THE CURIOUS CASE OF THE HASTY RUFF
Open Interstate I, Round 3, Board 9, North deals, EW vul

```
- K854
- 65
- J 542
- QJ9
```

```
& Q 102
\bullet 10982 V KJ74
                & J873
-K642
* A QJ
-A9
+ 102
```

4 A6

- AQ3
- 1083
- KQ 873

| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | INT | Dbl |
| $2 \nabla^{\prime}$ | Pass | $2 \nabla^{2}$ | Pass |
| Pass | Db\| | All Pass |  |

I. 4+ diamonds, 4 in a major
2. Pass or correct
3. "Optional"

When you chase ruffs in defence, it can often turn around and bite you later, as you will frequently establish declarer's long suit in the process.
West made a good decision to run from INT doubled. At the other table, this contract was beaten by two tricks. Against $2 \vee$ doubled, South led $₫ \mathrm{~A}$. North encouraged, won the continuation and dutifully gave his partner the ruff. Only now did South lead $K$, but it was too late.
Declarer took the ace, came to hand with a diamond and led $\uparrow 9$ which, predictably, had been established in the early play. South had only losing options: whether he ruffed or discarded, the losing club would be discarded from dummy. He elected to ruff with the queen, and declarer's other loser was $\vee$ A. Whilst $\uparrow$ A was an odd choice of lead, a switch to K does no harm once North has encouraged spades. Now the defence gets a club trick and a ruff for one down.
 David Lusk

## MEDNESDAY'S TIMETABLE 10:00am <br> ANC Interstate Teams-10-12 <br> Paul Lavings Bridge Books Butler Pairs l:30pm <br> ANC Interstate Teams-10-12 <br> Paul Lavings Bridge Books Butler Pairs <br> 4:30pm <br> ANC Interstate Teams-10-I2 <br> 7:30pm <br> Dendy Park Bridge Club Matchpoint Pairs And on Thursday . . . <br> MAX IT Open/Restricted Swiss Pairs <br> 10:00am and I:30pm

## Suggested Dining Options—continued

If you don't know your way around, come and see
us at the information desk for maps/directions to any of the above venues.
Chinta Ria Soul (Asian)
94 Acland St, St Kilda
95254664
Pelican (European)
16 Fitzroy St, St Kilda
95255847
II Fornaio (Bakery-cafe)
2 Acland St, St Kilda
95342922
Mirka (Torlanos) (Italian)
42 Fitzroy St, St Kilda 95253088
Topolinos (Italian-pizza)
87 Fitzroy St, St Kilda
95341925
Leo's Spaghetti Bar (Italian)
55 Fitzroy St, St Kilda
95345026

## MATCH OF THE DAY-ACT V. SOUTH AUSTRALIA YOUTH TEAM

| Round 8 Team 4 NS vs 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pair: Jessie de Garis - Sam Thorpe |  |  |  |  |
| Opps: Stephen Williams - Laura Ginnan |  |  |  |  |
| Bd | Cont | Dec | Ld | Score |
| I | 3NT | E | - Q | 50 |
| 2 | 5 | E | $\bigcirc 5$ | -510 |
| 3 | 3NT | W | $\checkmark 6$ | 200 |
| 4 | 3NT | N | -Q | -200 |
| 5 | INT | N | $\because Q$ | -300 |
| 6 | 3NT | N | - 7 | 490 |
| 7 | $4{ }^{4}$ | E | $\pm 7$ | 100 |
| 8 | 6ax | W | $\pm 6$ | 100 |
| 9 | 34 | S | $\checkmark 3$ | -50 |
| 10 | INT | S | $\checkmark 3$ | -100 |
| 11 | $4 \vee$ | N | -2 | -50 |
| 12 | 64 | E | $\checkmark 3$ | -980 |
| 13 | $4 \vee$ | N | 2 | 650 |
| 14 | 4* | N | -4 | 170 |
| 15 | 3NT | E | 2) | 100 |
| 16 | $3 \vee \times$ | S | - 7 | -300 |
| 17 | $4 \vee$ | S | $\pm 7$ | -50 |
| 18 | 5\% X | E | $\checkmark$ A | 1100 |
| 19 | 2* | W | $\cdots$ | -90 |
| 20 | 24 | S | $\pm 5$ | 110 |


| Round 8 Team 4 EW vs 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pair: Shane Harrison - Lauren Travis |

Pair: Shane Harrison - Lauren Travis
Opps: James Higgins - Sebastian Yuen

| Bd | Cont | Dec | Ld | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | $3 N T$ | E | $\mathbf{4} 7$ | -50 |



| Datum | Datum IMPs | Datum IMPs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -40 | 3 | -3 |
| -660 | 4 | -4 |


| $\mathbf{2}$ | $4 N T$ | E | $\vee 8$ | 520 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 3 NT | E | $\vee 2$ | -100 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | INT | S | $\uparrow 7$ | -90 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | $2 \uparrow$ | S | $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ | 200 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 6 | S | $\uparrow 4$ | -920 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 4 | $W$ | 4 | 650 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3 |  |
|  | 7 |
|  | 3 |
|  | 10 |
| 13 |  |


| -660 | 4 | -4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110 | 3 | 0 |
| 70 | -7 | -1 |
| -150 | -4 | 2 |


| -150 | -4 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 510 | -1 | -9 |
| -410 | 11 | 6 |


| 8 | 4. | W | $\pm$ Q | 450 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | INT | N | - A | -180 |


| 10 | INT | S | $\checkmark 7$ | -90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | $4 \vee$ | S | -3 | -420 |
| 12 | 74 | E | - 5 | -50 |
| 13 | 3NT | S | *5 | -630 |
| 14 | 4 | S | - 5 | 200 |
| 15 | 3NT | E | ¢ | 400 |
| 16 | 3 | S | ¢ 7 | 50 |
| 17 | 6 | N | \& A | 50 |
| 18 | $6 \vee$ | S | $\checkmark 6$ | -1430 |
| 19 | $4 \vee$ | S | -Q | 100 |
| 20 | 24 | N | -6 | -170 |


|  | 5 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 |
|  | 14 |


| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9 |  |


| -640 | -8 | -12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 640 | 0 | 0 |
| 220 | -2 | 9 |
| -80 | 5 | 8 |
| -190 | -3 | -4 |
| -60 | 0 | 0 |
| 870 | 6 | -11 |
| 30 | -3 | 4 |
| 60 | 2 | -3 |
| Total | -2 | -20 |



Lauren Travis, James Higgins, Shane Harrison \& Sebastian Yuen


I watched a very pleasant match in the Closed Room between Sebastian Yuen-James Higgins, NS for ACT and Shane Harrison-Lauren Travis, EW for South Australia.
There were some exciting moments, with opportunities available for both pairs.
Board I was a see-saw affair, with Travis and Yuen both erring-all for a flat board:

Board I, North deals, nil vul

- Q
- 107543
- J 1063
- A8 7


| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Harrison | Yuen | Travis | Higgins |
|  | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Harrison bid a straightforward 3NT over Travis' 2NT opening, and Higgins led a spade. Travis put up $\uparrow$, covered perforce by $\& \mathrm{Q}$. Travis won and played a top club, ducked, and a second club, ducked again. Now declarer, with nine tricks in the bag, went to the well again. This time, Yuen, in with A, shifted accurately to $\vee 10$. Travis ducked $\checkmark 10$ and put $\vee K$ in on the next trick, leading to one down when hearts were blocked. In the Open Room, South led $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, making it easy for NS to collect their five defensive tricks. Another flat board on Hand 2, where Travis declined a quantitative raise bid by partner. She held \&QI06, KJ3, *KIO, AQI082, and opened a I517 notrump, Harrison transferred to hearts, and followed up with 4NT. On a heart lead, declarer played five rounds of hearts, and when Yuen discarded a club Travis had 13 tricks when clubs came in for five tricks.
With a probable source of tricks in hearts and a good five-card suit of her own, was it really a minimum? I leave it to you to judge.
On Board 3, Travis had another chance to shine when a favourable lead gave her a chance for game:

Board 3, South deals, EW vul

- 84
- Q 65
- Q 10976
* QJ 4

| - K Q 10 | - J962 |
| :---: | :---: |
| - 987 | - K 104 |
| - 53 | - AKJ42 |
| - AK865 | \& 10 |

- A753
- AJ 32
- 8
- 9732

| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Harrison | Yuen | Travis | Higgins <br> Pass |
| l\& | Pass | I | Dbl |
| Pass | I | 3NT | All Pass |

After a heart lead to the queen and Travis' king, she cashed $\$$ A before crossing to a spade and finessing successfully in diamonds. Now, however, Higgins refused to win $\uparrow A$ until the third round, effectively cutting Travis off from her hand. She belatedly realized that she should have knocked out $\uparrow A$ before finessing in diamonds. One down, but 3 IMPs to South Australia when West played 3NT in the Open Room, two down after $\vee 6$ lead. After a couple of partscore deals, Higgins-Yuen bid impeccably to $6 \uparrow$ on the next deal:
Board 6, East deals, EW vul

- AK6
- K 6
-KJ63
- A 1074


Higgins-Yuen play Two-Over-One with a short club and transfer responses. Higgins started with 1\&, Yuen bid I\& (clubs), and over Higgins' INT rebid, asked for more information with a forcing 2NT. Once Higgins bid $3 \star$, it was a short route to 6 . Higgins won the spade lead in dummy, crossed to $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and played Q , covered with the king and won by dummy's ace. With that hurdle over, Higgins could afford a safety play in diamonds, playing a diamond to $d \star$ and $\downarrow 10$, but soon claiming.

Two consecutive 4a contracts provided I3 then II IMPs for South Australia-in the Closed Room, Shane Harrison made a vulnerable 4a with an overtrick, +650 while his counterpart in the Open Room was one down, then Travis-Harrison stayed safely at the four-level, making five, while the Open Room was overboard in 6a.
10 more IMPs traded hands on Board II, when the Open Room NS went one down in $4 \vee$.
Then a rush of blood led to a disastrous 14 IMPs to ACT on the following deal:

Board I2, West deals, NS vul

- J 1083
- 1092
- K 107
\& Q 103

| - KQ92 | - A 764 |
| :---: | :---: |
| - AK754 | - 86 |
| - - | - A Q 42 |
| - A 876 | * KJ2 |


I. Splinter
2. Key Card ask and response
3. Queen ask, residual kings
4. $Q+\vee K$

I was surprised, sitting behind Lauren, to see her emerge with 7a, especially with likely duplicated values in diamonds. On a trump lead, Travis quickly found out her fate when she played a second round of trumps. Even with a 3-2 trump break, there is still a lot of work to do. The hearts were friendly, 2 Q was onside, but still the grand slam went down, perhaps a reminder that one needs to be sure of a source of tricks before contracting for a grand slam.
A nicely-timed psyche on the next board saw South Australia gain 9 IMPs two boards later:

| WEST | NORTH | EAST <br> Travis | SOUTH <br> Higgins |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Harrison | Yuen | Pass | Pass <br>  |
| INT | Dbl | Rdbl |  |
| 2\& | Dbl | $2 \uparrow$ | $4 \downarrow$ |

The full hand:
Board 14, East deals, nil vul

- AQ
- 1062
- A4

2 A Q 7654

- 19853
- K764
- $8 \quad \vee$ A9743
- 8732 QJ5

K83 10

- 102
- K Q J 5
- K 1096
- J 92

Higgins redouble was for blood, and Harrison's run to $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ confirmed that his bidding was suspect. After a spade lead, declarer should maybe have suspected a very bad trump break (East was marked with a void in clubs if the bidding could be believed). A less than optimal defence and declarer play (Travis shifted to $\uparrow Q$ on winning $\uparrow K$, and declarer won $\downarrow K$ in hand) led to four down in $4 \vee$, with 6NT possible from the North hand. Quite a turnaround. The Open Room NS brought back +170 from their club partscore.
Board 15, South deals, NS vul

- A Q 3
- 985
- K 10653
+ 87

| - KJ7 |  | - 9654 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - KQ 87 |  | $\checkmark$ A 103 |
| - AQJ84 |  | - 92 |
| - 6 |  | * A Q 42 |
|  | - 1082 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 42 |  |
|  | - 7 |  |
|  | * KJIO953 |  |

I don't admire the lead found from the South hand on our final specimen hand, especially when the EW bidding has been: 1ヶ, 1\&;2ヶ, 3\&(FSF); 3A, 3NT.
Travis won Q and played a club to the queen and North's king. North returned his second club.
Travis played $\uparrow 9$ and passed it when South showed out. North won dIO, and had no successful gambit. When hearts broke 3-3, Travis had nine tricks, +400 . At the other table, on the same lead, East was one down in 3NT.
The final score was a 7I-48 IMP win to ACT.

OPSM ANC Congress Teams: Result For Round 6

| Rank | Team | Name | Won | Drew | Lost | Last IMP | IMP | BFwd | Last VP | Total | MPs |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (I | 3 | ARBER | 4 | 0 | 2 | 38.0 | 86.0 | 90.0 | 25.0 | 115.0 | 3.90 |
| 2 | 4 | KLOFA | 4 | 0 | 2 | 17.0 | 77.0 | 88.0 | 20.0 | 108.0 | 3.05 |
| 3 | 1 | $\underline{\text { MURRAY }}$ | 4 | 0 | 2 | -17.0 | 45.0 | 96.0 | 10.0 | 106.0 | 2.49 |
| 4 | 9 | KOVACS | 4 | 1 | 1 | 17.0 | 38.0 | 81.0 | 20.0 | 101.0 | 2.16 |
| 5 | 5 | SMALL | 2 | 0 | 4 | 32.0 | -8.0 | 63.0 | 25.0 | 88.0 | 0.42 |
| 6 | 7 | KUIPER | 4 | 0 | 2 | -32.0 | -7.0 | 82.0 | 5.0 | 87.0 | 1.08 |
| 7 | 10 | RICH | 2 | 1 | 3 | -38.0 | -35.0 | 77.0 | 3.0 | 80.0 | 0.53 |
| 8 | 2 | HOMER | 3 | 0 | 3 | 11.0 | -35.0 | 59.0 | 18.0 | 77.0 | 0.81 |
| 9 | 6 | WHITE | 1 | 0 | 5 | -11.0 | -71.0 | 56.0 | 12.0 | 68.0 | 0.27 |
| 10 | 8 | VEARING | 1 | 0 | 5 | -17.0 | -90.0 | 54.0 | 10.0 | 64.0 | 0.27 |

## QUESTION FOR THE EXPERTS

Board 6, East deals, EW vul

- 54
- J 7542
- Q865
- Q 5

| A8 | \& $K 7$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| AK6 | Q 10983 |
| K7 | AJ 1094 |
| K96432 | 5 |

\& K 96432

- QJIO9632
$\checkmark$ -
- 32
- AJ 107

OK, Margaret, you asked for it! Our expert is youth player Justin Howard.
6v was bid and made by Justin Howard - Max Henbest of the Victorian Youth Team, with Justin displaying his excellent declarer play skills to
 develop a nice trump coup ending.
With a spade preempt by South during the auction to guide him, Justin won $₫ \mathrm{Q}$ lead in hand and then led a club towards dummy, South flying with $\& A$. He won the spade continuation in dummy, and cashed 2 K and $\vee \mathrm{A}$.
With hearts now known to be 5-0, a trump coup was the only way to make, so Justin proceeded to
shorten trumps in his hand by ruffing a club, at which point he knew the full layout of the hand ( $\stackrel{\mathrm{Q}}{ }$ location was irrelevant):


Justin now cashed $\star \mathrm{K}$ and $\star \mathrm{A}$, ruffed a diamond in dummy with $\vee 6$ and claimed. David Thompson

## VICTORY DINNER/DANCE

7PM FRIDAY 29 JULY AT THE POWERHOUSE FUNCTION CENTRE
Presentation of trophies and medallions for Interstate Teams Championship

$$
17
$$

Dinner, drinks and dancing
$\$ 85$ per person
Ask at the information desk or book online at www.vba.asn.au/anc20II/
Open after 9 Rounds

| Rank | Team | Name | Score | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | ACT | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 3 . 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | SA | $\mathbf{3 1 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 9}$ |
| 3 | 1 | VIC | 21 | 83.5 |
| 4 | 4 | NSW | 32.2 | 52.1 |
| 5 | 3 | QLD | -31.3 | -48 |
| 6 | 2 | WA | -18 | -125 |
| 7 | 7 | NT | -32.2 | -142.9 |
| 8 | 8 | TAS | -21 | -146.3 |

Women's after 9 Rounds

| Rank | Team | Name | Score | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | QLD | $\mathbf{3 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 9 . 4}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | WA | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 . 1}$ |
| 3 | 4 | NSW | 10 | 62.5 |
| 4 | 3 | SA | -11 | 53.6 |
| 5 | 1 | VIC | 11 | 1.9 |
| 6 | 7 | ACT | -10 | -12.3 |
| 7 | 8 | NT | -31.9 | -177.6 |
| 8 | 6 | TAS | -29 | -193.8 |

Seniors' after 9 Rounds

| Rank | Team | Name | Score | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | SA | $\mathbf{3 2 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 9 . 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | NSW | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 9 . 2}$ |
| 3 | 7 | WA | 23 | 34.4 |
| 4 | 1 | QLD | -23 | 9.2 |
| 5 | 6 | VIC | 10 | -13.8 |
| 6 | 4 | ACT | -10 | -55 |
| 7 | 2 | TAS | $\mathbf{- 3 2 . 9}$ | -239.1 |

Youth after 9 Rounds

| Rank | Team | Name | Score | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | VIC | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 6 . 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | SA | $\mathbf{- 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3}$ |
| 3 | 1 | WA | $\mathbf{- 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 4}$ |
| 4 | 3 | QLD | 9 | $\mathbf{- 1 6 . 2}$ |
| 5 | 2 | ACT | 6 | $\mathbf{- 3 7 . 5}$ |
| 6 | 6 | NSW | -9 | $\mathbf{- 1 1 7 . 5}$ |

Paul Lavings has a full range of books and supplies at the stall in the main room. These are some of the best buys:

## Deadly Defence

by Ron Klinger $\$ 34.95$
Sensational book covering all areas of defence, a must-read for the serious tournament player.


DEADLY DEFENCE

## The Hog Takes to Precision

 by Victor Mollo \$29.95
From articles by Victor Mollo, hilarious tales of the Hog, Rabbit and other original menagerie characters.

Defensive Signalling at Bridge by David Bird \$29.95
gignaline


Breaking the Bridge Rules by Barry Rigal $\$ 29.95$
Excellent book on card play, many new situations, for the serious player.

## The Card Turner by Louis Sacher \$34.95 Attractive hardcover novel, has won much critical acclaim -great reviews. <br> 

- Great range of software, including all the latest
 CDs - ALL at I0\% discount
- All the latest bridge books - many new titles
- Wide range of new books on special, great titles at just \$10 and \$12 only!
- Set of four quality pens in presentation box-\$14.95
- $100 \%$ linen tea towels just $\$ 10$ each or six for $\$ 50$ - eight different designs
- Serviettes \$4.95 and bridge socks \$4.95 or \$7.95
- Super Bid Boxes $\$ 44.95$ set of four, state of the art design, with quantity discounts

Bridge Club discounts available for quantity on all items

Paul Lavings Bridge Books<br>www.postfree.cc<br>postfree@bigpond.net.au<br>(02) 9388886 I

## WHEN CAN I UNDERLEAD AN ACE?

One of the most difficult decisions in defence is assessing the need to underlead an ace to defeat a contract. How much easier it is if partner has assisted you with sensitive carding.
Two hands from the first round robin permitted the defender to confidently underlead an ace to defeat the contracts.

Board I3, Match 2, West deals, all vul

- K 3
- 98
- 9643
- 98632

| - 1086 | - Q 752 |
| :---: | :---: |
| - 653 | - AKQJ2 |
| - K2 | - J 7 |
| - AQ 1074 | - K 5 |

- AJ 94
- 1074
- AQ 1085
$-J$
Defending 4v, South had a difficult lead problem. Most chose ${ }^{\mathrm{j}}$, but this is unlikely to be correct as it needs partner to hold $\& A$ to succeed. It is better to lead an ace and then see both the dummy and partner's signal before switching if necessary to a club- there will be four easy defensive tricks on this layout (three aces and a ruff). So it must be right to lead an ace and $\& A$ is clearly better than $\uparrow$ A as it is less likely to give the contract away. At the table where I was watching, the correct lead was found, and when Kx appeared in dummy partner played $\$ 9$. This should be a suit preference signal for spades, as both count and attitude are irrelevant when there are only winners left in the suit in the dummy. However, South did not have enough confidence in their methods in this situation to underlead the ace of spades- and now there is no defence to beat the contract.
What a satisfying defence if South does -down two when North can overruff dummy on the fourth round of spades!


Board 15, Match 4, South deals, NS vul

- K 106
- Q975
- AQ2
- Q94

| - J753 | - 84 |
| :---: | :---: |
| - A 8 | - K 62 |
| -108743 | - J6 |
| - K 7 | - A 108632 |

- AQ92
- J 1043
-K95
- J 5

North was declarer in $3 \vee$, and East led one of their doubletons. West gave count, as this is not a suit preference situation.
However, after winning $\vee \mathrm{A}$, West returned the lowest of opener's led suit to indicate an entry in clubs. When East won a trump continuation with $\vee K$, it was necessary to underlead $\& A$ (better than A A and another) to get a ruff to defeat the contract.
West's card here is clearly suit preference, as count is known and attitude irrevelant-so only suit preference is left.
Again, a satisfying defence, demonstrating excellent partnership trust.
Of course, the lesson from all thirs is to ensure you recognize suit preference situations and play cards to assist partner. In this way, partnership confidence is improved, and risky plays like underleading aces-become simple and extremely effective.

Andrew Braithwaite

Ben Thompson of the Victorian Open Team was also successful in the heart slam bid and made by Justin Howard on page 5 (Question for the Experts).
In his match, it was just another flat board.


THE QUEENSLAND BRIDGE ASSOCIATION, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE AUSTRALIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION PRESENTS THE...

GOLD COAST CONVENTION CENTRE GOLD COAST HIGHWAY
BROADBEACH

# GOLD COAST CONGRESS 

SATURDAY FEBRUARY $25^{\text {TH }}$ TO SATURDAY MARCH $3^{\text {RD }} 2012$
$+{ }^{101}$
GOLD COAST
congress

For further enquiries or to register, contact: KIM ELLAWAY
Call: +61733518602 or +61412064903 Fax: +61731034799
Email: manager@qldbridge.com

