMPS, Game only needs to be about a $36 \%$ chance to be worth bidding. .

## MATCHING THE 1NT RESPONSE TO THE 1NT OPENING BID'S RANGE

T1 experts like to get stuff like this right, rather than adding on new conventions.
Many players tell me that if partner opens 1D, a response of 1 NT shows 6 to 9 points. Is this so?
Long ago, 1 NT showed 16-18 HCP or 15-18 HCP, the latter range being popularised (as was Extended Stayman which is now extinct at T1 level) by its use by Australia's top pair from the 1950s to the early 1980s Tim Seres and Dick Cummings/Roelof Smilde.

Now, $15-17$ is normal in Standard, with some people playing 14-16. Why the change?
Opening 1 NT on 16-18 went with a 13-15 range for a 1NT rebid by opener. Nowadays we know that opening 12 counts is a winning action (and that a 4 point NT range like 12-15 is too wide), so $13-15$ dropped to 12-14. Therefore, 1NT 16-18 dropped to 15-17, when 12 counts are opened.
In the last few years, experts are starting to think that opening many or even all 11 counts is a winning style, especially when not vulnerable (when the cost of going down is smaller). If you open on 11, then the lowest NT rebid should be 11-13, because a 3 point range is best (ref page 2). If your 1NT rebid is $11-13$, then the 1NT opening bid becomes 14-16. So it's the people that like to open on 11 points who like to play a 14-16 1NT opening.
Your 1NT Opening Bid Range Recommended Strength of 1NT Response to 1\& or 1*

16-18
15-17
14-16
12-14
15-18

6-9 $\quad 9+15=24$
6-10 $\quad 10+14=24$
$6-11 \quad 11+13=24$
$5-8(9) \quad 8+16=24$
6-10 $\quad 10+14=24$

For all the Strong 1NT ranges in the above table, if Responder has the max \# of HCP for the 1NT response, and Opener is one point short of opening 1 NT , then opener can pass 1 NT , because the partnership has at most 24 points, one short of the 25 points needed for Game.

For the weak 1NT, opener should have some balanced hands that can pass a 1NT response to $1 *$ or 1D, so 1NT response should be 5-8, if hands of 15 or 16 points will pass the 1NT response.

Perhaps one reason why only T1's like to think about this sort of idea is that it's hard to explain, although the concept is simple.

## WHAT T1 EXPERTS LIKE TO THINK ABOUT

Most T1 experts play 5 card majors, not because 5 card Majors are better than 4 Card Majors, but because 5 Card Majors are easier to play. The 4-4 major fits can still be found because responder bids the 4 card major first.

Curiously, the new T1 trend toward Transfer Responses to $1 \AA$, making the opener often declare responder's major suit, has some circular similarity to the olden days of Four Card Majors, when opener played more of the major suit contracts.

T1 experts like to have simple ways to defend against the weirdo bids that opponents like to play. For example, although T1's like David Beauchamp (top qualifier in the Gold Coast Pairs), Sartaj Hans and Tony Nunn are normally seen playing Weak Twos (not Multi 2 ${ }^{\text {) }}$ ), they all have a simple (not fatiguing) Defence to Multi $2 \diamond$ known in advance. Double of $2 \diamond$ is a good hand, Double of a later major suit bid is take-out, the only Penalty Double is the third double by your partnership. Everything else is natural, 2NT overcall being about 1518 points, with System On. .
Why do so many T1 Experts prefer Weak Twos to Multi $2 \downarrow$ ? They like to give the opponents the last guess in competitive auctions by raising as high as possible as soon as possible, To do this, they need to know what opener's suit is, straight away. The Multi 2 gives well-prepared opponents more space to bid their hands. Here's another "not gospel" reminder.

## CONCLUSIONS

T1 experts like to construct bidding systems so that everything fits together and doesn't take the players out of their Comfort Zone. For some people, that Comfort Zone might include a lot of conventions, but the default in non-regular partnerships should be not to overload the memory bank and thus the brain.
If anyone wants to read about constructing a bidding system well, Roy Hughes' book Building a Bidding System is a useful read.

HELP ME, HELP YOU ....!!, by John Mcllrath
Sometimes as a Director you give the player several choices and they ask "what would you do?" We all know the answer, "sorry, would love to, but ..."

In session 3 of the Restricted Teams, I desperately wanted to.
South picks up this 19 count and opens 1ヶ:-
A A J 4
VJ1065

- A J
$\%$ AK J 10
Problem was, on board 13 partner was the dealer, OOPS!
This opening bid out of turn was not accepted and I had now barred partner from bidding during the auction.
So after two passes, it was South's bid. I wanted so much to tell him to just bid 3NT, but I was not allowed. I felt so bad when the auction continued 1\%, passed out....sorry!


## SOME MORE BLANK SPACE HUMOUR

If at first you don't succeed..... Destroy all evidence that you ever tried.
Anything dropped on the floor will roll over to the most inaccessible corner.
$42.70 \%$ of all statistics are made on the spot.
If you have paper, you don't have a pen. If you have a pen, you don't have paper. If you have both, no one calls.


Thursuay 26th - Sunday 29th March 2015 Wrest Point, Hobart Tasmanian Festival of Bridge Restricted Pairs
 Island Matchpointed Swiss Pairs Roger Penny Senior Swiss Pairs Australian Swiss Pairs Tournament Organiser: Dallas Cooper $\boxtimes$ : asp@abf.com.au $\mathbf{\mathbf { 0 }}$ : 0427-724-266 All information at www.tasbridge.com.au


## 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.

## 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.

## NEXT YEAR'S THEME - PLAN IT NOW GYPSIES - TRAMPS - THIEVES



Under 50 Masterpoint Pairs - Wednesday

| Place | North-South | \% | Place | East-West | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Warren Moore - Gary Jenkins | 59.32 | 1 | Gordon Stone - Gwyneth Thompson | 59.69 |
| 2 | Robert Olander - William Webster | 58.58 | 2 | Karin Strahan - Cliff Strahan | 58.80 |
| 3 | John Wilson - Geoff Willson | 57.99 | 3 | Janet Jefferies - Kim Reeder | 58.73 |
| 4 | Thea Hobson - Sue Rohrig | 57.84 | 4 | Ian Fraser - Richard Farquhar | 55.70 |
| 5 | Hazel Parkins - Tom Lyons | 57.69 | 4 | Brian Goldberg - Peter McNamee | 55.70 |
| 6 | Patrick Eather - Amanda Adams | 57.62 | 6 | Carol Cowley - Janette Youens | 55.70 |
| 7 | Donna Rix - Helen Harkin | 56.07 | 7 | Moira Smith - Gaye Poll | 55.40 |
| 8 | Julie Heib - David Gillard | 55.62 | 8 | Jim Skeen - Michelle Behrens | 54.73 |
| 9 | Stephen Singer - Peter Jaffe | 52.07 | 9 | Bruce Brown - Tony Roberts | 52.66 |
| 10 | Barbara Bright - Narelle Mclver | 51.63 | 10 | Bernhard Boulton - Mary Stoney | 52.59 |
| 11 | Jennifer Montague - Jane Hills | 51.63 | 11 | Anthony Marsland - Helen Blair | 51.55 |
| 12 | Jayne Lansdown - Lori Sexton | 51.55 | 12 | Marguerite Bettington - Jan Deaville | 51.18 |
| 13 | Colleen Rowles - Pam Lorne-Tait | 51.18 | 13 | Ivy Monteiro - Robyn Seet | 51.11 |
| 14 | Leonie Elphinstone - May Waddell | 50.89 | 14 | Pat White - Helen Cunynghame | 51.04 |
| 15 | Robert Sharp - Susan Sharp | 49.93 | 15 | John Stimpson - Cherylene Stimpson | 48.67 |
| 16 | Philip Atkinson - Nili Wood | 49.33 | 16 | Edie Ridler - Janette Cael | 47.71 |
| 17 | Vicki Clark - Margaret Ashby | 49.26 | 17 | Kristine Rossiter - Anita Boyle | 47.56 |
| 18 | Darryl Lock - Glenda Lock | 48.96 | 18 | Judy Dwyer - John Burns | 46.82 |
| 19 | Claudia Gibson - Lin Kendall | 48.96 | 19 | Karen Sweep - Rhonda Henry | 45.27 |
| 20 | Trish Hart - Bing Wilson | 48.82 | 20 | Anna Jadach - Sue Smalley | 45.12 |
| 21 | Wendy Ledgerwood - Aggie Bowyer | 47.26 | 21 | Maureen Lubinsky - Jill Gilbertson | 44.38 |
| 22 | Judith Egan - Peter Goldman | 45.93 | 22 | Bruce Gough - Bruce Wiggins | 43.64 |
| 23 | Jim Love - Sandra Goodworth | 44.16 | 23 | Suzi Ledger - Barbara Simpson | 43.34 |
| 24 | Anthony Donkersloot - Anne Ross | 40.31 | 24 | Kevin Gilbert - Susan Gilbert | 42.75 |
| 25 | Raja Bawajee - Savi Bawajee | 38.09 | 25 | Janet Lewis - Elizabeth Handley | 41.57 |
| 26 | Ann McKenzie - Lily Manlapig | 35.95 | 26 | Rena Indermaur - Annie Sinclair | 38.61 |
| 27 | Clare Gleeson - Gillian Kinsella | 33.36 |  |  |  |
| Holiday Pairs Event 2 - Session 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ | Score |  | E-W | Score |
| 1 | Anne Lamport - Paul Thiem | 59.43 | 1 | Gwenda Jewell - Stephanie Chapman | 60.23 |
| 2 | Barbara Herring - Brenda Herring | 59.26 | 2 | Gaynor Hurford - Jeanette Chatterton | 58.90 |
| 3 | Patricia Burton - Pamela Tranberg | 51.85 | 3 | Parveen Rayani - Jamaluddin Rayani | 56.63 |
| 3 | Judith Gaspar - Sue Small | 51.85 | 4 | Geoff Read - Ming Shu Yang | 54.73 |
| 5 | Pam Lawson - John Lawrence | 51.35 | 5 | Anna Monks - Fred Whitaker | 54.55 |
| 6 | Peter Allingham - Mick Fawcett | 48.82 | 6 | Geoffrey Lawson - Kathy Lawson | 50.00 |
| 7 | Heather Brown - Edna Nicholson | 48.15 | 7 | Eddie Mullin - Dianne Mullin | 47.81 |
|  | Robin Hassall - Dawn Simpson | 46.97 | 8 | Janice Gladders - Dot Lawrence | 47.54 |
| 9 | Leif Michelsson - Maria Michelsson | 46.63 | 9 | Maureen Neubauer - Kate Forrester | 45.64 |
| 10 | Phillip Mason - Lesley Mason | 45.79 | 10 | Lesley Martin - Roger Cael | 44.70 |
| 11 | Robert Peard - Gail Smith | 45.45 | 11 | Rashmi Limaye - Diana McAuliffe | 44.28 |
| 12 | Louise Garnett - Lol Garnett | 44.44 | 12 | Minnie Bragg - Chris Bragg | 44.11 |
|  |  |  | 13 | Kevin Balkin - Pauline Balkin | 43.43 |

## Open

PlaceNo. Team MembersScore2 Taufik Asbi - Robert Parasian - Franky Karwur - Julius George - Beni Ibrad
21 Michael Ware - Tom Jacob - Fiona Brown - Tony Nunn - Hugh McGann - Matthew Thomson ..... 123.50
3 Liam Milne - Nye Griffiths - Andy Hung - Nabil Edgtton - Paul Gosney - James Coutts ..... 118.82
418 Peter Fordham - Chris Sundstrom - Ross Stuart - Maureen Dennison ..... 114.74
55 Bruce Neill-Arjuna De Livera - Zolly Nagy - David Lilley ..... 114.24
611 Phil Gue - Bill Hirst - Julian Foster - David Weston ..... 113.18
716 Ursula Harper - Ross Harper - Justin Howard - Ishmael Del'Monte ..... 112.47
86 Terry Brown - Avinash Kanetkar - Matthew Mullamphy - Ron Klinger ..... 111.73
941 Watson Zhou - Michael Chen - Charlie Lu - Chuan Liu ..... 110.10
1035 Jonathan Free - Linda Coli - Sue Ingham - Howard Melbourne ..... 110.06
1121 Christine Duckworth - Brian Callaghan - Marshall Lewis - David Appleton - Barry Rigal ..... 109.70
1283 David Wurth - David Fryda - Joe Quittner - Liz Quittner ..... 105.79
13 19 Herve Cheval - Gilles Josnin - John Wignall - Bob Scott - Jane Skipper - John Skipper ..... 105.50

| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  | Score |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | 46 | Stephen Hurley - Liz Hurley - Bill Hunt - Rosa Lachman |  | 105.31 |  |  |
| 15 | 4 | Ashley Bach - Mike Cornell - Geo Tislevoll - Ervin Otvosi - Pablo Lambardi | 105.22 |  |  |  |
| 16 | 13 | Pauline Gumby - Warren Lazer - Stephen Henry - Annette Henry | 105.06 |  |  |  |
| 17 | 119 | Yuzhong Chen - Gary Foidl - Hamish Brown - Brett Glass |  | 104.93 |  |  |
| 18 | 7 | David Beauchamp - Peter Hollands - Maxim Henbest - David Wiltshire |  | 104.81 |  |  |
| 19 | 8 | Anthony Burke - Peter Gill - Nick Jacob - Glen Coutts |  | 103.98 |  |  |
| 20 | 15 | Joachim Haffer - John Newman - Mike Doecke - William Jenner-O'Shea | 103.47 |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team |
| 21 | 34 | Leibowitz | 102.11 | 115 | 165 | L Gray |
| 22 | 54 | Bouton | 101.33 | 116 | 77 | Simes |
| 23 | 110 | Lockwood | 101.31 | 117 | 203 | De Vocht |
| 24 | 10 | Pertamina Ep Blue | 101.01 | 118 | 70 | Smee |
| 25 | 22 | M Bourke | 100.48 | 119 | 103 | Williams |
| 26 | 157 | Lee | 100.47 | 120 | 75 | Lorraway |


| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 71 | 47 | Budai | 86.19 | 165 | 193 | Page | 65.88 |
| 72 | 96 | Mayers | 86.13 | 166 | 98 | M Allan | 65.34 |
| 73 | 146 | Lisle | 86.04 | 167 | 95 | Frazier | 65.17 |
| 73 | 43 | McCartney | 86.04 | 168 | 188 | Carr | 65.09 |
| 75 | 101 | Kovacs | 85.73 | 169 | 170 | Clift | 64.88 |
| 76 | 82 | Grahame | 85.42 | 170 | 121 | Thompson | 64.81 |
| 77 | 31 | Sawicki | 85.30 | 171 | 143 | Mill | 64.77 |
| 78 | 117 | Maltz | 85.07 | 172 | 151 | Anderson | 64.61 |
| 79 | 62 | Tier | 84.78 | 173 | 59 | Jones | 64.27 |
| 80 | 64 | Folkard | 84.42 | 174 | 89 | Kudelka | 64.24 |
| 81 | 80 | Barda | 84.31 | 175 | 127 | Saxby | 64.18 |
| 82 | 99 | Cains | 84.30 | 176 | 114 | Gibson | 64.04 |
| 83 | 92 | Clarke | 83.88 | 177 | 125 | B Inglis | 63.05 |
| 83 | 74 | S Gray | 83.88 | 178 | 178 | Beckett | 62.21 |
| 85 | 37 | Samuel | 83.77 | 179 | 107 | Bogatie | 62.10 |
| 86 | 29 | Strong | 83.50 | 180 | 149 | Andersson | 61.78 |
| 87 | 196 | Edelstein | 83.30 | 181 | 112 | Van Wyck | 61.72 |
| 88 | 132 | Clyne | 83.23 | 182 | 131 | Darley | 61.54 |
| 89 | 191 | Campbell | 83.20 | 183 | 162 | Senior | 61.38 |
| 90 | 53 | Deaton | 82.83 | 184 | 145 | Fraser | 60.48 |
| 91 | 100 | Briscoe | 82.54 | 185 | 139 | Stringfellow | 59.77 |
| 92 | 55 | E Hurley | 82.28 | 186 | 159 | Grant | 59.25 |
| 93 | 72 | Doddridge | 82.22 | 187 | 189 | Kable | 57.92 |
| 94 | 208 | Ridgway | 82.09 | 188 | 152 | Bennett | 57.72 |
| 95 | 79 | Weaver | 81.99 | 189 | 173 | Wilkinson | 57.62 |
| 96 | 207 | Armstrong | 81.95 | 190 | 183 | Bonnick | 57.19 |
| 97 | 163 | Barrie | 81.91 | 191 | 126 | Valentine | 57.07 |
| 98 | 136 | Orsborn | 81.84 | 192 | 195 | Stanton | 56.65 |
| 99 | 32 | Richardson | 81.77 | 193 | 142 | Jenkins | 56.03 |
| 100 | 86 | Stacey | 81.75 | 194 | 175 | Carroll | 55.80 |
| 101 | 40 | Treloar | 80.98 | 195 | 192 | Littler | 55.21 |
| 102 | 167 | Howes | 80.94 | 196 | 185 | Mills | 54.25 |
| 103 | 111 | Beddow | 80.87 | 197 | 201 | Van Bakel | 53.97 |
| 104 | 51 | Hegedus | 80.77 | 198 | 190 | L Allan | 53.88 |
| 105 | 140 | Date | 80.69 | 199 | 176 | Turnell | 51.62 |
| 106 | 122 | Morrison | 80.51 | 200 | 168 | Peak | 50.92 |
| 107 | 105 | Luck | 80.45 | 201 | 181 | Munro | 48.13 |
| 108 | 180 | Pepper | 80.44 | 202 | 187 | Rose | 47.63 |
| 109 | 97 | Obenchain | 79.54 | 203 | 197 | McMahon | 46.98 |
| 110 | 108 | Terry | 79.52 | 204 | 172 | Varmo | 46.25 |
| 111 | 113 | Baker | 79.35 | 205 | 148 | Millar | 45.94 |
| 112 | 85 | Shaw | 78.92 | 206 | 164 | Fry | 44.95 |
| 113 | 61 | Afflick | 78.75 | 207 | 166 | Roughley | 42.85 |
| 114 | 60 | P Bach | 78.51 | 208 | 116 | Hamilton | 40.32 |
| Seniors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 11 | Trevor Robb - Andrew Janisz - Patsy Walters - Lynne Geursen - Arie Geursen |  |  |  |  | 114.33 |
| 2 | 2 | Martin Bloom - Nigel Rosendorff - Steven Bock - Les Grewcock |  |  |  |  | 111.64 |
| 3 | 7 | Tom Moss - Dennis Zines - David Stern - Robert Grynberg - Sue Picus - Brent Manley |  |  |  |  | 107.85 |
| 4 | 17 | Helen Milward - Robert Milward - Richard Touton - Larry Moses |  |  |  |  | 106.86 |
| 5 | 18 | Derek Evennett - Glenis Palmer - Neil Stuckey - Barry Palmer |  |  |  |  | 100.01 |
| 6 | 9 | Stan Klofa - Alex Czapnik - Robert Gallus - Robert Stewart |  |  |  |  | 98.74 |
| 7 | 8 | Andrew Creet - Stephen Mendick - Peter Grant - Tony Marinos |  |  |  |  | 96.29 |
| 8 | 1 | Richard Brightling - Peter Buchen - David Hoffman - Chris Hughes |  |  |  |  | 93.38 |
| 9 | 5 | Alan Walsh - Barbara McDonald - Elizabeth Havas - Gordon Schmidt |  |  |  |  | 93.18 |
| 10 | 4 | Robert Bignall - Peter Chan - Robert Sebesfi - Roger Januszke |  |  |  |  | 92.97 |


| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | 14 | Freeman-Greene | 90.20 | 24 | 20 | Davis | 75.83 |
| 12 | 21 | Harris | 89.73 | 25 | 23 | Tootell | 74.76 |
| 13 | 31 | Sheehy | 88.66 | 26 | 16 | Marks | 74.28 |
| 14 | 26 | Crockett | 82.53 | 27 | 34 | Johnstone | 73.63 |
| 15 | 13 | Jackman | 82.16 | 28 | 28 | Cohen | 71.94 |
| 16 | 15 | Finikiotis | 81.52 | 29 | 27 | Biro | 67.07 |
| 17 | 6 | Marr | 80.77 | 30 | 25 | Cullen | 66.66 |
| 18 | 10 | Kahler | 79.44 | 31 | 12 | Braithwaite | 65.70 |
| 19 | 19 | Shand | 79.34 | 32 | 29 | Clarke | 64.11 |
| 20 | 32 | Meakins | 78.49 | 33 | 33 | Lee | 63.23 |
| 21 | 22 | Schaap | 78.20 | 34 | 35 | Gray | 48.43 |
| 22 | 24 | Heyting | 78.18 | 35 | 3 | Irving | 39.21 |
| 23 | 30 | Spurway | 77.74 | 36 | 36 | Popa | 14.81 |
| Intermediate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plac <br> e | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 76 | Michael McAuliffe - Richard McAuliffe - Leigh Matheson - Lavy Libman |  |  |  |  | 130.79 |
| 2 | 6 | Michael Stoneman - Val Roland - Herold Rienstra - Bert Luchjenbroers |  |  |  |  | 111.01 |
| 3 | 43 | Jenifer Codognotto - Annette Rose - Kate Bechet - Jennifer Millar |  |  |  |  | 106.42 |
| 4 | 66 | Eric Baker - Chris Stead - Keith Blinco - Terrence Sheedy |  |  |  |  | 104.51 |
| 5 | 4 | Donna Krosch - Gayle McCarthy - Bruce Carroll - Paul Roberts |  |  |  |  | 103.16 |
| 6 | 12 | Margaret Pisko - Trish Anagnostou - Bev Crossman - Bruce Crossman |  |  |  |  | 102.37 |
| 7 | 83 | Nimul Weerasinghe - Max Robb - Lyn Mould - Ann Deaker |  |  |  |  | 101.35 |
| 8 | 27 | Alan Brown - Frances Brown - Janet Hansen - Diane Morgan |  |  |  |  | 101.22 |
| 9 | 17 | Chris Fernando - Bert Romeijn - Kathryn Attwood - Larry Attwood |  |  |  |  | 98.48 |
| 10 | 15 | Judith Anderson - Nick Ware - Philip Thompson - Molly O'Donohue |  |  |  |  | 98.39 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 1 | Runting | 98.01 | 49 | 11 | Grant | 76.46 |
| 12 | 21 | Mander | 97.59 | 50 | 38 | Drwecka | 76.42 |
| 13 | 82 | Klugman | 96.18 | 51 | 54 | McNee | 75.81 |
| 14 | 41 | Eldridge | 94.74 | 52 | 37 | Pincus | 75.15 |
| 15 | 78 | Black | 93.18 | 53 | 3 | Ho | 74.87 |
| 16 | 5 | Jesser | 93.14 | 54 | 64 | Kent | 74.69 |
| 17 | 58 | Erskine | 92.95 | 55 | 77 | Chaffey | 74.61 |
| 18 | 7 | Bolt | 92.94 | 56 | 75 | B Gordon | 73.78 |
| 19 | 60 | Moody | 92.07 | 57 | 23 | De Mestre | 73.65 |
| 20 | 35 | Campbell | 91.46 | 58 | 16 | Warnock | 73.32 |
| 21 | 62 | Sadigh | 91.37 | 59 | 28 | Sinclair | 72.81 |
| 22 | 22 | Nilsson | 91.33 | 60 | 26 | Barbour | 72.43 |
| 23 | 13 | Wylie | 91.26 | 61 | 18 | Eastman | 71.48 |
| 24 | 9 | Bailey | 91.05 | 62 | 84 | Turner | 70.87 |
| 25 | 25 | Kavanagh | 89.74 | 63 | 49 | Paris | 70.86 |
| 26 | 69 | McWilliam | 89.67 | 64 | 10 | Butler | 70.80 |
| 27 | 29 | Rohde | 89.37 | 65 | 14 | Webb | 70.74 |
| 28 | 33 | Edrich | 89.16 | 66 | 30 | Wooler | 69.26 |
| 29 | 59 | Rogers | 88.03 | 67 | 50 | Tomlinson | 69.22 |
| 30 | 24 | Hollingworth | 87.87 | 68 | 86 | Kennealy | 67.76 |
| 31 | 53 | Cockbill | 87.16 | 69 | 61 | Greenwood | 67.64 |
| 32 | 65 | Jones | 87.15 | 70 | 71 | Gardiner | 67.36 |
| 33 | 19 | P Gordon | 85.91 | 71 | 34 | Kull | 66.37 |
| 34 | 79 | Roseman | 85.53 | 72 | 52 | Fulton | 65.22 |
| 35 | 2 | Sykes | 85.50 | 73 | 85 | Whittle | 64.84 |
| 36 | 31 | Williams | 85.36 | 74 | 20 | Nishigami | 64.27 |
| 37 | 8 | Johnson | 84.17 | 75 | 70 | Dickerson | 64.19 |
| 38 | 80 | I Beattie | 82.70 | 76 | 68 | Routley | 63.40 |
| 39 | 57 | Graham | 82.36 | 77 | 74 | Chau | 60.15 |
| 40 | 72 | Armstrong | 82.35 | 78 | 44 | Gooley | 56.89 |
| 41 | 73 | Ward | 82.14 | 79 | 32 | Land | 56.61 |


| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  | Score |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 42 | 40 | Tuckey | 81.33 | 80 | 56 | Binsted | 55.51 |
| 43 | 45 | Leckie | 81.16 | 81 | 55 | Pearson | 54.50 |
| 44 | 51 | Webber | 79.96 | 82 | 63 | Stephenson | 53.92 |
| 45 | 47 | Abdelhamid | 79.64 | 83 | 42 | Steinhardt | 48.77 |
| 46 | 48 | Palethorpe | 77.97 | 84 | 36 | Murray | 47.65 |
| 47 | 67 | P Beattie | 77.22 | 85 | 81 | Heap | 45.23 |
| 48 | 39 | Driscoll | 77.08 | 86 | 46 | Robertson | 44.39 |

## Restricted

Place No. Team Members Score
116 Arne Jonsberg - John Lahey - Lesleigh Egan - Lynne Henley 124.33
22 Anne McNaughton - Faye Bell - Heather Scott - Margot Moylan 110.19
335 Jane Gray - Teena McKenzie - Janet Ham - John Ham 108.61
433 Liz Jacka - Elizabeth Tonkin - Kristin King - Helen Sharwood 107.67
54 Mimi Packer - Virginia Seward - Susanne Gammon - Deana Wilson 104.93

627 Judy Bardone - Anne Kirkpatrick - Peggy Pang - Helen French 102.87
$\begin{array}{lll}7 & 36 & \text { Marlise Jones - Kerry Watson - Julie Nyst - Carolin Morahan }\end{array} 101.19$
83 Fatma Ahmet - Jacqui Morton - Molly Butcher - Ian Williams 98.60
97 Marcey Spilsbury - Sheryl Gardner - Desiree Fenaughty - John Erlandson 97.28
1010 Margaret Stevens - Sue Luby - Penny Brodie - Barbara Green 96.72

| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1241 Brake $\quad 94.55 \quad 43 \quad 17$ Hooper 75.15

32 Pick
1432 Simmons
1521 Sullivan
1619 Rossiter-Nuttall
1763 Crawford
1871 Tattersfield
191 Clift
2034 J Jenkins
2143 Greenway
225 Loxton
2340 O'Neill
246 Weaver
2568 Wilson
2624 Hyland
2769 Linden
2818 Symons
2925 Clark
3055 Pettit
3112 Treloar
3257 Kommeren
3320 Duggin
3449 Fraser
9 Clifford
65 Baillon-Bending
14 McMaster
44 Haley
26 Paul
37 Smith
39 Powley
.55
93.96
93.92
92.93
92.91
92.89
91.91
$91.89 \quad 51 \quad 42$ Sawyer 71.79
$90.78 \quad 52 \quad 46$ Devlin 70.91
$89.87 \quad 53 \quad 11$ Wippell 70.84
$87.63 \quad 54 \quad 62$ F Stuart 69.82
$87.31 \quad 55 \quad 61$ Macintosh 69.79
$85.41 \quad 56 \quad 70$ Shannahan 69.63
$85.35 \quad 57 \quad 30 \quad$ M Jenkins 69.58
$84.58 \quad 58 \quad 58$ Rees 67.30
$83.82 \quad 59 \quad 48$ Corney 64.83
$83.44 \quad 60 \quad 45$ R Stevens 64.20
$81.96 \quad 61 \quad 22$ Sheffield 63.73
$81.57 \quad 62 \quad 47$ Nice 62.56
$81.31 \quad 63 \quad 52$ Crommelin 62.08
$80.75 \quad 64 \quad 56$ Munro 61.50
$80.47 \quad 65 \quad 31$ Peever 61.46
$80.20 \quad 66 \quad 50$ Pfafflin 60.75
$80.17 \quad 67 \quad 59$ Higgins 60.28
$80.16 \quad 68 \quad 64$ Verity 58.72
$79.50 \quad 69 \quad 54$ Butler 58.41
$78.80 \quad 70 \quad 51$ Jenkin 52.44

| 78.80 | 71 | 67 | Sealy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{llll}78.36 & 72 & 53 & \text { Reynolds }\end{array}$

## Novice

19 Justine Wlodarczyk - Bronnwyn White - Caroline Marshall - Margaret Teitzel 115.22
26 Don Du Temple - Adrienne Du Temple - Alex Hunyor - Roslyn Hunyor 114.17

32 Denise Merrin - Mary Smith - Joanne Evans - Sheena Pollock 107.06
47 Prunella Adams - Malcolm Adams - Annemarie Hugentobler - Walter Hugentobler 102.14

| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 3 | Adam Hertelendy - Dorothy Hertelendy - Margaret Robertson - Donald Robertson |  |  |  |  | 99.32 |
| 6 | 12 | Daria Williams - Ian Cameron - Nanette Hinsch - Colleen Sobey |  |  |  |  | 98 |
| 7 | 15 | Louise McKenna - Elizabeth Ryan - Judith Bennett - Del Dudman |  |  |  |  | 97.15 |
| 8 | 5 | Claire Weston - Wilma Coloper - Karl Buchmann - Jill Buchmann |  |  |  |  | 90.98 |
| 9 | 25 | Jenny Bryant - Gay Thompson - Vivienne Renton - Helen Bowra |  |  |  |  | 90.41 |
| 10 | 10 | Susan Kennard - Beverley O'Hara - Fay Jeppesen - Kenneth Griggs |  |  |  |  | 89.99 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 34 | Byrnes | 88.61 | 23 | 22 | Noble | 72.45 |
| 12 | 18 | Howitt | 88.44 | 24 | 23 | Carter | 71.41 |
| 13 | 13 | Nugent | 84.87 | 25 | 27 | Northey | 69.19 |
| 14 | 4 | Taylor | 84.01 | 26 | 19 | Jackson | 68.90 |
| 15 | 17 | Sharp | 83.05 | 27 | 29 | O'Keeffe | 66.78 |
| 16 | 11 | Cox | 79.21 | 28 | 26 | Mawson | 63.90 |
| 17 | 24 | Garside | 79.18 | 29 | 28 | Anderson | 61.93 |
| 18 | 8 | Hall | 77.81 | 30 | 14 | Sargent | 60.26 |
| 19 | 1 | Knight | 77.55 | 31 | 33 | Hughes | 59.87 |
| 20 | 31 | Speiser | 76.61 | 32 | 30 | Archer | 58.56 |
| 21 | 20 | Musgrave | 76.04 | 33 | 21 | Coyle | 54.12 |
| 22 | 16 | Nilsson | 74.33 | 34 | 32 | Reilly | 38.48 |

## GOLD COAST CONGRESS 2015 CALENDAR OF CELEBRITY SPEAKERS

Thursday

26th February

Overcalling Two Suited Hands
with Joan Butts Upstairs Room 5
 Joan Butts has represented Australia in world championships. She was 2 nd in the 2015 TBIB National Swiss Pairs Championship. Her passion is bridge education. In 2011, she was appointed the Australian Bridge Federation (ABF) National Teaching Coordinator. In this capacity she trains teachers and arranges professional development programmes. Joan is also involved with bridge online.

10:15am
Joan has a BA, Dip Ed and Dip Ed Psych from the Uni of Qld and has been the official bridge teacher in Queensland for the past 12 years.

Thursday


## Due to popular demand we are hosting a second holiday!

BOOK NOW! MON 27 April--FRI 1t May 2015

Andy and Alex invite you to enjoy a Bridge Holiday at the Tuscany Wine Estate Resort at Hunter Valley

## THE PACKAGE INCLUDES:

- All accommodation and meals (cooked breakfast, lunch, and three fine dining restaurant experiences!)
- Return Bus Transfer (Sydney -Tuscany Resort)
- All bridge competitions and workshops
$\checkmark$ Winery visits and cheese store tasting

PRICING: Single: $\$ 1470$ - Double or T/S: $\$ 1310 \mathrm{pp}$

## THE BRIDGE:

\& Lots of professional seminars and duplicates

* Topics include: Card Play Technique, Beating More Contracts on Defence, and Winning Competitive Bidding Battles!
\&For all standards of player incl. intermediate \& advanced


## Contacts:

a David Stern (For booking/admin) Email: david.stern.general@gmail.com Ph: 0411-111-655

[^0]|  | Thursday 26th February | Friday <br> 27th February | Saturday 28th February |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OPEN EVENTS |  |  |  |
| Open Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Open Butler Swiss Pairs Friday Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | Q/F Teams SIF Teams <br> 9:00am 2x12 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 4 \times 10$ <br> Brds Brds <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 Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start 4x12 Brds Final | All Are Dinner |
| INTERMEDIATE EVENTS |  |  |  |
| Intermediate Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final | 7:30pm $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { Bookings } \\ \text { are }\end{array}\right)$ |
| RESTRICTED EVENTS |  |  | 8:00pm Essential |
| Restricted Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Restricted Butler Swiss Pairs | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:30am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final 10:00am 1/3 2:00pm 2/3 | 10:30am 3/3 |
| NOVICE EVENTS |  |  |  |
| Novice Teams <br> Friday Novice Pairs | 10:30am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R9-R12 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final $10: 00 \mathrm{am} 1 / 2 \quad 2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 2$ |  |
| ROOKIE PAIRS |  |  |  |
| Rookie Pairs - Single Session Events | 10:30am 1/1 |  |  |
| UNDER 50MP PAIRS |  |  |  |
| Under 50 Masterpoint Pairs | 10:30am 1/1 |  |  |
| MIXED TEAMS |  |  |  |
| Seres/McMahon Mixed Teams |  | 10:00am 1/2 2:00pm 2/2 |  |
| WALK-IN PAIRS |  |  |  |
| Holiday Walk-In Pairs - Play 1, 2 or 3 Sessions | 10:30am 3/3 | 10:00am 1/3 2:00pm 2/3 | 10:30am 3/3 |
|  | Thursday | Friday | Saturday |

## CALENDAR OF SOCIAL AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

| NOVICE AND ROOKIE ACTIVITIES | Venue | Thursday 26th February | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Friday } \\ & 27 \text { th } \\ & \text { February } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-50 MP <br> Welcome, Assistance with System Cards and How it all Works etc | Arena Orange Tablecloths | 9:30am-10:15am |  |
| Rookies Welcome Welcome, Assistance with System Cards and How it all Works etc | Arena <br> Fuchsia Tablecloths | 9:30am - 10:15am |  |
| Novice Welcome Welcome, Assistance with System Cards and How it all Works etc | Arena <br> Maroon Tablecloths | 9:00am - 9:45am |  |
| OTHER ACITVITIES |  |  |  |
| Make-a-Wish Foundation Charity In Support of This Years Charity Collections Before Play - All day at Admin | Front Door and Top of Escalator | All Day |  |
| Champagne Breakfast for Shoe Shoppers | "In Her Shoes Store" Ground Floor Oasis Shopping Centre | 8:00am-10:00am |  |
| Dealing Machine Demonstration | Paul Lavings Bookstand | 9:30am - 10:15am |  |
|  |  | Thursday | Friday |

DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU


YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

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

DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

YESTERDAY'S SOLUTION DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

## 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.

## DID YOU KNOW?

43.6 percent of all slam contracts fail.
62.7 percent of all bridge players are women.
97.8 percent of all bridge statistics, including these, are made up.


Great bridge with superb prizes, Celebrity lectures and much more.

Sean Mullamphy not@abf.com.au 0401509616
www.summerfestivalofbridge.com


Thanks to all those who went to a lot of effort for our Dots and Dashes Theme Session


[^0]:    ^ Andy Hung (For bridge enquiries)
    Email: hung.andy.p@gmail.com
    Ph: 0425-101-094

