

## The Numbers Game

|  | Pairs |  |  |  |  |  | Teams |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Open | Seniors | Intermediate Novice Restricted | Swiss Pairs | Total | Year on Year Change | Open | Seniors | Intermediate Novice Restricted | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year on } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2006 | 324 | 98 | 156 |  | 578 |  | 244 | 56 | 86 | 386 |  |
| 2007 | 297 | 91 | 180 |  | 568 | -1.7\% | 243 | 45 | 103 | 397 | 2.8\% |
| 2008 | 332 | 104 | 162 |  | 598 | 5.3\% | 274 | 48 | 96 | 418 | 5.3\% |
| 2009 | 284 | 106 | 180 |  | 570 | -4.7\% | 246 | 46 | 96 | 388 | -7.2\% |
| 2010 | 314 | 102 | 204 |  | 620 | 8.8\% | 214 | 44 | 138 | 396 | 2.1\% |
| 2011* | 304 | 98 | 292 |  | 694 | 11.9\% | 240 | 46 | 150 | 436 | 10.1\% |
| 2012 | 264 | 94 | 282 |  | 640 | -7.8\% | 220 | 46 | 138 | 402 | -7.8\% |
| 2013 | 194 | 88 | 308 | 242 | 832 | 30.0\% | 200 | 52 | 174 | 426 | 6.0\% |
| 2014 | 198 | 70 | 312 | 296 | 876 | 5.3\% | 196 | 46 | 184 | 426 | 0.0\% |
| * 50th Anniversary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Our Trivia Winners: Will Adler, Brian Cleaver, Peter Gill (NPC),Kathy Buchen (front), Debbie McLeod, Mark Siegrist (back), Peter Buchen Terry Brown and Sue Ingham


N/S Winners Under 50 MP Pairs Daria Williams - Ian Cameron

E/W Winners Under 50 Pairs John Harrison - Charlotte Harrison Joan Butts and Annette Maluish Presenting the Winners

## APPEAL NUMBER 1

To ensure complete transparency of the Appeals Process, the Australian Bridge Federation ensures that the full details of Appeals at National Events are published in the Daily Bulletins wherever possible. Here is the first such Appeal for this Tournament.
Gold Coast Seniors Pairs Final 3
Chief Tournament Director:
L. Kelso

Appeals Committee:
B. Neill (c), T. Brown, M. Wilkinson

Scribe:
S. Yuen

| Dealer: West | \& Q J 103 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vul: E-W | \& J 10873 |
| Brd 16 | $\& 62$ |
|  | $\& 3$ |


| $\checkmark 64$ | -Q5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| - AKJ7 | -10853 |
| \& Q J 1075 | * AK 42 |

A A 752

- A 92
- Q 94
\& 986

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 2^ |
| $2 \mathrm{NT}^{2}$ | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| Pass | 39 | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | Pass | 4\% | 44 |
| Pass | Pass | Double | All Pass |
| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
| - | - | - | NT |
| - | 4 | - | 4 - |
| - | 4 | - | 4 - |
| 3 | - | 3 | - * |
| 3 | - | 3 | $\%$ |

${ }^{1}$ Weak, both majors
2 Agreed as showing both minors; not alerted

| Trick ${ }^{1}$ | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | X | X | X |
| 2 | - K | X | X | X |
| 3 | ¢Q | X | X | X |
| 4 | -10 | $\checkmark 3$ | X | Q |
| 5 | $\wedge 8$ | AQ | AK | A 2 |

1 Some uncertainty as to the order of play for the first four tricks; see respondents' case (Ed: It was the Seniors Pairs Finals)

| Table result | 4 $\uparrow x-1$ by South, NS -100 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Director's ruling | NS: $4 \uparrow x-1$ by South, NS -100 |
|  | EW: $4 \wedge x=$ by South, NS +590 |
| Committee's ruling | NS: $4 \uparrow x-1$ by South, NS -100 |
|  | EW: $4 \uparrow x=$ by South, NS +590 |

The Director: Was called to the table at the end of play. The players agreed that the 2NT bid had not been alerted, but East-West had the systemic agreement that it showed both minors. As South believed the 2NT bid to be natural, she placed the spade king with West, and consequently chose not to take the spade finesse.
The Director considered that general bridge knowledge for a player of South's standard would include the fact that 2NT was very likely to be unnatural in this position from a passed hand. Further, the play of the first tricks
had established substantial values in the West hand, and it was naive to expect West as a passed hand to also hold cover in the majors.

The Director ruled that the failure to alert 2NT constituted misinformation. However, the Director also ruled that subsequent to the infraction, South contributed to their own damage through a serious error (Law 12C1b); namely, not being aware of West's original pass. The table result was therefore allowed to stand for NorthSouth, 4Ax-1 by South, NS -100.

In accordance with Law 12C1b, East-West was awarded the score that it would receive as the consequence of its infraction only; namely (Law 47E2b, Law 12B1), 4Ax by South, NS +590.

## The Appellants:

The Respondents:

The Appeals Committee: Confirmed that East-West did have an agreement about the nature of the 2NT bid; this was strengthened by their agreement that 2NT by an unpassed West hand in this auction would also show a two-suited hand. The committee also confirmed that no questions were asked about either the 2NT or the 3\% bid prior to play.

The committee agreed that, on the assumption that West had the spade king, declarer's play at trick 5 was reasonable - crossing to dummy in hearts to take the spade finesse might have exposed declarer to a ruff, and ruffing the third diamond in dummy to take the spade finesse may have been problematic if spades had broken 4-1.

The committee's discussion therefore focused on the question of whether being unaware of West's original pass was a serious error. The committee noted that the non-alerted, non-forcing 3* bid and the final double of 4a were both consistent with the layout South had in mind - for example, playing 3\% as natural and non-forcing over a strong balanced 2NT bid would be reasonable as North had shown both majors. It was observed, however, that both actions were sufficiently unusual that they might have prompted South to reconsider the auction and realise that West had passed originally.

South was an experienced player who had, for example, previously qualified for Stage II of the Australian National Championship Open Butler Pairs. Ultimately, the committee decided that it was a serious error for a player of South's standard to have been unaware of the entire auction, including West's original pass, particularly when reinforced by other elements such as the unusual non-forcing 3* bid in response to what South believed to be a strong balanced hand.

The committee therefore allowed the Director's ruling to stand: for North-South, 4Ax-1 by South, NS -100; for East-West, $4 \mathrm{Ax}=$ by South, $\mathrm{NS}+590$. The appeal was also found to have merit.

## TEAMS QUALIFYING ROUND FOUR

## Barry Rigal

The final match of day one saw two of the top domestic teams colliding, each including some out of towners. I would be watching Bill Hirst and Phil Gue take on Ron Klinger and Matt Mullamphy. Two natural systems but Klinger/Mullamphy play transfer responses to 1\%. In the other room David Weston and Julian Foster were playing Nick Jacob and Ishmael Del'Monte. Two single imps gave Gue the lead; then something more substantial:

| Dealer: North | A AKQ 5 | Teams Qual R4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark 32$ |  |  | 1 | Pass 1a |  |  |
| Brd 17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A Q } 985 \\ & * 65 \end{aligned}$ |  | Double | 34 | All Pass |  |  |
| A J 97 |  | A 86 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 854 |  | - K J 109 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 4 |  | - J10762 |  | Makea | le Con | acts |  |
| \& A K Q 107 |  | \& 94 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A 10432 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | A |
|  | -Q 76 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - K 3 |  | - | - | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& J 832 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | 8 |

Klinger led a top club, getting count, then shifted to his singleton diamond, and declarer put in dummy's nine, captured East's ten with his king and carefully drew only two rounds of trumps. Then he played a top diamond from dummy. Klinger fell from grace by ruffing and leading out clubs from the top, setting up declarer's $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{J}} \mathrm{for}$ the ninth trick. He needed to shift to hearts, or more simply to discard on the $Q$ - that defence is absolutely necessary if the VK and VQ are switched. (And just for the record, three rounds of clubs is a far easier way to set the partscore). In the other room after an emetic strong 1NT from North, N/S never got spades into play and sold out to $3 \checkmark$ - not terrible in a sense since $4 \checkmark$ can be made though is unlikely to do so in practice (only three pairs bid and made the game here). Gue led 9-0.

| Dealer: South | A AK 972 | Teams Qual R4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 54$ |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| Brd 19 | - J 87 |  | 10 | 14 | 34 | Pass |  |
|  | \& 495 |  | 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 654 \\ & \bullet A K Q J 1092 \end{aligned}$ |  | A --- | 6 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark 8763$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - --- |  | - AK Q 1095 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& K J 10 |  | \& 843 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | A Q J 1083 |  | - | 2 | - | 3 | A |
|  | - --- |  | 6 | - | 6 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -6432 |  | 4 | - | 5 | - | - |
|  | * Q 762 |  | - | - | - | - | 9 |

On board 19 both tables bid slam, but Klinger found himself with a nasty guess after the $5 \diamond$ (RKC Response). He gambled that dummy --which had so far shown only a splinter in spades - would have a spade void, or the right keycard, and so it proved.

The datum was E/W plus 840, but there were of course some interesting results here - for example the E/W pair who played 4a doubled down 1700. I can understand playing it undoubled... no fewer than seven pairs reached $7 \%$ and all the Norths found the A lead. Well done them. About $40 \%$ of the field bid slam and quite a few were doubled by an untrusting North.


Klinger was in the hot seat again on the next deal. He heard his partner open 4\&, doubled on his right, and $4 \checkmark$ from Hirst. When this came round to him he doubled - an action that rated to pay dividends if dummy had the VK or partner the \&A. If wishes were horses....Mullamphy led the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow 9} 9$ and Hirst won in dummy, passed the VJ, then drew trumps and stripped off the club and diamond winners before endplaying Klinger with a top spade to lead into the spade tenace or give a ruff and discard. Nicely done for +990 and 8 imps .

We are all familiar with the trump promotion. Do you know about the anti-trump promotion? Phil Gue carefully avoided one on the next board:

| Dealer: North | ヘ 972 | Teams Qual R4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\checkmark 94$ |  |  | 3 | 30 | 4\% |  |
| Brd 21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K Q } 98752 \\ & \& Q \end{aligned}$ |  | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| A AJ 6543 |  | A K Q 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - K 6 |  | - Q J 873 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J 4 |  | - A 103 |  | Make | le Con | acts |  |
| \& 953 |  | \& J 6 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A 10 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | 4 |
|  | - A 1052 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 6 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& AK 108742 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | 4 |

When Hirst opened 3 Mullamphy insouciantly overcalled 3V. Gue bid $4 \boldsymbol{*}$ and Klinger tried $4 \vee$. Gue cashed two clubs and then avoided playing a third club for the trump promotion - you can see what might happen if partner ruffed with his 'high' trump of the eight or lower? Declarer might overruff and lead a heart to the six. Now THAT would be embarrassing. Instead Gue exited in diamonds at trick three and eventually obtained trump control for down two, when he cut declarer off from dummy's spades. In the other room 5 was undoubled and down 200, so Gue led 24-0 now.

The next deal saw the tide begin to turn:

| Dealer: East | A 932 | Teams Qual R4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - AK 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } 8 \\ & \& \text { Q } 963 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A J } 754 \\ & \vee 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } 108 \\ \bullet Q J 76 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - AK J 95 |  | -104 |  | ak | C |  |  |
| \& K 42 |  | \& A 1087 | 3 | - | 3 |  | NT |
|  | A K Q 6 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | 4 |
|  | $\checkmark 9853$ |  | 1 | - | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -7632 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& J 5 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | 9 |

Mullamphy has never seen an 11 count that he didn't like. He opened 1\% as East and Klinger now drove to 3NT, showing his spades but not his diamonds, while dummy had shown four hearts. Hirst led clubs (essentially an unbid suit) and now Klinger simply ran the clubs and gave up a diamond, losing just three red suit tricks. In the other room East for some reason did not dignify his cards with an opening bid and did not get beyond 2NT.
That made it 24-10 and after both tables had gone down in an unlucky 3NT (Klinger holding the loss to -100 for a 3imp gain) Hirst and Gue overreached to a minor-suit game off three aces to make it 24-18.

| Dealer: East | A 4 |  | West | North | East | Sout |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark 865$ |  |  |  | 19 | Pass |  |
| Brd 26 | -KJ943 |  | 14 | Pass | $2 V$ | Pass |  |
|  | \&J 976 |  | 2NT | Pass | $4 V$ | All P |  |
| A A Q 753 |  | A J 62 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 9$ |  | - KQ J 1073 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Q 76 |  | - A 108 |  | Make | le Con | cts |  |
| \& K 1083 |  | \& Q | 3 | - | 3 | - | NT |
|  | AK1098 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | 4 |
|  | - A 42 |  | 3 | - | 2 | - | $\nu$ |
|  | - 52 |  | 2 | - | 1 | - | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$ |
|  | \& A 542 |  | - | - | - | - | 8 |

The last swing of any significance came when Mullamphy and Klinger bid unopposed to 4V. After a low diamond lead Mullamphy must have hoped he would need little more than a good diamond guess. Alas for him, the cards lay in extremely hostile fashion. He played low from dummy and won the $\checkmark J$ with the ace then led a heart to the nine and drove out the club ace. Gue took his diamond ruff then engineered a spade ruff for his partner for down two. Since Weston-Foster had been able to stop in $2 v$ they gained 7 imps to win the match 31-19.

## TEAMS QUALIFYING ROUND FIVE - BRIDGE AT THE TOP

Barry Rigal

| Dealer: South | A A 5 3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Vul: Both | QJ2 |
| Brd 7 | Q953 |
| Teams Qual R5 | \& 94 |
|  |  |
|  | AKJ2 |
|  | \& 84 |
|  | KJ4 |
|  | \& A Q53 |


| A 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$--- |  |  |
| - Q 9 |  |  |
| \& --- |  |  |
| A --- |  | A 76 |
| - --- |  | ---- |
| - ? 8 |  | ? |
| \& 10 ? |  | \& ? |
| A J |  |  |
| - --- |  |  |
| - 4 |  |  |
| \& 5 |  |  |
| Trying to determine who has the 10 and the $\uparrow 8$ |  |  |

When top experts meet one another, it is reasonable to expect a certain amount of mutual respect. Board 7 demonstrated this nicely.
Phil Gue played 1NT as South after Sartaj Hans had overcalled 14 over 1*, and David Beauchamp led the spade ten to the discouraging eight and jack. Gue tried the diamond king: ace, three and seven.

Beauchamp played a low heart to the jack and ace, and back came the club seven, to the queen and king. Beauchamp reverted to spades, so Gue won in hand and led a heart to the jack. Hans sneakily produced the king, then cashed his side's heart trick. Gue pitched a club from hand and from dummy, and Beauchamp exited with the club jack. Gue won and cashed the diamond jack, and had reached this position:
When declarer cashed the spade jack Beauchamp threw the club ten, and Hans the spade six. When declarer led the diamond towards dummy was it right to finesse or play for the drop? Was Hans' last card other than his spade the club eight or diamond ten?

Gue got it right, by finessing; this was the full deal:

Dealer: South
AA53
Vul: Both $\quad$ QJ 2
Brd 7 Q953
\& 964
A. 109
$\checkmark 10963$
A Q 8764
-A 1082

- AK5
* K J 10
- 76
\& 872
AK J 2
- 874
-KJ4
\& A Q 53

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

Incidentally Gue could have made life a lot easier by pitching dummy's low spade on the fourth heart. now the spade jack legitimately squeezes West in the minors.

## EXTRACTING ONE'S POUND OF FLESH.

Barry Rigal

| Dealer: South | AKJ 9 | Pairs Fin S2 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark$ AK432 |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| Brd 3 | -1086 |  | Pass | 19 | Double 2V <br> All Pass |  |  |
|  | * $A$ Q |  | Pass | 4V |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 75 \\ & \vee \text { QJ } 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\text { A A } 1084$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\vee 95$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - J7532 |  | - A Q 4 <br> \& K J 109 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& 876 |  |  | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A Q 632 |  | - | 2 | - | 1 | $\wedge$ |
|  | $\checkmark 1076$ |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - K 9 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | - |
|  | ¢5432 |  | - | - | 1 | - | $\%$ |

Michael Whibley and Ashley Bach extracted their pound of flesh here from Kim Morrison. Kim had overreached to play $4 \checkmark$ as North. Whibley led a trump, the $\vee 9$ to the $\vee 8$ and king. Declarer tried the $\uparrow K$;

Whibley won and pressed on with trumps, and now declarer ducked in dummy and won the king, then led a diamond up in this position.

|  | ヘJ 9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 432$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1086 \\ & \& A Q \end{aligned}$ |  |
| A 7 |  | A 1084 |
| $\checkmark$ J |  | - --- |
| -J7532 |  | - A Q 4 |
| \& 876 |  | \& KJ109 |
|  | A Q 63 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 10$ |  |
|  | -K9 |  |
|  | ¢ 5432 |  |

Normal defence sees East win the diamond ace and exit in diamonds, and declarer wins the king, crosses to the spade jack, ruffs a diamond, and can now exit in hearts. Whatever suit West returns, declarer can arrange to run his trumps and squeeze East in the black suits to make his game. But Whibley crossed him up by inserting the $\downarrow$ Q on the first round of the suit! When Morrison took the king and played a second diamond Bach hopped up with the jack and drew the last trump then exited in diamonds. When declarer misguessed the ending he was two down, and the defenders has 25/26 MP.

MCGANN VERSUS DE LIVERA - TEAMS QUALIFYING ROUND 6
Barry Rigal


For Round six two of the teams at the top tables met head to head, in a generally well-played match. After three deals it was 2-1 to McGann on overtricks, both E/W pairs having bid a laydown slam on very few highcards (the datum was +570 non-vulnerable, meaning it was missed at $80 \%$ of tables).

| Dealer: East | A Q 1073 | Teams Qual R6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - A Q 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } 2 \\ & \& \text { A } 532 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A K 62 |  | A J 85 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -K5 |  | - J 873 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A Q 764 |  | - J 10983 |  | ak | - |  |  |
| \& 1074 |  | \& K | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A A 94 |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | A |
|  | -10942 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 5 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& Q J 986 |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | 9 |

Board 18 saw the first major swing when GeO, as keen to get no-trumps in as the next man - or maybe rather keener - overcalled 1NT over 1* as North. That got him to 3NT - not that it had to - his side might have defended $3 \diamond$ doubled for +500 . And when he misguessed clubs he was down 200. In the other room De Livera doubled 1 and reached $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ after Neill had doubled diamonds for take-out. l'd like to tell you how well he did to guess clubs, but what that entailed was winning the opening lead of the club king with the ace, which most of us would have managed. Then he played on trumps and lost a trump a ruff and a diamond, with the heart loser going on the clubs. De Livera led 14-1 now.

Both N/S pairs then guessed the trump queen missing four cards by accurately finessing the partner of an overcaller, and after six deals it was 14-3.

| Dealer: North | A K J | Teams Qual R6 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\checkmark$ Q1075 |  | Closed Room Auction |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 21 | -K873 |  |  | 1 * | 19 | $2 \checkmark$ |  |
|  | \& K 108 |  | Pass | 2NT | Double | 3 |  |
| A Q 10842 |  | A A 953 | Pass | Pass | ?? |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ J |  | - AK932 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -942 |  | - --- |  | Makea | Contra |  |  |
| \&J 653 |  | ¢ A 742 | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A 76 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\bullet 864$ |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A Q J 1065 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | - |
|  | \& Q 9 |  | 4 | - | 4 |  | 8 |

Where McGann-Thompson were East/West Thompson extracted a spade bid out of his partner and drove him to game, while in the other room after the auction shown above David Lilley won today's cowardy-custard award by selling out to 3 and collecting +100 . Since 4^ racked up +420 with ease, it was $14-11$ for De Livera now.

The next three deals saw four more imps going De Livera's way in dribs and drabs.

| Dealer: West | A 3 | Teams Qual R6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | -10642 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } 109832 \\ & \& 95 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ^ K Q } 109876 \\ & \vee \text { Q J } 93 \end{aligned}$ |  | A 52 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | - K 875 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  | - Q 764 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& 86 |  | \& Q 42 | - | 5 | - | 5 | NT |
|  | A A J 4 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | A |
|  | $\checkmark$ A |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A J 5 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& AK J 1073 |  | - | 5 | - | 6 | 9 |

On 24 Both N/S pairs bid sensibly to a minor suit slam on board 24. Neill De Livera played 6 ${ }^{*}$, Ware-GeO played $6{ }^{\circ}$. Note that after a violent preempt you might make 7 - on any lead but a heart. Win the spade lead, say, ruff a spade, run the 10 , repeat the finesse, unblock the $\forall$ A, ruff out the clubs, and draw the last trump, with dummy being high and accessible via the VA. But a heart lead takes your late entry out of dummy prematurely. Only one pair played $7 \star$....down three.

| Dealer: North | A A 64 | Teams Qual R6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } 6542 \\ & \& K 1086 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK K } 83 \\ & \vee K \text { K } 753 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A Q J } 105 \\ & \vee \text { A } 98 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -973 |  | - K |  | ak | C |  |  |
| \& A |  | \& J 9732 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A 72 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | A |
|  | - J1064 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A J 108 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& Q 54 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | 8 |

On our next exhibit I thought Zolly Nagy made a nice decision. Holding the West cards he opened 10 in fourth chair and the auction proceeded (Double) - Redouble - back to him. He passed, GeO raised to 3४, and Lilley bid 3V. Despite his dead minimum in high-cards Nagy bid 3^ now, and was raised to four. The defenders took their heart ruff, but that simply held declarer to ten tricks. Since the other room had played partscore here this was 10 imps to De Livera, leading 28-11 with three boards to go. (Overall many bid and made game here, but accurate defence - basically any lead but a diamond(!) - will beat the game.)

| Dealer: East | $\rightarrow$ Q 10 | Teams Qual R6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -KQ62 |  |
| Brd 26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q963 } \\ & \bullet \text { A } 83 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| A AK 875 |  | - 642 |
| $\checkmark 3$ |  | -98754 |
| - AKJ7 |  | - 4 |
| \& Q J 9 |  | ¢K 1076 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { N J } 93 \\
& \text { A J } 10 \\
& 10852 \\
& \& 542
\end{aligned}
$$

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

Time for a late charge. Would you raise 1A doubled to 2 A as East? Neither would I, but Matthew Thompson put the pedal to the metal and raised to $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and McGann bid game. In the other room Lilley passed initially then balanced over $2 \leqslant$ into $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and his partner did not advance. With all the side-suits breaking perfectly, declarer wrapped up ten tricks in both rooms and McGann had 10 imps to trail 28-21.

On the next deal both Norths opened 44. This was passed out in one room, but doubled by Lilley in the other room (on a 2-3-5-3 16-count). He got to score his doubleton queen of spades, but that still only held declarer to 590, and McGann had four more imps, down 28-25.

On to the last hurrah.

| Dealer: West Vul: N-S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 86 \\ & \bullet 1042 \end{aligned}$ | Teams Qual R6 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brd 28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K Q J } 4 \\ & \& 10985 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A Q 10954 |  | A K 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -AJ7 |  | $\checkmark 865$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 3 |  | -8762 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& AK 3 |  | *Q 764 | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | A A J 72 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | 4 |
|  | - KQ 93 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\nabla$ |
|  | -1095 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& J 2 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | 9 |

Both Wests opened 1A and East passed. In one room ware let 1A play in peace and quiet, and Nagy collected +110 . Bruce Neill balanced with 1NT and McGann informed him of the error of his ways by doubling. No one had anything further to say, and on a low spade lead the defenders collected eight rricks (three spades three clubs and two aces) while declarer just had five.
That was +500 and 9 imps to give McGann a 34-28 win.

## HAVE YOU DISCUSSED

Brent Manley

Back in the days when tournament entries were typed in by volunteers, one of them experienced a break in the monotony. Where the player number was supposed to be, the player had written, "Forgot. Can't remember what trump is either!"

It's tough to remember something you never knew, and that's one big reason why it's important to discuss bidding agreements with your partner - and not just the names of the conventions you're playing. Here's an auction for you:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \%$ | Dbl | Redbl | 3A |

What are your thoughts on the meaning of South's bid? It looks strong, right? Well, logic says otherwise.
Think about it. West has an opener, at least 12 high-card points. North's double indicates approximately opening values - another 12 HCP . East's redouble is based on at least 10 HCP . That's 34 of the 40 HCP , leaving only about 6 HCP for South.

It's highly likely that South is the owner of a six-card spade suit and is aiming to make life difficult for EastWest. South's hand might be something like this:

A Q 107543
-J2

- Q 5
\& 876
Because North's double promised at least three-card support for the unbid suits, South knows that he and North have at least nine spades between them. That means a spade contract is likely to play really well if there is shortness in either hand (or, ideally, both). Suppose North's takeout double is based on

```
A A J 9 2
* AQ4 3
-10987
&2.
```

This is a normal takeout double - only 11 HCP but perfect shape. It would not be surprising to find that South can make 4A, and 3A would be down only if both major-suit finesses failed. That's possible, but you would be justified in feeling very unlucky in such a case. Even if $3 \uparrow$ was doubled, the opponents certainly would be able to do better than plus 100 (you will, of course, be cautious with your pre-emptive actions when you are vulnerable) - and they will certainly find their best spot if South doesn't take up a big chunk of their bidding space.
South's bid is aggressive, but having a big fit in trumps can make up for a lack of HCP. That's part of the reason players like to cite the famous - thanks to Larry Cohen - Law of Total Tricks. Simplified - okay, oversimplified - "The Law" tells players they are safe to bid up to the level of their best trump fit, so nine trumps equals nine tricks. If you want to know more, get Larry's book, "To Bid or Not to Bid: The Law of Total Tricks."

Well, that takes care of the occasions when South is lucky enough to hold a long suit. More often, North-South will have to scramble. So, you may ask, what is South's main goal when East redoubles? Safety is the primary concern, so South should strive to make the call that is most likely to keep the level of the auction as low as possible. Once the opponents have established, via third hand's redouble, that they have the majority of the high-card strength, they will be quick to double for penalty if the opponents land in a bad spot.
Both partners should try to keep the bidding low. For example, say South holds
A Q 6
-10754

- 32
\& Q 7643
And this is the auction

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Dbl | Redbl $?$ |  |

South must bid $2 \boldsymbol{*}$, showing a clear preference for that suit. If South passes and North bids $2 \downarrow$, the doubling will start and South would have to run to the three level in clubs. Disaster! If South's hand is

A Q 64

- 10754
- 103
\& J 764 , it's best to just pass. South would not mind if North bids 1A.
Tomorrow: Bidding after they double for takeout.


## IMPROVING YOUR GAME <br> Barry Rigal



The auction poses an awkward problem for South. When he gets his first chance to speak, in the protective seat, he is clearly much too good to bid just 1A, which is consistent with a much weaker hand. Similarly, a jump to 24 shows a good suit but not much more than an opening bid - also not really doing justice to the hand. South's actual choice of doubling and then bidding a suit shows a pretty good hand, and when North invites to game, South still has a fair bit in reserve, enough to bid game directly. It is not easy to get to 3NT, though there are nine winners.
Against 4 4 . West leads the $V K$ and, seeing the $\vee Q$, shifts to the $\triangleleft J$, which is as good a shot as any. South wins in hand, and should see that he must build a heart trick for his contract from the rather unpromising material at his disposal. He crosses to the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$, leads the 10 , and throws a club loser away. West can win this trick and play another diamond, but South wins this trick, goes to dummy with a trump, and plays the 99 , throwing his immediate diamond loser away. West scores his VA, the third trick for the defence, but South's remaining slow club loser can be thrown on the V8, using the final spade entry to dummy. All three trump entries to dummy are essential, so you cannot afford to draw trump before setting up the hearts.

|  |  |  | Thursday 274h February |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trendy Transfers (Responses to Minor openings in Competition) with Pablo Lambardi |  | Pablo Lambardi lives and works as a bridge teacher in Buenos Aires, Argentina. He has won national and South American Championships, and represented Argentina in seven Bermuda Bowls \& six Olympiads. He has won the NEC tournament in Japan and played in many international tournaments. His hobbies include reading good literature eating good food, watching tennis, and everything esoteric and paranormal (he is a non-practising astrologer). | 9:00am |
| MINIMUM \$5 Contribution to the ABF Friends of Youth Bridge Fund |  |  |  |

## THE FULL STORY

Barry Rigal

Yesterday the bulletin got its facts wrong when discussing a couple of deals from set three. Time to set the record straight.

We mistakenly identified the E/W pair who bid the two grand slams in this set; in fact it was Nick Jacobs of Auckland and Glenn Coutts of Dunedin. Nick and Glenn are both part of bridge playing families, the four bridge playing members of the Jacobs family are here on different teams, while Glenn's brother James reached the final of the pairs with Fraser Rew.

Glenn and Nick are in especially good form: they topped the datum in the NOT where their team, seeded 43 finished third in the qualifying and reached the quarter-finals. Both have played representative bridge for New Zealand, Nick in Beijing, and Glenn in Malaysia...and as an aside with funding for New Zealand Juniors at the lowest possible levels, please feel free to toss a penny into their caps any time you see them.
Here are the deals again with the auctions to the successful contracts.

| Dealer: West | A Q 1074 | Teams Qual R3 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark$ Q6 |  | 100 | Pass | 10 | Pass |  |
| Brd 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } 7654 \\ & \& 74 \end{aligned}$ |  | 19 | Pass | 4 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK } 8 \\ & \checkmark 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A A } 932 \\ & \bullet A 10954 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| - AK 3 <br> \& K Q 108653 |  | - 9 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * A J 2 | 6 | - | 6 | - | NT |
|  | AJ65 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ KJ873 |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J1082 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
|  | \& 9 |  | 7 | - | 7 | - | $\%$ |

Here 7\% can only be reached with complete confidence if West takes control. In an auction such as the one shown above West can then ask for aces and bid the grand slam - and maybe offer a choice of grand slams with a call of six spades over the response to Blackwood?
Glenn and Nick actually bid: 1ヵ-1V-3\&-4NT-5A-5NT-6V-7\&. The 6V call showed either the heart king or the other two kings, and here East could be relatively confident that hearts would set up in 7\& if partner had that king, or that there would at least be play for the grand slam facing the other two kings.

| Dealer: East | A 1082 |  | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark$ K Q 108 |  |  |  | $1 *$ | Pass |
| Brd 14 | - Q 54 |  | 2* | Pass | 2 | Pass |
|  | \& 762 |  | 3\% | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| A Q 5 |  | - AK 9 | 4 | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| $\checkmark$ A 62 |  | $\checkmark 95$ | 4NT | Pass | 54 | Pass |
| - A J |  | -K9863 | 54 | Pass | 7\% | All Pass |
| ¢ A Q J 1085 |  | \& K 93 |  | Make | le Con | ats |
|  | AJ7643 |  | 6 | - | 6 | NT |
|  | $\checkmark$ J743 |  | 3 | - | 3 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - 1072 |  | 2 | - | 2 | $\nabla$ |
|  | \& 4 |  | 5 | - | 5 | - |
|  |  |  | 7 | - | 7 | $\%$ |

$2 v=12-14 / 18-19$ balanced
3n = probe for no-trump initially
5A = Grand slam try
When West set clubs, East's two efforts did not show the stronger hand but simply announced the spade controls.

After the keycard ask and East's response, East accepted the grand-slam try at his final turn because the diamond length suggested that even if partner had three diamonds he might have the spade queen. If so he would be able to pitch a third diamond on the spades, then ruff out diamonds and come back to the East hand in trumps. More important, within the constraints of showing 12-14 his partner could not expect more than an ace and three kings.

## UP AND COMING

## Brent Manley

A match with a relatively low score is usually indicative of a good play between the two teams. That was the case in the Intermediate Teams round-five match between the teams captained by Frances Garrick and Heather Grant. The latter prevailed, 19-12, in a match featuring steady play by both sides. One big swing settled the issue (that board will be saved to last in this report).
At the featured table, Janet Rowlatt and Frances Garrick faced Gerald Dawson and Megan Sutherland.


Janet Rowlatt and Frances Garrick
Their first board was No. 8

| Dealer: West | A Q 63 | Teams Qual R5 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | -K4 |  | 4 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| Brd 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK } \\ & \& \text { Q } 97652 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A 2 |  | A A 109874 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -AQJ98753 |  | $\bullet 10$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -103 |  | - Q 764 |  | Make | le Con | acts |  |
| \& J 3 |  | \& K 10 | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | A K J 5 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | A |
|  | -62 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - J 9852 |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& A 84 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\%$ |

The auction was quick: Dawson opened $4 \mathbb{V}$ and played it there. Garrick cashed her diamonds and put her partner in with a club. Rowlatt astutely continued with a diamond, which would have been essential to the defence if her partner had been dealt the doubleton trump queen or a singleton king. On the actual layout, it didn't matter because Garrick was always going to get her VK, but it was a thoughtful play. Plus 50 was a push (West lost the same four tricks at the other table). This board was a swing for Garrick.

| Dealer: West | A AKQ 743 | Teams Qual R5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | -K72 |  |
| Brd 12 | -6 |  |
|  | \& Q 94 |  |
| A J |  | A 9865 |
| $\checkmark$ A J 3 |  | $\checkmark 954$ |
| - A Q 1082 |  | - J 53 |
| ¢K853 |  | \& A 107 |
|  | A 102 |  |
|  | - Q 1086 |  |
|  | -K974 |  |
|  | \&J 62 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dawson | Garrick | Sutherl'd | Rowlatt |
| $1 \$$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 4}$ | $2 \uparrow$ | 3 | All Pass |


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

Garrick led the ^A and continued with the king, ruffed by Dawson. He played a club to dummy's ace and ruffed a spade, then cashed the 4 K and exited with a club, Garrick winning the queen. Another spade came back, and when Dawson ruffed he was down to three trumps. He played the vA and the 13th club, planning to pitch a heart, but Garrick ruffed in with the $\downarrow 6$, forcing the jack. Rowlatt overruffed, cashed the $V Q$ and exited with a trump. Dawson could cash the two trump honors but still had a losing heart for minus 50.

At the other table, Frank Campbell, North, playing with Grant, took the push to 3^ but could muster only eight tricks for minus 100 and 4 IMPs to Garrick.

Another swing went to Garrick when Rowlatt and Garrick took advantage of a minor slip by Dawson to defeat a 2A contract made in the other room.

| Dealer: North | A J 106 | Teams Qual R5 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - K 875 |  | Dawson | Garrick | Sutherl'd | Rowlatt |  |
| Brd 13 | - Q 86 |  |  | Pass | Pass | $1 *$ |  |
|  | * K 82 |  | 14 | Double | Rdbl |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A AK } 9872 \\ & \vee 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { か } 43 \\ & \vee \text { QJ } 63 \end{aligned}$ | 24 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| - 43 <br> \&J 974 |  | -K1092 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \& A 63 | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A Q 5 |  | 1 | - | 2 | - | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 1094 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A J 75 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  | \& Q 105 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\%$ |

After the redouble, obviously showing high-card values rather than spade support, Dawson was willing to give it one more try in his long suit. Garrick started with a low heart and Dawson made a play that would take in some defenders - he played low from dummy's queen-jack, hoping to make Rowlatt think he held the singleton ワK. Rowlatt did not bite, however, inserting the V9, which held the trick.
Rowlatt continued with a low heart, on which Dawson discarded a diamond. Garrick won the VK and exited with a low diamond. Dawson played the 10 and Rowlatt erred by playing the ace instead of the jack. She exited with a low spade from her doubleton queen, and Dawson inserted the 7 , losing to the 10 .
Garrick shifted to a club, taken in dummy with the ace. Dawson pitched a club on dummy's $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ then played the $\vee$ Q, covered by Rowlatt with the ace. Dawson ruffed and pulled trumps, but he still had to lose two club tricks for minus 100 . That was a 5 -IMP swing to Garrick when $2 \uparrow$ was made at the other table for plus 110.
On board 14, Rowlatt and Garrick bid too much and lost 4 IMPs, but there was an interesting end position engineered by Rowlatt.

| Dealer: East | AJ 842 | Teams Qual R5 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None |  |  | Dawson | Garrick | Sutherl'd | Rowlat |  |
| Brd 14 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Q } 72 \\ \& \quad \text { A } 52 \end{array}$ |  | 2NT | 37 | 1NT <br> All Pas | $2 V$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 1073 \\ & \vee 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | A AKQ 5 <br> -K1086 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -K J 1063 |  | - 84 |  | Makea | le Contr | acts |  |
| \& 10763 |  | \& K 94 | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A 96 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - A J 32 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | $\text { A } 95$ $\text { \& OJ } 8$ |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | - |

At the other table, East opened 1NT and played it there but could manage only six tricks (a misguess in diamonds means declarer never gets to dummy).

Dawson's 2NT was a relay to $3^{*}$, after which he was planning to bid 3 to play.
Against 3V, Dawson led the $\mathbf{\wedge} 7$, taken by Sutherland with the queen. She knew that her partner held a minor suit, so she switched to the suit in which she held some help. Rowlatt put up her queen and when it held, she exited with her spade. Sutherland won the king and, aware that her partner's suit was diamonds, played the -8.

Rowlatt ducked to Dawson's king and won the diamond return with dummy's queen. Rowlatt took the successful heart finesse and might have returned to dummy to repeat it, but the only way to dummy was with the \&A, which would have resulted in the loss of a club and one down anyway.

So Rowlatt cashed the $\vee A$ and, learning of the bad break, played the $\star A$. Sutherland could ruff and cash the VK, but then she was stuck. If she played a high spade, Rowlatt could ruff and pitch her losing club on dummy's now-good $\uparrow \mathbf{J}$. So she continued with a low club, on which Rowlatt played the jack, which held.

The big swing in the match came on the following deal, where East-West can make 64 if they do everything just right, which is easy for Deep Finesse (the analysing program) because it can see all the cards.

| Dealer: East | A 109 | Teams Qual R5 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark 1096$ |  | Dawson | Garrick | Sutherl'd | Rowlatt |  |
| Brd 10 | -K654 |  |  |  | 14 | Pass |  |
|  | \& 10532 |  | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass |  |
| A A Q 85 |  | AKJ642 | 24 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |  |
| $\checkmark 5$ |  | - Q J 873 | 3 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |  |
| - AJ 1093 |  | - | 54 | All Pass |  |  |  |
| \& Q J 9 |  | \& A 76 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  | A 73 |  | 2 | - | 3 | - | NT |
|  | - AK42 |  | 5 | - | 6 | - | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - Q 872 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& K 84 |  | 2 | - | 3 | - | - |
|  |  |  |  | - | 2 |  | $\%$ |

It is worth noting that the deal was played 84 times (Intermediate) and only 13 declarers managed 12 tricks, and only four of them were in slam - it's a tough deal.
Dawson and Sutherland tried for slam but decided against it. Rowlatt started with a trump, taken in hand by Sutherland. She played a second trump to the ace, pitched a club on the A , then played a club to her ace and a low club from hand. Rowlatt won and cashed a high heart, but that was it for the defense.
At the other table, Marsh and Daglish got to slam played by East. South led the $V A$ and switched to a trump. The slam failed when Marsh took an unsuccessful club finesse.

The slam can be made against any lead if East declares and takes the right view, certainly easier on a doubledummy basis. The spade slam by West has no chance on a club lead.

Say South leads a trump. Declarer must win in dummy, cash the $\star$ A to pitch a club, then ruff a diamond. Next, declarer must play the VQ or VJ . South wins and plays another trump. Again, declarer must win in dummy and ruff a diamond, followed by a low heart, ruffed in dummy. A third diamond ruff establishes dummy's jack, and now declarer - having seen the 99 from North - must play the VJ, covered and ruffed in dummy. When North's $\vee 10$ appears, declarer can claim, discarding his other low club on the $\downarrow$ J. He plays a club to his hand, which now contains two good hearts.
Of course, it's a lot easier to arrive at 12 tricks when you can see all the cards.

## MAKE A WISH - OUR CHARITY AGAIN IN 2014

The Queensland Bridge Association would like to announce that Make-A-Wish® Australia volunteers will be fundraising at the Gold Coast Bridge Congress today Thursday 27th February 2014. 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. Over 7,000 wishes have been granted to children with life-threatening medical conditions since their inception in Australia 27 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.
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

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


Sign up to gain access to

- Daily Problems
Weekly Quizzes
An entire Library
full of my bridge
articles
Q Make sure to sign up for
Premium Membership
to get access to all
RonklingerBridge.com
has to offer.

| North (Dummy) | West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AQJ106 |  |  | Pass | $1 \vee$ |
|  | Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

South wins the opening lead and plays the $\uparrow 4$. Dummy has entries. Who has the ace? Do you play the king or do you play low?

Solution: With $A A-x$ or $A A-x-x$, declarer is highly likely to take the normal spade finesse as dummy has entries. East is almost certain to have the ace and you should play low. The layout could be like this:

| West AK 852 | North $\text { A Q J } 106$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | East <br> AA973 |
|  | South $\rightarrow 4$ |  |

When the $\uparrow \mathbf{4}$ is led, if West plays the $\uparrow \mathbf{K}$, declarer can later cross to dummy and lead the $\uparrow$ Q. If East plays the ace, South ruffs and dummy has two spade tricks. The defence makes only one spade trick. If West plays low, declarer will play an honour from dummy. East wins with the ace. Later declarer can lead an honour from dummy and let it run if East plays low. Now the defence makes two tricks and declarer only one.

| CALENDAR OF SOCIAL AND OTHER ACTIVIT\|ES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOVICE AND ROOKIE ACTIVITIES | Venue | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thursday } \\ & 27 \text { th } \\ & \text { February } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Friday } \\ & \text { 28th } \\ & \text { February } \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 |  |  |  |
| Dealing Machine Demonstration | Paul Lavings Bookstand | 9:30am - 10:30am |  |
| Make-a-Wish Foundation Charity Collection | Entrance to Main Playing | All Day in Foyer |  |
|  |  | Thursday | Friday |



|  | Thursday 27th February | Friday 28th February | Saturday <br> 1st March |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OPEN EVENTS |  |  |  |
| Open Teams <br> Weekend Matchpoint Swiss Pairs Monday Butler Swiss Pairs Ivy Dahler Open Butler Swiss Pairs Friday Teams | 10:00am Start $4 \times 14$ Brds R9-R12 | Q/F Teams S/F Teams <br> 9:00am 2x12 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 4 \times 10$ <br> Brds Brds <br>   <br> 09:30am 1/3 2:00pm 2/3 <br> 09:30am 1/3 $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} \mathrm{2/3}$ | 9:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final 10:30am 3/3 |
| SENIORS EVENTS |  |  |  |
| Seniors Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final | All Are Dinner |
| INTERMEDIATE EVENTS |  |  |  |
| Intermediate Teams | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final | 7:30pm Bookings for are |
| RESTRICTED EVENTS |  |  | 8:00pm Essential |
| Restricted Teams <br> Ivy Dahler Restricted Butler Swiss Pairs | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 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 Teams <br> Friday Novice Pairs | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10:00am Start } \\ 4 \times 14 \text { Brds R9-R12 } \end{gathered}$ | 10:00am Start $4 \times 12$ Brds Final $9: 30 \mathrm{am} 1 / 2$ $2: 00 \mathrm{pm} 2 / 2$ |  |
| ROOKIE PAIRS |  |  |  |
| Rookie Pairs - Single Session Events | 0:00am 1/1 |  |  |
| MIXED TEAMS |  |  |  |
| Seres/McMahon Mixed Teams |  | 09:30am 1/2 2:00pm 2/2 |  |
| WALK-IN PAIRS |  |  |  |
| Holiday Walk-In Pairs - Play 1, 2 or 3 Sessions | 3:00pm 3/3 | 09:30am 1/3 2:00pm 2/3 | 10:30am 3/3 |
|  | Thursday | Friday | Saturday |


| Under 50MP Pairs - Wednesday |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | North-South |  |  | East-West |  |  |  |
|  |  | Score | \% | Place |  | Score | \% |
| 1 | Daria WILLIAMS - lan CAMERON | 559.8 | 61.0 | 1 | John HARRISON - Charlotte HARRISON | 582.6 | 63.5 |
| 2 | Sally MORTON - Derek PONSFORD | 553.7 | 60.3 | 2 | Anita BOYLE - Kristine ROSSITER | 522.4 | 56.9 |
| 3 | Pat WHITE - Helen CUNYNGHAME | 545.4 | 59.4 | 3 | Arjen DRAAISMA - Margot HARRIS | 521.0 | 56.8 |
| 4 | Leanne NUGENT - Jenny ILIESCU | 528.0 | 57.5 | 4 | Alan ANDERSON - Greg KERSWELL | 515.4 | 56.2 |
| 5 | Amanda ADAMS - Patrick EATHER | 522.0 | 56.9 | 5 | Anne RUSSELL - Diane MCCLINTOCK | 508.4 | 55.4 |
| 6 | Gail PERRY - Tom LYONS | 515.5 | 56.2 | 5 | Fiona LAW - Norma HALE | 508.4 | 55.4 |
| 7 | Brett MIDDELBERG - Ming Shu YANG | 499.8 | 54.5 | 7 | Margaret MUNRO - Gloria FRENCH | 493.3 | 53.7 |
| 8 | Jennifer SAWYER - Diana BERGMARK | 486.6 | 53.0 | 8 | Jayne LANSDOWN - Lori SEXTON | 479.7 | 52.3 |
| 9 | Michelle BEHRENS - Jim SKEEN | 472.1 | 51.4 | 9 | Rena INDERMAUR - Annie SINCLAIR | 478.8 | 52.2 |
| 10 | Diane ARNOLD - Warren MOORE | 467.3 | 50.9 | 10 | Kenneth GRIGGS - Fay JEPPESEN | 475.2 | 51.8 |
| 11 | Helen BLAIR - Anthony MARSLAND | 462.3 | 50.4 | 11 | Daina GEISE - Kay PEACHEY | 472.3 | 51.5 |
| 12 | John WILSON - Geoff WILLSON | 443.3 | 48.3 | 12 | Kay SNOWDEN - Jeanette MARVELL | 468.9 | 51.1 |
| 13 | Hazel PARKINS - Bill SZUMIDLO | 433.6 | 47.2 | 13 | Jane HILLS - Jennifer MONTAGUE | 463.8 | 50.5 |
| 14 | Marguerite BETTINGTON - Jan DEAVILLE | 424.1 | 46.2 | 14 | Geoff RYDON - Gloria RYDON | 443.9 | 48.4 |
| 15 | Ella LUPUL - George LUPUL | 423.2 | 46.1 | 15 | Cherylene STIMPSON - John STIMPSON | 434.0 | 47.3 |
| 16 | Carol COWLEY - Janette YOUENS | 411.6 | 44.8 | 16 | Margaret MARSHALL - Margaret GAGEN | 426.2 | 46.4 |
| 17 | Denise COLLISTER - Robyn HENWOOD | 405.3 | 44.2 | 17 | Renuka MAHADEVAN - Lyn TRACEY | 419.7 | 45.7 |
| 18 | Robyn SEET - Ivy MONTEIRO | 404.1 | 44.0 | 18 | Drew CAMPI - Joan CADE | 405.4 | 44.2 |
| 19 | John BURT - Janice LITTLE | 398.6 | 43.4 | 19 | Leonie ELPHINSTONE - Gordon PLANT | 402.4 | 43.8 |
| 20 | Beverley NORTHEY - Dianne THATCHER | 389.6 | 42.4 | 20 | Clare GLEESON - Barbara BARLOW | 354.3 | 38.6 |
| 21 | Janet LOWE - Narelle MCIVER | 296.6 | 32.3 | 21 | Irma PAAL - Jillian Ma MCPHERSON | 266.2 | 29.0 |

## Team Members

Liam Milne - Nye Griffiths - Michael Whibley - Ashley Bach - Andy Hung - Adam Edgtton
Anthony Burke - Peter Gill - Sartaj Hans - David Beauchamp

| 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 28 |
| 5 | 13 |

Ralph Parker - Arran Hodkinson - Peter Hainsworth - Sanmugaras Kamalarasa

| 5 | 13 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 30 |

Barry Jones - Jenny Millington - Steve Boughey - Carol Richardson

| 7 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 8 |
| 10 | 10 |

Phil Gue - Bill Hirst - David Weston - Julian Foster
Chen Shenghong - Shi Xuao - Wang Xiaojing - He Zhenyi - He Liqiang - Gui Shenyue

| 10 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9 | 32 |

Margaret Bourke - Neil Ewart - Felicity Beale - Robbie Van Riel

| 11 | 12 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 | 48 |

Marjorie Askew - William Powell - Eric Hurley - Janet Brown 107.32

Terry Brown - Paul Wyer - Sue Ingham - Michael Courtney 107.38

| 12 | 48 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 2 |
| 14 | 6 |
| 15 | 25 |
| 16 | 46 |
| 17 | 49 |
| 18 | 16 |
| 19 | 23 |
| 20 | 1 |

Hugh Korenhof - Carola Hoogervorst - Niels Van Der Gaast - Agnes Wesseling 106.97 Hu Henry Sawicki - Rachel Frenkel - Eva Caplan - Rena Kaplan 106.28 Maurice Brumer - Leigh Gold - Jeff Fust - Eva Samuel Susan Sykes - Gerard Palmer - Brian Fitzsimons - Mairi Fitzsimons
$\square$

|  | 10 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 10 |

Joachim Haffer - Laura Ginnan - Mike Doecke - William Jenner-O'Shea - Pieter Vanderpoel $\quad 10$
Ish

| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | 80 | Weaver | 101.14 | 109 | 186 | Anagnostou | 77.68 |
| 22 | 22 | Giura | 100.97 | 110 | 139 | Taylor | 77.56 |
| 23 | 20 | Wilkinson | 100.80 | 111 | 57 | Curry | 77.49 |
| 24 | 26 | Harley | 100.38 | 112 | 149 | Marker | 77.06 |
| 25 | 37 | Newman | 99.91 | 113 | 17 | Moren | 77.00 |
| 26 | 102 | Williams | 98.29 | 114 | 191 | Diamond | 76.35 |
| 27 | 39 | Kiss | 98.25 | 115 | 136 | Foster | 75.37 |
| 28 | 11 | Brayshaw | 98.21 | 116 | 122 | Flanders | 75.22 |
| 29 | 74 | Schokman | 97.25 | 117 | 181 | Leach | 75.18 |
| 30 | 68 | Sheridan | 97.04 | 118 | 71 | Steinwedel | 74.64 |
| 31 | 89 | Fleischer | 97.00 | 119 | 97 | Maltz | 74.60 |
| 32 | 96 | Martin | 96.82 | 120 | 130 | Tunks | 74.52 |
| 33 | 55 | Mundell | 96.78 | 121 | 118 | Meldrum | 74.40 |
| 35 | 21 | Fischer | 96.42 | 122 | 70 | Porter | 74.30 |
| 34 | 75 | Ashwell | 96.42 | 123 | 82 | Rhodes | 74.28 |
| 36 | 43 | Badley | 96.25 | 124 | 158 | Fraser | 74.10 |
| 37 | 41 | Chadwick | 96.20 | 125 | 140 | Blackham | 74.03 |
| 38 | 120 | Grahame | 95.69 | 126 | 128 | Trend | 74.01 |
| 39 | 67 | Grenside | 94.99 | 127 | 164 | Carroll | 73.90 |
| 40 | 60 | Smith | 94.63 | 128 | 189 | Brown | 73.63 |
| 41 | 7 | Krochmalik | 93.85 | 129 | 109 | Allgood | 72.56 |
| 42 | 132 | Osmund | 93.75 | 130 | 115 | Banks | 72.52 |
| 43 | 36 | Butts | 93.55 | 131 | 106 | Mcdonald | 72.51 |
| 44 | 84 | Green | 93.40 | 132 | 169 | Andrews | 72.50 |
| 45 | 27 | Arber | 93.36 | 133 | 95 | Kefford | 72.36 |
| 46 | 64 | Mckinnon | 92.96 | 134 | 113 | Jewell | 72.02 |
| 47 | 77 | Frazer | 92.48 | 135 | 194 | Healy | 71.82 |
| 48 | 65 | Gray | 92.39 | 136 | 86 | Treloar | 71.55 |
| 49 | 47 | Scott | 91.77 | 137 | 187 | Orsborn | 71.30 |
| 50 | 38 | Faranda | 91.54 | 138 | 100 | Norden | 70.96 |
| 51 | 78 | Lindsay | 90.66 | 139 | 79 | Doddridge | 70.60 |
| 52 | 142 | Goodwin | 90.34 | 140 | 108 | Kahn | 70.37 |
| 53 | 24 | Li | 90.04 | 141 | 172 | Ashman | 69.83 |
| 54 | 119 | Moffat | 90.00 | 142 | 161 | Sharp | 69.56 |
| 55 | 59 | Woodhall | 89.68 | 143 | 167 | Brandt | 69.37 |
| 56 | 195 | Spencer | 89.46 | 144 | 123 | Andrew | 69.03 |
| 57 | 19 | Gosney | 89.22 | 145 | 152 | Scerri | 68.90 |
| 58 | 51 | Ferguson | 89.19 | 146 | 190 | Christian | 68.50 |
| 59 | 15 | Carter | 88.92 | 147 | 150 | Whiddon | 68.09 |
| 60 | 170 | Fraser | 88.50 | 148 | 133 | Rusher | 67.84 |
| 61 | 44 | Clarke | 87.66 | 149 | 137 | White | 67.59 |
| 62 | 50 | Mayo | 87.42 | 150 | 35 | Boughey | 67.37 |
| 63 | 52 | Moritz | 87.30 | 151 | 81 | Daly | 67.27 |
| 64 | 76 | Lowry | 87.03 | 152 | 162 | Hill | 67.05 |


| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65 | 5 | Travis | 87.01 | 153 | 88 | Walters | 67.01 |
| 66 | 53 | Mcleod | 86.20 | 154 | 156 | Eastman | 66.68 |
| 67 | 143 | Rutter | 85.88 | 155 | 116 | Darley | 66.44 |
| 68 | 31 | Livesey | 85.77 | 156 | 129 | Rooney | 66.20 |
| 69 | 135 | Andersson | 85.47 | 157 | 105 | Jeffery | 66.18 |
| 70 | 56 | Hall | 85.06 | 158 | 196 | Inglis | 66.01 |
| 71 | 184 | Mcalister | 84.43 | 159 | 98 | Bourke | 65.81 |
| 72 | 69 | Morgan-King | 84.31 | 160 | 183 | Herbert | 65.11 |
| 73 | 111 | Valentine | 83.94 | 161 | 72 | Spiro | 65.06 |
| 74 | 159 | Krosch | 83.90 | 162 | 114 | Motteram | 64.65 |
| 75 | 104 | Howard | 83.84 | 163 | 193 | Muller | 64.60 |
| 76 | 18 | Konig | 83.77 | 164 | 165 | Rose | 64.43 |
| 78 | 138 | Jeffery | 83.63 | 165 | 163 | Leach | 64.41 |
| 77 | 177 | Smith | 83.64 | 166 | 178 | Littler | 64.05 |
| 80 | 54 | Finikiotis | 83.55 | 167 | 94 | Kudelka | 63.89 |
| 79 | 73 | Bedi | 83.57 | 169 | 166 | Barrett | 63.21 |
| 81 | 173 | Irvine | 83.26 | 168 | 134 | Mickevics | 63.22 |
| 82 | 42 | Alexander | 83.23 | 170 | 110 | Halford | 63.11 |
| 83 | 127 | Gilfoyle | 82.95 | 171 | 87 | Morris | 63.09 |
| 84 | 34 | Jacob | 82.60 | 172 | 171 | Gold | 62.05 |
| 85 | 103 | Hadfield | 82.47 | 173 | 155 | Roughley | 61.45 |
| 86 | 66 | Simes | 81.49 | 174 | 185 | Mcmahon | 61.38 |
| 87 | 131 | Bugeia | 81.27 | 175 | 146 | Watson | 59.84 |
| 88 | 33 | Kalmin | 81.07 | 176 | 126 | Lewis | 59.80 |
| 89 | 107 | Swanson | 81.06 | 177 | 148 | Redlich | 57.76 |
| 90 | 85 | Lachman | 81.03 | 178 | 192 | Matskows | 57.50 |
| 91 | 58 | Palmer | 81.01 | 179 | 92 | Schoen | 57.37 |
| 92 | 144 | Crisp | 80.91 | 180 | 174 | Perl | 57.36 |
| 93 | 182 | Lawson | 80.82 | 181 | 147 | Waterhouse | 56.95 |
| 94 | 29 | Hoffman | 80.66 | 182 | 61 | Tant | 56.61 |
| 96 | 63 | Afflick | 80.29 | 183 | 117 | Priestley | 56.41 |
| 95 | 83 | Waldvogel | 80.31 | 184 | 121 | Anlezark | 55.84 |
| 97 | 93 | Luck | 80.25 | 185 | 168 | Kelly | 55.08 |
| 98 | 40 | Mott | 79.71 | 186 | 179 | Hutton | 54.31 |
| 99 | 62 | Van Vucht | 79.43 | 187 | 157 | Clift | 54.25 |
| 100 | 153 | Kenyon | 79.37 | 188 | 112 | Nash | 54.20 |
| 101 | 151 | Shaw | 79.32 | 189 | 124 | Eastment | 53.64 |
| 102 | 180 | Bennett | 79.28 | 190 | 145 | Neels | 53.42 |
| 103 | 99 | Mangos | 78.90 | 191 | 125 | Reid | 51.43 |
| 104 | 101 | Allen | 78.83 | 192 | 160 | Dawson | 47.59 |
| 105 | 154 | Senior | 78.77 | 193 | 141 | Johnson | 46.55 |
| 106 | 176 | Allan | 78.38 | 194 | 188 | Barda | 44.91 |
| 107 | 91 | Obenchain | 78.18 | 195 | 90 | Fitzgerald | 43.43 |
| 108 | 175 | Mills | 77.78 | 196 | 45 | Randhawa | 32.54 |


| Senior Teams After Round 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 1 | Richard Brightling - David Hoffman - Peter Chan - Roger Januszke |  |  |  |  | 111.18 |
| 2 | 6 | Stephen Mendick - Andrew Creet - Peter Grant - Tony Marinos |  |  |  |  | 109.05 |
| 3 | 3 | Elizabeth Havas - Gordon Schmidt - Alan Walsh - Barbara Mcdonald |  |  |  |  | 107.99 |
| 4 | 5 | Martin Bloom - Nigel Rosendorff - Steven Bock - Les Grewcock |  |  |  |  | 104.82 |
| 5 | 8 | Wally Malaczynski - Andrzej Adamczewski - Andrzej Gorzynski - Miroslaw Milaszewski - Kendall Early |  |  |  |  | 102.74 |
| 7 | 22 | Derek Evennett - Lynne Geursen - Trevor Robb - Andrew Janisz |  |  |  |  | 100.47 |
| 6 | 16 | Nicky Strasser - Peter Strasser - Eva Shand - George Bilski - Les Varadi |  |  |  |  | 100.48 |
| 8 | 2 | Arthur Robbins - Gary Ridgway - David Happell - Douglas Newlands |  |  |  |  | 96.42 |
| 9 | 11 | Elly Urbach - John Scudder - Marcia Scudder - Inez Glanger |  |  |  |  | 95.93 |
| 10 | 18 | Mike Robson - Betty Lee - Alan Smith - Robyn Clayton |  |  |  |  | 91.74 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 31 | Currie | 91.71 | 29 | 28 | Reid | 72.93 |
| 12 | 4 | Klofa | 90.32 | 30 | 20 | Braithwaite | 72.70 |
| 13 | 14 | Goodman | 89.93 | 31 | 27 | Mottram | 71.43 |
| 14 | 40 | Young | 88.52 | 32 | 46 | Lee | 71.30 |
| 15 | 10 | Kahler | 88.22 | 33 | 30 | Nightingale | 71.22 |
| 16 | 7 | Manley | 87.08 | 34 | 29 | Lawrence | 70.98 |
| 17 | 9 | Freeman-Greene | 86.55 | 35 | 32 | Coats | 70.74 |
| 18 | 45 | Long | 85.36 | 36 | 36 | Biro | 70.65 |
| 19 | 13 | Marr | 85.07 | 37 | 39 | Mill | 70.54 |



| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 4 | Denis Ward - Laurie Skeate - Denis Moody - Monty Dale |  |  |  |  | 101.21 |
| 7 | 8 | Neil Strutton - Helen Chamberlin - Robyn Clark - Brigid Marland |  |  |  |  | 99.10 |
| 8 | 15 | Sally Cullen - Chris Cullen - John Dunlop - Jill Dunlop - John Ham - Janet Ham |  |  |  |  | 97.22 |
| 9 | 32 | Helen Tyler - Terry Nadebaum - Sheryl Haslam - Marcey Spilsbury |  |  |  |  | 95.84 |
| 10 | 44 | Cherry Trengove - Margaret Rex - Susan Hunt - Janet Grieve |  |  |  |  | 95.74 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 13 | Mcnaughton | 95.45 | 40 | 29 | Anderson | 77.12 |
| 12 | 34 | Earnshaw | 94.52 | 41 | 52 | Nice | 76.20 |
| 13 | 1 | Tomlinson | 92.96 | 42 | 66 | Ryan | 75.69 |
| 14 | 14 | Rosengren | 90.81 | 43 | 59 | Lenton | 74.53 |
| 15 | 12 | Bristow | 90.38 | 44 | 19 | Clifford | 74.44 |
| 16 | 40 | Paul | 89.42 | 45 | 10 | Duggin | 73.23 |
| 17 | 54 | Howard | 88.60 | 46 | 67 | Crommelin | 72.57 |
| 18 | 23 | Treloar | 88.46 | 47 | 50 | Meakin | 71.93 |
| 19 | 62 | Macintosh | 88.37 | 48 | 7 | Morgan | 71.15 |
| 20 | 65 | Mabin | 87.39 | 49 | 56 | Kommeren | 70.75 |
| 21 | 28 | Williams | 87.27 | 50 | 51 | Devlin | 70.03 |
| 22 | 16 | Pike | 87.23 | 51 | 64 | Finger | 69.83 |
| 23 | 20 | Ward | 87.21 | 52 | 61 | Crowe | 69.82 |
| 24 | 43 | Hooper | 86.98 | 53 | 49 | Chapman | 68.84 |
| 25 | 31 | Boyd | 86.66 | 54 | 57 | Gault | 68.64 |
| 26 | 9 | Clift | 85.84 | 55 | 39 | Howe | 67.95 |
| 27 | 17 | Rossiter-Nuttall | 85.30 | 56 | 33 | Erlandson | 67.92 |
| 28 | 63 | Jacobs | 84.36 | 57 | 18 | Balkin | 64.72 |
| 29 | 6 | Webber | 83.98 | 58 | 35 | Gladders | 64.68 |
| 30 | 45 | Jenkins | 83.88 | 59 | 48 | Simmons | 63.72 |
| 31 | 25 | Graham | 83.67 | 60 | 27 | Cook | 62.22 |
| 32 | 22 | Mcmaster | 83.16 | 61 | 38 | Steward | 62.14 |
| 33 | 41 | Mcconvill | 82.84 | 62 | 55 | Corney | 61.17 |
| 34 | 11 | Griffith | 82.63 | 63 | 37 | Fraser | 58.92 |
| 35 | 36 | Perry | 81.33 | 64 | 21 | Benes | 58.09 |
| 36 | 3 | Fulton | 81.10 | 65 | 53 | Knight | 56.95 |
| 37 | 30 | Sinclair | 78.47 | 66 | 24 | Crothers | 54.51 |
| 38 | 47 | Jones | 78.23 | 67 | 46 | Pearce | 46.88 |
| 39 | 60 | Morris | 77.40 | 68 | 68 | Frost | 42.48 |
| NoviceTeams After Round 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Place | No. | Team Members |  |  |  |  | Score |
| 1 | 16 | Maureen Gibney - Susan Lipton - Godfrey Baillon-Bending - Michael Mcauliffe |  |  |  |  | 109.42 |
| 2 | 2 | Linda Norman - Kay Roberts - Joan Jenkins - Carmel Wikman |  |  |  |  | 106.28 |
| 3 | 11 | Jo Neary - Dennis Sullivan - Val Courtis - Louise Tucker |  |  |  |  | 104.36 |
| 4 | 14 | Gabrielle Elich - John Elich - Christophe Wlodarczyk - Justine Wlodarczyk |  |  |  |  | 99.61 |
| 5 | 5 | George Gibson - Lynne Layton - Neil Casey - James Williamson |  |  |  |  | 94.25 |
| 6 | 1 | Roxane Brayshaw - Gaynor Rogers - Dianne Carlton-Smith - Pamela Brown |  |  |  |  | 93.64 |
| 7 | 6 | Raymond Powley - Susan Powley - Walter Hugentobler - Annemarie Hugentobler |  |  |  |  | 92.97 |
| 8 | 17 | Ian Hoschke - Sylvia Billingham - Sue Falkingham - Dot Saxon-Williams |  |  |  |  | 90.51 |
| 9 | 19 | Sonia Brodman - Jackie Yung - John Fox - Jenny Fox |  |  |  |  | 89.48 |
| 10 | 31 | Val Kempe - Julie Clark - - |  |  |  |  | 88.08 |
| Place | No. | Team | Score | Place | No. | Team | Score |
| 11 | 9 | Shardlow | 87.52 | 22 | 12 | Trevisanello | 72.91 |
| 12 | 20 | Howitt | 86.42 | 23 | 23 | Bryant | 72.77 |
| 13 | 8 | Wilson | 86.36 | 24 | 10 | Egan | 72.37 |
| 14 | 4 | Jones | 85.68 | 25 | 30 | Hughes | 69.70 |
| 15 | 32 | Wang | 84.78 | 26 | 18 | Webb | 69.43 |
| 16 | 3 | Lane | 80.16 | 27 | 25 | Newman | 69.19 |
| 17 | 29 | Young | 78.94 | 28 | 28 | Gilfillan | 68.53 |
| 18 | 7 | Adams | 78.86 | 29 | 13 | Du Temple | 67.99 |
| 19 | 15 | Parker | 77.86 | 30 | 22 | Clark | 62.62 |
| 20 | 21 | Ledger | 77.23 | 31 | 26 | Bowen | 38.17 |
| 21 | 27 | Yap-Giles | 76.43 | 32 | 24 | Mathews | 27.48 |

DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| 4: | 19+ |  | ${ }^{6-}$ |  | 84× | ${ }^{12+}$ |  | 14+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | 8 | 12+ |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 32+ |  | 2 : |  |  | 18+ |  | 3- |
|  |  | 18x |  | 19+ | 9 |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 72x |  | 2 : |
| 14+ | $2 \cdot$ |  | 360x | $1 \cdot$ |  | 3 : | 112x |  |
|  | 11+ |  |  |  | 10+ |  |  |  |
| 9 |  | 7 |  | 48× |  |  |  | 3 |
| 2 : |  |  | 7 |  | 27× |  | 30x |  |

YESTERDAY'S DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| $6$ | ${ }^{11+}$ | 2 | $1$ | 3 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} 30 x_{2} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 1 & \\ & 1 \end{array}$ | 5 | ${ }_{4}^{13+}$ | 6 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | ${ }^{4} 4$ | ${ }^{9+} 2$ | 1 | 6 |
|  | ${ }_{5}^{60 \times}$ | $10+3$ |  | ${ }^{0-}$ | 4 |
| 4 | 6 | 1 | $12+$ | ${ }^{5} \quad 5$ | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4 | $1 \begin{array}{ll}1 & \\ & 1\end{array}$ |

DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

YESTERDAY'S DIFFICULT SUDOKU

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

## 2014 Autumn National Teams Adelaide Wayville Showgrounds



Thursday $1^{\text {st }}$ May - Friday $2^{\text {nd }}$ May Saturday $3^{\text {rd }}$ May - Sunday $4^{\text {th }}$ May Monday $5^{\text {th }}$ May

Open, Seniors', Women's and Restricted Swiss Pairs
Open and Restricted Teams
Open Teams Final and Graded Pairs

- Graded pairs includes a section for players with 0-99 masterpoints.
- Pairs wishing to compete in the Restricted Pairs must be under Life Master as at January 1st 2014.
- Senior players must be born before 1st January 1956


# Gold Coust CONGRESS <br>  

GOLD COAST CONVENTION CENTRE • GOLD COAST HIGHWAY • BROADBEACH Sat February $21^{\text {st }}$ - Saturday February $\mathbf{2 8}^{\text {th }} 2015$


## GOLD COAST

congress


For further enquiries or to register, contact: Kim Ellaway
Call: +61 733518602 or +61 412064903
Fax: +61 731034799 Email: manager@qldbridge.com


