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While it may be gloomy outside...


Matt Mullamphy enlightens us inside

## WINNERS STARTING TO EMERGE

Two events have been run and won and we would like to laud the winners together with you. Firstly the Weekend Matchpoint Swiss Pairs was won by Adam Edgtton and Andy Hung. After being in front with three rounds to go they had to survive two bad matches and some fortunate results at other tables to emerge the winners and take home the $\$ 550$ prize money which they assured me would not be used for partying - yeah sure guys!

The Second event completed on Sunday was the Rookie Pairs which saw an excellent turnout of thirteen tables. The winners North-South were Lucinda Gun \& Christine Williams scoring $60.8 \%$ while East-West was won by Catherine Armstrong \& Veronica Amerena scoring 63.8\%. It must be great to be starting your bridge career and win an event like this - if only I could remember back that many years I also would be happy.


Andy Hung \& Adam Edgtton


Lucinda Gun \& Christine Williams


Catherine Armstrong \& Veronica Amerena

EVEN THE EXPERTS MAKE MISTAKES! - PAIRS QUALIFYING SESSION 2
Barry Rigal
In the second qualifying session I was hoping to find some good or at least educational bridge. Since we all learn by our (and other people's) mistakes maybe the following accidents will help us all become better players. As usual, only the names have been changed - to protect the guilty even if they don't deserve it.
The first board of the evening that I watched saw declarer turn triumph into disaster.

Dealer: North
A A J 103
Vul: None
Brd 1
Pairs Qual S2
$\uparrow$
-QJ65

- 4
\&AKQJ9753
$\checkmark 94$
-AQJ105
\& 84
AK Q 982
- A 72
- 987
\& 106

A 7654
-K 1083
-K632
\& 2

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \star$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Double |
| 5\& | Double | Pass | Pass |
| Pass |  |  |  |


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

I have no idea where North dredged up his final double but when he led the $\geqslant 9$ declarer decided that the double must be based on an original singleton heart. Up went the ace, down went the contract.
Declarer could take the ruffing finesse in spades before drawing trumps, but North could win and get his heart ruff for down one. Other attempts would be no more effective; if declarer draws trumps early, ending in dummy he can only lead hearts from dummy one more time, and if South ducks his king he will collect two heart tricks eventually.

On an initial club lead declarer should probably win in dummy and advance the 1 KK , pitching his diamond. Then he can win a heart shift, take his discard on the other spade winner, and just give up a heart.


On this board North-South did well to reach game, then South flushed the hand down the toilet. To be fair, the best line of play is far from easy to spot. But how would you play 4A as South after having opened your hand 2• (weak) and shown your spades at your next turn? You may not like it but that's life in the fast lane. You just have to play them up after a top club lead.
Best I think is to win the club and advance the 10 , and run it round to West. When a club is returned, cross to the heart ace and then play a spade to the jack. East does best to duck, so you cross to hand with a club ruff and repeat the spade finesse. East can win but will not be able to prevent you taking a second diamond finesse. When you play the diamond ace West ruffs in, you overruff and ruff a club to hand with your last trump. Then you can take the heart finesse at trick 12 for the overtrick.


This board saw an expert player draw an expert inference. Would you have done the same? Imagine yourself as North defending against $1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \mathbb{V}-2 \boldsymbol{A}$. Cover the South and West hands to give yourself the same problem.

You elect to lead the $\mathbf{V 8}$ - second highest, to the jack, queen and ace, and declarer crosses to the heart king to pass the diamond nine. This goes $\uparrow 6,4$, and you win the king. What now?

Declarer obviously has a doubleton heart and is threatening to set up diamonds to pitch clubs. So you must go after clubs; did you find the \&K shift? Well done - but someone had altered the script on you. When North plonked the club king down on the table declarer won in hand and led a spade to the ten. South then confidently returned the $\boldsymbol{\$ 1 0}$ - suit preference to get his ruff. Oops! Declarer won her queen, crashing dummy's jack, repeated the spade finesse, and won the next diamond in hand to play the club nine and force an entry to dummy to draw trumps for a magnificent +170 . Yes 3 NT was cold $(72 \%)$ as the cards lay, but +170 ( $50 \%$ ) wasn't bad either.

## THANKS FOR YOUR SIGNATURE

Jan Randall

Entering the world of 'life after work' I decided to return to playing bridge after some 20 years of not touching a card or looking at a bridge hand. I started reading the bridge magazines (was surprised how many names from the 70's and 80's were still hitting the headlines!). It was a good way to get a feel for the game again. I decided it would be interesting to actually get to see who these constantly read about players were. l'd make an effort not just to see their names and wonder who they were, l'd approach and speak to them, l'd get their signatures!! So off I went and purchased a double pack of cards....I had to have some form of criteria so I started with the top 100 Master Point Earners and culled out the inactive. Then I added names of those who had achieved victory in tourneys I thought were significant or representing Australia etc. I wanted a mix of the "old" the "mid" and the "young".

Armed with my list I headed off for my first big city tourney....Criteria One was the first signature (well that is not $100 \%$ true as the actual first signature privilege was given to Peter my life partner! Just as I reserved the highest card for Mr Richman my husband was to be the only non-credentialed player and his honour was the lowest card the 2 Clubs!) had to be my (and everyone else's!) favourite player Paul Lavings...who graciously obliged...the next person was Bobby Richman...when I explained to him what I was doing and that the Ace of Spades was reserved for him as he was the top Australian player...he looked at me...and in a gruff voice asked "do you actually know who I am?" I stammered "yes Bobby Richman" so relieved for he was one of the few I did know...He smiled and took his card. I looked down and he was signing with the wrong pen.. I was not going to tell him! Having said that he was often at the table when I was chasing a signature and he was always happy to be interrupted and joked with the guys as they signed.

As I live in Central Queensland and have limited exposure to the top players I had no idea who people were: I spent hours checking the on line registrations and ticking names off on my list: At the venue I scanned the seating allocations and those on my list became a table number. What I learnt very early was top players arrive at their table 5 minutes before the session commences and leave the table 30 seconds after the last card is played!
There is only one card I look at with disappointment.....that person was the holy grail of signatures for that particular tourney and maybe if they realised just how much time l'd spent over the three days trying to track them down they might not have been so unpleasant.
Everyone else was really wonderful and there are a few who stand out.....Barbara Travis, Kieran Dyke, Bob Scott, Margaret Bourke, Peter Gill and my favourite (and heir apparent to Paul Lavings!) Griff Ware.
A few became very special for different reasons:
I was very privileged to meet Blaine Howe. He was so friendly and helpful. He would constantly say to me "that is X they'll be on your list" I was so grateful for his help and would not have got anywhere near the number of signatures I did without his kindness.
I was collecting a signature and they said "he should be on your list" indicating the other person at the table - I looked at him and asked "are you a good player?" he simply replied "yes" so I said "by all means please sign a card". I was thinking there will always be a few who will fall outside my criteria! Now every time I see his name I smile and have no idea how his name escaped my list - it turned out to be Kim Morrison!
I rattled off to everyone who I approached "you can sign any card except the Joker or an Ace" I looked down and there was Michael Courtney scrawled across the Ace of Diamonds!

It has been a fun adventure and I thank everyone who so graciously accepted the interruption by a complete stranger and who contributed their signatures...one hundred and four...there were of course a few I would have loved to have come across and did not but over all I achieved the mix I set out to achieve and I will treasure my little piece of bridge history.


## PAIRS FINAL - A SECTION - SESSION ONE <br> Barry Rigal

Bob Scott and John Wignall were the early leaders. The first board out of the box certainly didn't hurt.

| Dealer: North | A Q 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | -1095 |  |
| Brd 1 | - A Q J 94 |  |
| Prs Fin S1 | \& K 107 |  |
| A AJ2 |  | A 64 |
| $\bullet$ A 4 |  | - J 862 |
| - 752 |  | - K 1063 |
| \& A 8543 |  | \& Q 96 |
|  | $\text { AK } 109875$ |  |
|  | $\text { - K Q } 73$ |  |
|  | \& J 2 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |


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

As South John Wignall certainly had his bidding boots on. When East led a trump (one can hardly argue with the choice of any card in his hand) that was one hurdle over. Scott's $\uparrow 7$ held, and he played a second trump. West won and should surely have exited with a low club, but he cashed his club ace, receiving encouragement, then erred by taking his heart ace before playing a second club. Scott rose with the king and led the heart ten from hand, ducked smoothly by East. Scott overtook and ran the trumps, and in the four-card ending had come down to this position:


Notice the effect of cashing the last trump and pitching your heart from hand. East gets caught in a bizarre triple squeeze of the show-up variety. Scott erred when he pitched his club ten instead, and East could now let go the $\Leftarrow$, which he did after much squirming. Scott then took the $\vee Q$, and decided to play East for an honest man when he led a diamond to his ace and made +420 .

| Dealer: East | A 843 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 76$ |
| Brd 22 | -Q843 |
| Prs Fin S1 | ¢ A Q 73 |

A K J 5
-1053
-A 107
\& K J 96

A A 102

- K 84
- J 52
\& 10852

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ^ } 8 \\
& \vee Q 7 \\
& \text { Q } 8 \\
& \text { \& --- }
\end{aligned}
$$

| West | East |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \nabla$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ | $4 \downarrow$ |
| Pass |  |



Pass

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

Board 22 saw Bruce Neill as East at the helm in the most interesting declarer and defensive problem of the day. He declared $4 V$ on the unopposed auction above where the two spade call showed three trumps and limit-raise values).

James Coutts kept his side in the game with a club lead, (the five playing third and fifth) and I wonder if Neill might have considered playing low from dummy. North will often find it very hard to duck even from eg A10.

Neill actually put in the jack and North, Fraser Rew won the queen and after much thought found the killing trump shift (a few defenders played for club ruffs and made declarer's task easy).
Neill finessed, and now it was up to Coutts to exit in either major suit. The key is that declarer is threatening a dummy-reversal. Repeated trump leads kill that possibility. Coutts cashed the $\uparrow A$ then went back to clubs and Neill put in the nine and claimed when it forced the ace. From South's perspective he should know that his black suit losers aren't going away. North's decision to shift to trumps rather than cash his club ace makes declarer's shortage highly likely.
Only three tables beat 4V; five made ten tricks in hearts, two played what at imps would be the somewhat superior spot of 3NT making nine tricks.

| Dealer: South | A AQ5 3 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -KQ4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 23 | - AK 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pairs Fin S1 | \& Q 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AK 76 |  | A 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A J 102 |  | -98653 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 96 |  | -Q1084 | Make | le Con | acts |  |  |
| \& J 1072 |  | \& K 65 | - | 4 | - | 4 | NT |
|  | A J 10982 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | A |
|  | $\bullet 7$ |  | 1 | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 32 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | * A 984 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | 9 |

Board 23 is surely a candidate for the dullest board of the event. With North declaring 4^ on either red suit lead, 11 tricks are trivial. On a heart to the ace declarer has six spade tricks and five side suit winners, on a diamond lead when he puts the $\checkmark J$ up the hand is over. So why is the bulletin wasting our time with this hand?
Answer: because at no table l'm sure did West find (or even consider?) the best defence to $4 \vee$. When partner leads the revealing $v 9$ top of nothing or $0 / 2$ higher. West should duck! Now can declarer overcome the duck? If he draws trumps he has six spades but only four side-suit winners. Maybe best is to cross to dummy in whichever suit you feel inclined to (all three options have plusses and minuses) then draw trump and lead a low diamond towards the jack. If you did that, you'd feel you earned your 650.

## HAVE YOU DISCUSSED

Brent Manley

A bridge player told the story of her 8-year-old granddaughter, who had watched her mother play four duplicate sessions. Later on, the girl was playing in a foursome with her 12-year-old brother. When her brother made a face indicating a bad hand, the girl showed off some of her knowledge of duplicate. "If you make a face like that in duplicate," the girl exclaimed, "they'll call the janitor on you."

The takeout double is one of the most-used conventions in bridge. In many ways, unfortunately, it is also one of the most misused.
Yesterday's edition covered the practice - too common among newer players - of doubling for takeout with any hand that approximates opening strength. We established that doubling for takeout without at least threecard support for unbid suits is a mistake.
There is actually a box on the convention card for you to indicate that you and your partner agree to make offshape takeout doubles with minimum values.

If you take away one thing from this page, I hope it is the understanding that making off-shape takeout doubles with minimum values is losing bridge.
That said, there are a couple of exceptions, the most common being the takeout double to show extra strength and a very strong suit. Suppose you are dealt this hand:
A AKQJ 98
$\bullet K 2$

- 6
\& K Q 54.
Your right-hand opponent opens 1V. What should you do? If you overcall 1A and partner's hand is

A 1043
$\vee 7654$
-A 1065
\& 85 ,
he will not bid with only 4 high-card points, and you will miss a virtually ironclad game. In case you were thinking of bidding 4^, dismiss that thought. A 4A overcall is strictly pre-emptive and would look like this:
AK Q J 10965
$\checkmark 62$
-K Q 4
\& 5 .
So what should you do? You could play intermediate jump overcalls, but that is not recommended for newer players. Also, the intermediate variety of jump overcalls comes up far less often than the preemptive version: weak jump overcalls.
A better plan is to double. Yes, it's ostensibly for takeout, but you plan to rebid in spades suit to describe a hand with 17 or more HCP and a long, strong suit. Partner can pass with a bad hand and inadequate support for your suit, but he will strain to raise with any excuse. The auction would go like this (you are South)

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \downarrow$ | Dbl |
| Pass | $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |

You would have to be very unlucky not to take 10 tricks with those two hands.
Any time you double and bid your own suit it shows extra values and, usually, a strong, six-card or longer suit.
The other exception to the rule about having support for unbid suits was touched on in yesterday's article. Suppose you have this collection
A A Q J
-KQ62

- 98
* A K 107 and RHO opens 1 1v.

You don't have a suit you can bid and your hand is too strong to overcall 1NT (recommended range: 15-18), so you must double. You have three-card spade support in case partner bids that suit, but a more important task for you is to show your strength. Over any minimum response by partner (1A, $2 \boldsymbol{\&}$ or $2 \downarrow$ ), you will bid notrump at the cheapest level to show your power and a balanced hand. Partner should know what to do from there. Note that if partner bids 1 NT , this is not a minimum response. It shows some high-card values and a stopper in opener's suit.

## IMPROVING YOUR GAME

Barry Rigal

| Dealer: North <br> Vul: Nil | A A 72 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 96 |  |  | Pass | Pass | 18 |
|  | -9764 |  | 14 | 24 | Pass | 4 |
|  | \& K 43 |  | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| A Q J 1084 <br> $\bullet 7$ <br> - A Q 3 <br> \&A963 |  | A963 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | - Q 85 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -10852 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * 1087 |  |  |  |  |
|  | A K 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | マKJ10432 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | -KJ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \& Q J 5 |  |  |  |  |  |

The auction has a few points of interest; first of all West does best to overcall 1A, not make a take-out double. With limited values, one should overcall in a five-card major rather than double, otherwise a 5-3 major-suit fit gets lost sometimes. North could make a negative double of 1 , but it looks better to cue-bid, showing a sound raise to $3 \boldsymbol{V}$. This agreement allows you to use a jump to $3 \boldsymbol{V}$ in competition as pre-emptive. Playing this
style, South has enough to jump to game, despite some concerns about his kings being badly placed because of the overcall.
In $4 \mathbf{V}$, on the lead of the $\uparrow \mathbf{Q}$, South will have to play carefully to make. Of course he could succeed by playing East for the queen of trumps, but there is a far better line. South wins the king and ace of spades, and ruffs the spade loser in hand. Then he leads the \&Q, to knock out the \&A; West is forced to win, and can only exit with another club. South wins the $\% \mathrm{~J}$, cashes the VA, and then takes the $\%$ K. (On a bad day West might ruff the third club, but if he did, he would probably have no trumps left, and thus be compelled to lead away from the $\bullet$ A, or to give you a ruff and discard by playing spades.)

As it is, when the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ lives, the key play follows. South leads a second trump from dummy and when East follows with a low heart he finesses the VJ, a "Heads I win, tails you lose" play. If the finesse wins, South is safe; he must give up two diamonds but has ten tricks. If the finesse loses, West will be out of hearts and must open up the diamonds, or give South a ruff and discard. Either way, South is home free.

## ROOKIE PAIRS - KENMORE STARS

## Brent Manley

Since its founding nearly three years ago, the Kenmore Bridge Club in suburban Brisbane has gained attention as a club providing a friendly atmosphere which has resulted in impressive growth. The club has produced some good players and sent eight pairs to play in the Sunday Rookie game at the 53rd Gold Coast Congress.

One of the Kenmore pairs - Chris Williams and Luci Gun finished first North-South in the Sunday Rookie Pairs while Kathy Males, the club treasurer playing with Ming Yang finished third East-West. Here are some of the deals that helped Males and Yang achieve their 58.14\% game.
This deal was from the first round:

| Dealer: East | A 85 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 10$ |  | Yang |  | Males |  |  |
| Brd 6 | -K J 10843 |  |  |  | 4 | Pass |  |
| Sun Rookie Prs | * A J 86 |  | Pass | Pass |  |  |  |
| A 10973 |  | A A 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 854$ |  | -AKQJ9632 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 96 |  | - 72 |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
| \& K Q 94 |  | \& 7 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | AKQJ42 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | A |
|  | $\checkmark 7$ |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A Q 5 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 10532 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\%$ |

South started with the AK, taken by Males with the ace. Instead of pulling trumps, Males put the $\boldsymbol{\$ 7}$ on the table, hoping to sneak it past South if that hand held the \&A. North had that card, however, and after South got in with a spade at trick three, the defenders could have cashed two diamonds to defeat the contract. South, however, was apparently worried that Males might have the $\downarrow$ K, so she exited with a club instead of cashing

On this board from the sixth round, Yang played well to land a 1NT contract, earning another near top.

| Dealer: East | A K 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -106 |  |
| Brd 26 | -K10732 |  |
| Sunday Rookie Prs | \& K Q 74 |  |
| A 863 |  | A A Q 109 |
| - A J 9 |  | -7542 |
| - 854 |  | - Q 96 |
| \& J 1093 |  | \& A 2 |
|  | AJ754 |  |
|  | - KQ 83 |  |
|  | - A J |  |
|  | \& 86 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yang |  | Males |  |
|  |  | 1 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | 1 | - | NT |
| - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| - | - | 1 | - |  |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| - | 2 | - | 1 | $\&$ |

South might have balanced with a double, but the vulnerability probably served as a deterrent.
North started with a low club, ducked by Yang to her $\$ 9$. One hurdle jumped. At trick two, Yang played a spade to dummy's 9 . South won the $\uparrow \mathbf{J}$ and cleared the club suit. In dummy with the \&A, Yang played a low
heart, inserting the jack when South played low (because of the blockage in diamonds, it would not have helped for South to split her honours).

After winning the $Y J$, Yang played a second spade and was relieved to see the king pop up. She now had three spade tricks to go with two hearts and two clubs. Plus 90 was worth $95 \%$ of the matchpoints.

Yang was at the helm again on the next round, proving herself a fearless bidder. Perhaps she has met the wag who claims that "stoppers are for children."

| Dealer: West | a 753 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vul: Both | A J |
| Brd 4 | J 654 |

Sunday Rookie Prs \& K 742

A A 10

- 10754
-KQ73
\& Q 96
^Q964
$\checkmark 2$
- A 108
\& A J 1085
AKJ82
-KQ9863
- 92
*) 3


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yang |  | Males |  |
| Pass | Pass | 10 | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Double | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 \wedge}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |


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

Yang painted herself into a corner with an apparent negative double that did not deliver the expected other major. After Males bid spades, Yang more or less had to bid 2NT despite the weak holding in hearts. She was lucky on two counts. First, North did not lead his partner's suit, trying a low club instead. Second there is blockage in the heart suit. If North starts with the VA and continues with the jack, South cannot overtake the jack without establishing declarer's $\geqslant 10$.
Yang played the $\& 10$ on the opening lead ( $a$ minor error), but collected five club tricks before playing four rounds of diamonds, putting North on lead with a diamond at trick nine. North could have held Yang to nine tricks by exiting with a spade, but he played the VA and $¥ J$, putting South in to lead away from the AK-J in the two-card ending. Plus 180 was good for $91 \%$.

The best round for Males and Yang was the penultimate.

| Dealer: South | ヘAJ5 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\bullet 1074$ |  | Yang |  | Males |  |  |
| Brd 19 | - A Q 8 |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| Sunday Rookie Prs | \& K J 82 |  | Pass | 1NT | Pass | 3NT |  |
| A Q 10 |  | A 86432 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| - J 83 |  | $\checkmark$ AKQ96 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -K965 |  | -7 |  | Make | le Con |  |  |
| \&9643 |  | ¢75 | - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | - K 97 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\dagger$ |
|  | $\checkmark 52$ |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ }$ |
|  | - J 10432 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | * |

Bidding to show the majors with the East hand would be the choice of many players, but Males took a conservative view that paid off handsomely when she was able to take five heart tricks before declarer could get in. Some North-South pairs were apparently warned by the bidding to avoid notrump, playing diamond partscores. One East played in 3V, taking only five trump tricks to finish minus 400. Males and Yang scored $86 \%$ for plus 50.

On the next deal, Males took advantage of a defensive slip to earn their fourth $95 \%$ score of the session.

| Dealer: West | A 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - Q 10965 |  |
| Brd 20 | -97653 |  |
| Sunday Rookie Prs \& 76 |  |  |
| A K Q 52 |  | A 10963 |
| - A J 87 |  | $\checkmark$ K |
| -K2 |  | - A J 1084 |
| * A 92 |  | \& K J 10 |
|  | A A J 74 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 432$ |  |
|  | - Q |  |
|  | \& Q 8543 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2} \boldsymbol{\phi}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | - | 6 | - | NT |
| 6 | - | 6 | - | $\uparrow$ |
| 3 | - | 3 | - |  |
| 5 | - | 5 | - |  |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | 9 |

South started with his singleton diamond, taken by Males in hand to lead a spade up. South could have given declarer a harder time by playing low, but he played the ^A and exited with a low club. Males won in hand again and played a second spade to dummy's king. When North showed out, Males played a low heart to the king, followed by the 10 , which she ran when South declined to cover.
It wasn't long before Males was claiming plus 480 for another near top.
Gun and Williams were surprise winners North South, at least in Gun's estimating. On being asked about their game at the end of the session Gun said she thought it was terrible, mostly bad cards and mistakes. It will be interesting to see the results when Gun thinks she has played well.

## EVEN THE EXPERTS MAKE MISTAKES! - PAIRS FINAL SESSION 1 <br> Barry Rigal

Mistakes you'd never make - or would you? The final of the ' A ' pairs is an environment where nobody ever makes mistakes....or do they? Any of the novices or intermediates reading this will be heartened to know that they play just as well (or badly) as the great and the good. To prove the point here is a round of three deals that I watched between two pairs who you would have thought would have known better.

| Dealer: West | A 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark$ A J 6 |  |
| Brd 16 | - A 109842 |  |
| Prs Fin S1 | \& Q 93 |  |
| AKQ73 |  | A AJ642 |
| $\checkmark 542$ |  | -KQ973 |
| -63 |  | - Q 7 |
| \& K 652 |  | \& 4 |
|  | ヘ 1098 |  |
|  | -108 |  |
|  | - K J 5 |  |
|  | \& A J 1087 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \star$ | $1 \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{1}$ | Pass $^{2}$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{3}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{4}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{5}$ | Pass $^{6}$ |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |  |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | $\uparrow$ |  |
| 1 | - | 1 | - |  |  |
| - | 4 | - | 4 |  |  |
| - | 4 | - | 3 | 9 |  |

This is not an easy deal to judge; North-South want to compete to 4 with a big double fit and matching shortages. East-West cannot bid beyond the three-level or they may get doubled.
This was what I saw; my footnotes are in the accompanying numerals

1. East must have available Michaels or the equivalent to get his two suits off his chest at his first turn. If you don't play the cuebid for a two-suiter and reserve the cuebid for a strong hand you are wasting the bid altogether. Double with strong hands and take it from there.
2. Passing 1a isn't the worst bid of the auction but it sure is bad matchpoint strategy. If you cannot stand to bid $2 \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ - a call that in the best circles does not promise a rebid over opener's minimum rebid -- then raise to 2 . Yes you have only three trump but your spade length makes it highly unlikely that partner doesn't have four. And in an Acol base the call stands out. With the same pattern but weaker clubs, pass then balance with 2NT over 2A to show $3-5$ in the minors and about a seven-count.
3. If you don't have a mixed raise available (the shape for preemptive raise but the values for a raise from one to two, typically four trump and 6-9 HCP in a semi-balanced hand) then get one! Right now! Typically the jump cuebid can be used to get those values across, and since it is a spare call, you are giving up nothing.
4. This by contrast to the previous actions is a sin of commission not omission. Why bid again when partner heard you open $1 \Downarrow$ ? To compete to $3 \star$ shows the $\varangle K$ more than you have.
5. The 3A competition is reasonable because of the extra shape, and since $3 \boldsymbol{r}$ should be a game-try not looking for the best partscore, 3 ${ }^{\boldsymbol{A}}$ is the best bid available.
6. This is terrible; no other word for it. Yes you expect partner may have overbid his hand by a trick or so, but failing to compete to 4 - or even better bidding 4ヵ as a game-try for diamonds - is just absurd.

The play was equally undistinguished. The defenders took their diamonds at once and shifted to a trump, but declarer played on hearts, and then South (enjoying the same pre-prandial snooze that he had been indulging in during the auction) ducked his \&A to let through 170. The good news was that letting through the overtrick was not very expensive, as -140 would only have scored 6 MP out of 26 .
On to the next instalment. Here is the bidding:

| Dealer: North | AK2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | -KJ98 |  |
| Brd 17 | -J754 |  |
| Prs Fin S1 | * A 32 |  |
| AJ43 |  | A A Q 98765 |
| - A 106 |  | $\checkmark$ Q 52 |
| -98 |  | - K |
| * K Q J 107 |  | \& 95 |
|  | A 10 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 743$ |  |
|  | - A Q 10632 |  |
|  | \& 864 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $1 \boldsymbol{a}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{1}$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\AA}^{2}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\AA}^{3}$ | Pass $^{4}$ |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |


| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | - | NT |
| 4 | - | 4 | - | $\vdots$ |
| - | 1 | - | 1 |  |
| - | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| 3 | - | 3 | - | 9 |

1. Again South took the VERY low road with his $2 \star$ call. l'd prefer $4 \diamond$ to $3 *$ albeit that it could be our hand in 3NT.
2. East-West were obviously playing the jump raise as limit not preemptive. I deprecate this method -- after all you have the cuebid of $3 \star$ available for the limit hand, so you can jump to $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ as a preempt.
3. Either way East has a raise to game.
4. Very slow, doubtless regretting his earlier passivity.

East played 4A on the lead of the $\downarrow \mathrm{A}$, and it might have occurred to him that he was only missing 18 HCP , and that North had opened. When South after much rumination decided against continuing with the $\vee Q$ and shifted to the heart four (UGH! Why not the $\geqslant 7$ to make partner's life easy?) the defenders won the $\mathbf{V K}$ and returned the suit.

Declarer won cheaply in dummy; what now? The line chosen at the table of a low trump to the ace was a deserved catastrophe. More subtle is that if declarer is planning to finesse in trumps --as he obviously should -- he MUST start by leading the jack. This is not just to tempt the cover but to pick up K102 onside. If you lead low to the queen you are left with a forced loser if trumps break 3-0.

Down one in 4A got E/W two MP, and so the round was absolutely level with a board to play.

| Dealer: East | - A 10754 |  | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\checkmark 10$ |  |  |  | 1 | Pass |  |
| Brd 18 | - 865 |  | 1 V | 14 | $2 \checkmark$ | $2{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ |  |
| Prs Fin S1 | \& A Q 72 |  | Pass | Pass | $3 v^{2}$ | Pass ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| -96 |  | ヘQJ3 | Pass | Pass |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ J742 |  | - 653 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A932 |  | -KJ104 |  | Makeab | le Con | acts |  |
| \& J 95 |  | * K 8 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | AK 82 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - KQ9 8 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - Q 7 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |
|  | * 10643 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\%$ |

Again the auction will be littered with comments. Like the curate's egg, some parts were indeed excellent..

1. South's raise to $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ is arguably not an underbid here. Though he has 10 points most of the hand is wasted heart cards, so the simple raise is best.
2. By contrast the re-raise to 30 is terrible. Larry Cohen's Law of Total Tricks discusses these situations thoroughly. If you aren't familiar with it, take a read. Basically the law encourages you to compete to the level of your total trumps. Here you know West knows you have four trumps - because with three you would double 1A. Thus either he is very weak with five trump or has only four hearts. Look at your values soft trump tricks in spades and weak hearts -- but the key ace, the value that works on defence. If you had, by contrast, $\uparrow x x x \geqslant K Q x x \checkmark K Q J x ~ \& K x$ you could sell me on a $3 \vee$ bid...maybe.
3. Failing to double $3 \checkmark$ is mindboggling. If they make it, you can in Boris Schapiro's words, call me Percy.

The defence to 30 undoubled was not critical. +300 was going to be good, +100 or +50 somewhere around average. But the bridge continued at the level of the bidding. North led diamonds -- unluckily picking up his partner's queen but getting him close to giving his partner the diamond ruff. The first diamond went to the jack queen and ace. Declarer led a heart to the ace and a heart back.
South won and now had an obvious diamond continuation - declarer had not played for discards so he didn't have any coming. South actually played a spade. North won and somewhat mysteriously went back to diamonds, won in dummy for a third heart play. Now South made it easy for his partner by cashing the AK then exiting with the club 10. North took his club ace for down one, and dummy now consisted of the high cards in all three side-suits. Where was another trick coming from except a diamond ruff. North played back...a spade. Down one, at which point like the best News of the World reporters, I made my excuses and left?
 bridge and find out more about my upcoming holidays and seminars at RonKlingerBridge.com
Regards,


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

BRIDGE FOR THE IMPROVER
Ron Klinger
Problem 1
North (Dummy)

- 43

West

- Q 107

Hearts are trumps. You led a spade which declarer won in dummy. Declarer then played the $\downarrow$ : low from East, eight from South and you win with the $\downarrow 10$. Who has the king of diamonds? Who has the ace? What is declarer planning? How might you counter that?

Solution 1: It looks as though declarer is planning to ruff one or more diamonds in dummy. South cannot have $\forall A+\mathbb{K}$, since declarer then would not have ducked the first round of diamonds. East cannot have $\forall+\star$ K, because East would have won the first round of diamonds. Therefore the diamond honours are split. South does not have the $\$$ K. South would have played it when East played low. Therefore East has the $\forall K$ and South the $\forall A$. To try to reduce or eliminate dummy's trumping potential you should switch to a trump unless that would cost you a natural trump trick.

## Problem 2

North
$\checkmark$ A 104

## West <br> VK752

South is in 4A. Your minor suit lead was won in dummy and declarer played the V4: low from East and VQ from South. You take it with your king. Who has the VJ? Who has the V9?
Solution 2: If declarer began with VQ-J, declarer would come to hand at some point and take the heart finesse. Declarer would not be leading low from dummy. Therefore the VJ is with your partner, East.
If declarer began with VQ-9 or VQ-9-x, after East played low, South would tend to place the king with West and so play the $\vee 9$ from hand (to cater for the VJ with East. You can deduce that East began with VJ-9-x and return a heart quite safely.

## MEETING FOR NSW AFFILIATED CLUBS \& PLAYERS

Would you like to:

- Meet NSWBA Councillors?
- Find out about current NSBWA initiatives?
- Discuss issues of concern to you?

Who can attend?

- Anyone interested in furthering bridge in NSW
- No need to be a regional representative or club official

The NSWBA wants to improve our communications with clubs and players and identify how to better serve them so we look forward to seeing as many people as possible

Wednesday 26th Feb 2014
Convention centre seminar room (upstairs opposite the Bridge Admin office) - BYO lunch

VICTOR CHAMPION CUP BRIDGE FESTIVAL 10:00am Daily - Thursday $5^{\text {th }}$ June to Monday $9^{\text {th }}$ June 2014
Bayview Eden Hotel 6 Queens Road, South Melbourne Victoria

## Swiss Pairs Events

Women's, Seniors, Open, Restricted, \& < 50 MP
Thursday 5th June - Friday 6th June
Swiss Teams Event:
Open \& Restricted
Saturday 7th June - Monday 9th June
New for 2014
Warm-Up With Speedball Wednesday 4th June Starting 8pm
An ABF Gold Point and Playoff Qualifying Points Event For more details and to enter visit the website: www.vba.asn.au/vcc


THE OASIS SHOPPING CENTRE IS DELIGHTED TO ANNOUNCE OUR SPONSORSHIP OF THE
Bobby Richman Open Pairs Championship.
The Oasis Shopping Centre is the premier destination for fashion, food \& lifestyle
in Broadbeach and is located a short 5 minute walk from the Gold Coast Convention and Exhibition Centre.

We would like to extend a very warm welcome to all players attending the Gold Coast Congress.
Look out for the Welcome Signs in Centre for your exclusive store discounts (from participating retailers) and their SPECIAL CONGRESS OFFERS

All specials are valid during The Congress

## ANTHONY LEIGH DOWER BOUTIQUE'S <br> New Designer Clearance Outlet Oasis Shopping Centre <br> Shop 1.10 (Level One) <br> BROADBEACH BOUTIQUE: <br> SHOP 40A, GROUND FLOOR, BEACH END <br> OASIS SHOPPING CENTRE 0755382007

We would also like to thank Anthony Leigh Dower Boutiques for their generous donation of gift voucher prizes for the Gold Coast Congress

## Weekend Matchpoint Swiss Pairs

## Names

 Andy HUNG - Adam EDGTTON Tony BOND - Tony ONGChris WILLIAMS - Ian LINCOLN
Robyn O'DELL - Maha HOENIG
Kathy JOHNSON - Lois STEINWEDEL
Eileen LI - Watson ZHOU
Robyn CLAYTON - Alan SMITH
Simon BRAYSHAW - Matthew RAISIN
Ken MOFFITT - Sue MOFFITT
Jan HACKETT - Tom HACKETT
Charles HOWARD - Kerry WOOD
Lisa MA - Emlyn WILLIAMS
Connie SCHOUTROP - Albina SMYTH
Paul WEAVER - Terry BODYCOTE
Helen HEALY - Tim HEALY
Andrew RICHMAN - Sandra RICHMAN
Deborah COOPER - Bruce BATCHELOR Ian AFFLICK - Paul COLLINS
Bijan ASSAEE - Margaret KLASSEN
Sue BROWN - Robert BROWN
Di COATS - Janet CLARKE
Anne RUTTER - Jenny MICHAEL
Maura RHODES - Rick RHODES
Ralph PARKER - Arran HODKINSON
Chris WATSON - Shirley WATSON
Noel GRIGG - Bruce TURNER
Tom STRONG - Edda STRONG
Helen WILSON - Jane NORTH
Andrew WOOLLONS - Alan BOYCE
Ronald SMITH - Anne SMALL
Julie JEFFRIES - David O'GORMAN
Ann OHLSEN - Pauline HAMMOND
Bruce FRASER - Helen KEMP
Kirsten BAILEY - Gavin BAILEY
Eric HURLEY - Marjorie ASKEW
Wayne BURROWS - Kaylee LEMON
Roman PAWLYSZYN - Amanda LEVICK
Donna SMITH - John LANHAM
Simon ANDREW - Gwen KING
Sharon MAYO - Greg MAYO
Richard WARD - Lynette VINCENT Marion BUCENS - Mike ROBERTSON
Peter HAINSWORTH - Alan CURRIE
Peter GRANT - Zhenlong ZHANG
Ben RAAPHORST - Magda KIRALY
Ken STORR - Phaik YAO
Stephen BARON - Anita THIRTLE
Marina DARLING - Ben KINGHAM
Bev GUILFORD - Sue SPENCER
Roy ROBERTS - Astrid GONCHAROFF
John MASTERS - Kaye DONALDSON
Maruta BOYD - Bert FORAGE
Ron LORRAWAY - Jan DOONER
Lucie ARMSTRONG - Rua FREEBORN
Roger WEATHERED - Krystyna HOMIK
Judy PERL - Byron LONGFORD
Michael NEELS - Jan SPAANS
Peter NILSSON - Deborah NILSSON
Charlie LU - Chuan QIN
Ian LISLE - Pat WALKER
Don TYLEE - Robin HECKER
Christine HOUGHTON - Wayne HOUGHTON
Rosalind TREND - Alan HARROP
Perelle SCALES - Lyn TURNER
Carol DE LUCA - Bev HENTON
Adrienne KELLY - Stephen BROOKES
Geoffrey NORRIS - Erin BATCHELOR
Ruth LITTLER - Kath CRANE
Susan RODGERS - Diana STAGG
Michael JOHNSON - Michael SIMES
Val CHURCHILL - Helga CORBETT
Rob GAULT - Helen GAULT

Tot
,
Rank

| Pr\# |
| :---: |
| 50 |

\#
Names
Helen LARSEN - Margaret MELSOM
Ross STEINWEDEL - Elaine HENNIG $\quad 78$

| Jack CARSON - Anne REILLY | 78 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Arch MORRISON - Cherie BUTLER | 78 |

Gerry GREENWOOD - Elizabeth GREENWOOD $\quad 78$

Theo MANGOS - Leigh FORAN

| Gerald DAWSON - Megan SUTHERLAND | 77 |
| :--- | :--- |


| Marelle IRVINE - Judy KINGSTON | 76 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Jan ASHWELL - Bronwyn MACLEOD | 76 |


| Sandra MCBAIN - Kerrie CROTHERS | 76 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sue ROLPH - John ROLPH | 76 |


| Sylvia SENDER - Annette CORKHILL | 76 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Neville FARRELL - Pauline ERBY | 75 |


| Arthur ANLEZARK - Margaret THORN | 75 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sharmini HOOLE - Milton HART | 75 |

Sharmini HOOLE - Milton HART

| Leeron BRANICKI - Susie HAWKINS | 75 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Dov BERNS - Sandra BERNS | 75 |


| Bev CROSSMAN - Bruce CROSSMAN | 75 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Chris TURNER - Ian BRASH | 74 |


| Noel ATHEA - Annemarie ATHEA | 74 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Peter HOLLOWAY - Phil MCAREAVEY | 74 |

Rita KAHN - Merle BOGATIE $\quad 74$

| Denise O'REGAN - Kay WEBBER | 74 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sue EASTMAN - Diane NICHOLS | 74 |


| Gwenda MEALYEA - Cecile SENIOR | 74 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Therese GARBUTT - Vivian ZOTTI | 74 |


| Meta GOODMAN - Wynne WEBBER | 74 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Timothy CREGAN - Louise CREGAN | 73 |


| Maureen BAKER - Eileen PIERCE | 73 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Helen JEFFERY - Phyllis LOGAN | 72 |


| Lorraine ROBINSON - Jeanne ANDERSON | 72 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Sue COOPER - Kathleen DAVIES | 72 |


| Dorothy JESNER - Sue COLEMAN | 71 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Malcolm MARTIN - Jennifer ROTHWELL | 71 |


| Chris BAYLISS - Catherine CHOWN | 70 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Lorraine CARR - Beverley CONNELL | 70 |


| Vona HADFIELD - Lynn BAKER | 69 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Michelle RADKE - Verna BROOKES | 69 |

Fifine HUTTON - Wendy HUTTON $\quad 69$

| Jennifer BANDY - Angela NEWTON | 68 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Nicky STRASSER - Peter STRASSER | 68 |


| Sylvia YOUNG - Peta GRICE | 67 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cecily JOHNSON - Graham CARSON | 67 |


| Cecily JOHNSON - Granam CARSON | 67 |
| :--- | :--- |


| Janina FLEISZIG - Gabor FLEISZIG | 66 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sandra ALLEN - Evol CRESSWELL | 66 |


| Terence FARRALL - Betty DAY | 66 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lex BOURKE - Judith LEATHIEY | 66 |


| Lex BOURKE - Judith LEATHLEY | 66 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Barbara ANDERSON - Janet BELL | 66 |

Pamela LAWRENCE - Michele TREDINNICK $\quad 65$

| Rosemary MATSKOWS - Fern MCRAE | 65 |
| :--- | :--- |


| Madeleine GRAY - Ellen BORDA | 65 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Christine BAYNES - Sheryl CULLENWARD | 64 |


| Janice PEARSON - Janice PALM | 63 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Karen ERENSTROM - James FYFE | 61 |


| Anne CLARKE - Richard CLARKE | 61 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sally MORTON - Derek PONSFORD | 60 |

Peter GILES - Jodrey BAILLON-BENDING
Heath COOK - Barry COOK
Marilyn WHIGHAM - Judy WULFF
Heather GRANT - Frank CAMPBELL
Maree FILIPPINI - Merylene PERRY
Donald KNAGGS - Vicky LISLE
Anne BATES - Robert JACOBS
Joan YOUNG - Anne ASHMORE
Marie WALLIS - Kay SMITH
Beryl DAWSON - Maureen COOKSLEY
Sandra MULCAHY - Tracey YOUNG
Carole MCDONALD - Dorothy BEIL
Robyn HARRISON - Liz FALKINER
Rusty WARNER - Joan ROSEMEYER

| Sunday Rookie Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | Pair | North-South | Score | \% | Place | Pair | East West | Score | \% |
| 1 | 6 | Christine WILLIAMS - Lucinda GUN | 350.20 | 60.80 | 1 | 5 | Catherine ARMSTRONG - Veronica | 367.60 | 63.83 |
| 2 | 1 | Beverley NORTHEY - Dianne THATCHER | 316.40 | 54.92 | 2 | 8 | Kerry RAYMOND - Mary FLETCHER | 337.10 | 58.52 |
| 3 | 8 | Wendy CASEY - Barbara MONI | 305.50 | 53.03 | 3 | 3 | Kathryn MALES - MingShu YANG | 334.90 | 58.14 |
| 4 | 4 | Yvonne CROFT - June ABBOTT | 296.70 | 51.52 | 4 | 10 | Rita VAN LIESHOUT - Petronella PROKOP | 324.00 | 56.25 |
| 5 | 2 | Julie HEIB - Diann YOUNG | 290.20 | 50.38 | 5 | 11 | Mary SIMON - Isabel GRIINKE | 316.40 | 54.92 |
| 6 | 11 | Rena INDERMAUR - Annie SINCLAIR | 288.00 | 50.00 | 6 | 1 | Drew CAMPI - Joan CADE | 296.70 | 51.52 |
| 7 | 12 | Joan PUTLAND - Lorraine TYNAN | 283.60 | 49.24 | 7 | 12 | Elizabeth BASILE - George BEYROUTHIE | 291.30 | 50.57 |
| 8 | 7 | John BURT - Janice LITTLE | 281.50 | 48.86 | 8 | 7 | Jan LAWSON - Jill WILDEY | 278.20 | 48.30 |
| 9 | 5 | Amanda ADAMS - Patrick EATHER | 280.40 | 48.67 | 9 | 2 | Gillian KINSELLA - Helen HART | 257.50 | 44.70 |
| 10 | 3 | Jan FLANIGAN - Bevley D'AQUINO | 268.40 | 46.59 | 10 | 9 | Ken MACDOUGALL - Elizabeth HANDLEY | 254.20 | 44.13 |
| 11 | 10 | Jane HILLS - Jennifer MONTAGUE | 267.30 | 46.40 | 11 | 13 | Nili WOOD - Laurence WOOD | 243.30 | 42.23 |
| 12 | 13 | Robert OLANDER - William WEBSTER | 266.20 | 46.21 | 12 | 6 | Marguerite BETTINGTON - Jan DEAVILLE | 238.90 | 41.48 |
| 13 | 9 | Geoffrey DAVIS - Anthony | 249.80 | 43.37 | 13 | 4 | Louise NOWLAND - Faye HOOIVELD | 204.00 | 35.42 |




## FAVOURITE OPERATIONS

Four Danish surgeons sit around discussing their favourite patients. The first surgeon says: "I like operating on librarians. When you open them up, everything is in alphabetical order".
The second surgeon says: "I like operating on accountants. When you open them up, everything is in numerical order".
The third surgeon says: "I like operating on electricians. When you open them up, everything is colour coded.
The fourth surgeon says: "I like operating on politicians."
The other three surgeons look at each other in disbelief and wonder why politicians are his favourite patients. They get his reply:
"Because they're heartless, gutless, spineless, and the arse and head are interchangeable".

| GOLD COAST CONGRESS 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Monday 24th February | Tuesday 25th February | Wednesday 26th February | Thursday 27th February | Friday 28th February | Saturday <br> 1st March |
| OPEN EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bobby Richman Open Pairs Championship <br> Open Teams <br> Weekend Matchpoint Swiss Pairs <br> Monday Butler Swiss Pairs <br> Ivy Dahler Open Butler Swiss Pairs <br> Friday Teams |  | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R1-R4 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R5-R8 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R9-R12 | Q/F Teams S/F Teams | 9:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final 10:30am 3/3 |
| SENIORS EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seniors Pairs Championship <br> Seniors Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R1-R4 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start <br> 4x12 Brds Final |  |
| INTERMEDIATE EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  | All Are Dinner <br> Imited Dance |
| Intermediate Pairs Championship <br> Intermediate Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R1-R4 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R5-R8 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start <br> $4 \times 12$ Brds Final |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restricted Pairs Championship <br> Restricted Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Restricted Butler Swiss Pairs | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R1-R4 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R5-R8 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R9-R12 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final 09:30am 1/3 $\quad 2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 3$ | 10:30am 3/3 |
| NOVICE EVENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Novice Pairs Championship <br> Novice Teams <br> Friday Novice Pairs | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1:00pm } \\ \text { F3/3 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R1-R4 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R5-R8 | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R9-R12 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 12 \text { Brds Final } \\ \text { 9:30am 1/2 } \\ \text { 2:00pm 2/2 } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ROOKIE PAIRS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rookie Pairs - Single Session Events |  |  |  | 10:00am 1/1 |  |  |
| UNDER 50MP PAIRS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 50 Masterpoint Pairs |  |  | 10:00am 1/1 |  |  |  |
| MIXED TEAMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seres/McMahon Mixed Teams |  |  |  |  | 09:30am 1/2 2:00pm2/2 |  |
| WALK-IN PAIRS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holiday Walk-In Pairs - Play 1, 2 or 3 Sessions |  | 3:00pm 1/3 | 3:00pm213 | 3:00pm3/3 | 09:30am1/3 2:00pm213 | 10:30am 3/3 |
|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday |


| CALENDAR OF SOCIAL AND OTHER ACTIVTIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOVICE AND ROOKIE ACTIVITIES | Venue | Monday 24th February | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuesday } \\ & \text { 25th } \\ & \text { February } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wednesday } \\ & \text { 26th } \\ & \text { February } \end{aligned}$ | Thursday 27th February | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Friday } \\ & \text { 28th } \\ & \text { February } \end{aligned}$ |
| GCC Novice Welcome Assistance with System Cards, How it all Works etc | Main Playing Area | 9:00am-10:00am |  |  |  |  |
| Under 50's <br> Assistance with System Cards, How it all Works etc | Main Playing Area | 9:00am-10:00am |  |  |  |  |
| Rookies Welcome Assistance with System Cards, How it all Works etc | Main Playing Area | 9:00am-10:00am |  |  |  |  |
| GCC Novice Welcome Assistance with System Cards, How it all Works etc | Main Playing Area | 8:45am - 9:30am |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER ACITVITIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oasis Shopping Centre Fashion Parade Oasis Shopping Mall Ground Floor outside Newsagency | Oasis Shopping Mall | 10.30am - 11.45am |  |  |  |  |
| Trivia Night - Marigold Restaurant and Café Broadbeach on the Ground Floor of the Oasis Mall - Jac and Bill Rossiter-Nuttal your hosts | Marigold Restaurant | Starting at 6:00pm |  |  |  |  |
| Dress Up Award - Denim and Lace | Sally Eliott of Meegs Boutique | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 3rd Session Prs } \\ \text { Fin } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Queensland Directors Breakfast Meeting 1st FI Above Bridge Office - Stairs LHS main door as leaving | Jan Peach | Starting 8:00am Finish 09:30 |  |  |  |  |
| Dealing Machine Demonstration | Paul Lavings Bookstand | 9:30am - 10:30am |  |  |  |  |
| Make-a-Wish Foundation Charity Collection | Entrance to Main Playing | All Day in Foyer |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |

## MORE FROM THE NEC

## Barry Rigal

The NEC is a tournament comprising 16 invited international teams together with open domestic entries. The teams is a three days Swiss event followed by quarters, semis and a final. The strength of the field at the top is considered very high and invitations are much sought after by most of the world's top players.

Another interesting hand this time featuring the Australian Team of young players.

| Dealer: East | A 106432 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\bullet 64$ |  | Milne | Hallberg | Whibley | Black |
| Brd 10 | - Q 75 |  |  |  | 1\% | Double |
|  | \& K 73 |  | $1 V^{1}$ | 14 | Double ${ }^{2}$ | 4a |
| A Q 8 |  | A 9 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| -Q108752 |  | -AJ3 | $1=1$ | 2=Suppo |  |  |
| - J 922 |  | - AK 3 |  |  |  |  |
| \& 9 |  | \& 1086542 | Whittaker | Howard | Patterson | Holland |
|  | A AKJ75 |  |  |  | 1\% | Double |
|  | - K 9 |  | $1 V^{1}$ | 14 | 27 | 4a |
|  | -1064 |  | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  | \& A Q 7 |  | 1=^ |  |  |  |

You and I in a casual pick up partnership would expect to be able to bid this hand to 3NT without any problems - wouldn't we? Both tables missed this for some reason, and both Easts led a top diamond and worked out to win the first heart and exit passively to avoid any endplay. Down one, and still 1913.

In our second match Burgess for team Lorentz was allowed to make the game when East, enjoying a pre-prandial snooze, ducked the VA and endplayed his partner.
India led 22-17 now. With South declarer the defensive error is still embarrassing but comprehensible - but remarkably, this particular mistake (or a variation on it) was committed by my reckoning at one third of the tables in play. Colour me deeply unimpressed.
Let's instead concentrate on congratulating Fu Zhong (North) and Hideki Takano (South) who did bid the hand to 3NT ([1\&]:X:[1৫]:P:[2\&]:2A:[P]:3A:[P]:3NT)- to hold their loss on the board to just 1 imp .

DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| $13+$ | $60 \times$ | $11+$ | $6+$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $18 \times$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | $11+$ |  |  |
| $12+$ |  |  | $10+$ | $14+$ | $12+$ |
| $6+$ |  |  |  |  |  |

YESTERDAY'S DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| $14+\frac{}{3}$ | 6 | ${ }_{5}^{13+}$ | 4 | $1:_{1}$ | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | ${ }_{2}^{3-}$ | 4 | ${ }^{7+}$ | 6 | 3 |
| $18+4$ | 5 | ${ }_{3}^{60 x_{3}}$ | 6 | ${ }_{2}^{13+}$ | 1 |
| 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | $\text { 2- } 5$ | 4 |
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 12 \times \\ 2 \end{array}$ | 1 | 6 | $12+3$ | 4 | 5 |

IMPOSSIBLE SUDOKU

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

YESTERDAY'S IMPOSSIBLE SUDOKU

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

2014 is ..... The Year of the Horse Come to the

## AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

 at CANTERBURY PARK RACECOURSE \& GAMBOL 12 - 24 JULY 2014

INTERSTATE TEAMS $\leqslant$ AUSTRALIAN BUTLER PAIRS $\leqslant$ ANC SWISS PAIRS OPEN WOMEN'S, SENIORS' \& RESTRICTED

BRIDGE AT THE RACES CHAMPAGNE STAKES
CANTERBURY GUINEAS WEEKEND CONGRESSES
More information at www.abfevents.com.au/events/anc/2014
email: anc2014@abf.com.au phone: 0411-582-997

Register your team at the Bridge Administration desk in the GCCC and a table will be reserved for you. Entries will be taken at the venue subject to availability.

TRIVIA PARTICIPANT SPECIAL \$11.50 MAINS AS WELL AS A FULL A LA CARTE MENU

