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## THE CADBURY CADDIES

Once again Cadbury Schweppes have supported our event including the sweets in your welcome satchels, those you find around the playing area and the wonderful purple T-Shirts worn by our Cadbury Caddies. It is only with the generous support of our sponsors that we are able to provide the level of service that you have come to expect from this tournament. So as we say, support those who support bridge - have a Cadbury chocolate today!!!


## INTRODUCING THE TIM SERES - MARY MCMAHON MIXED TEAMS

 Tony JackmanIn March, shortly after the 2007 GCC - the 46th and first in the new Convention Centre Therese Tully and her congress committee conducted a review. A significant decision was to create a new event, a two session Mixed Teams Championship, to be played at the end of the week, on Friday. Some months later, in September, Australia lost its greatest bridge player, Tim Seres who died in Sydney aged 82. Five years earlier his long time partner Mary McMahon had also passed away.
Their contribution, together and separately, to Australian bridge generally has been detailed elsewhere. Their association with our Gold Coast Congress deserves a special tribute. Both attended the first in 1962. Indeed the event itself was created by George McCutcheon after a suggestion from Tim that a weeklong congress at a holiday venue would prove popular. Tim was right as he so often was at the table! Much of the success of the GCC can be attributed to the constant presence and support of Tim and Mary. If they were playing everyone else wanted to come.
Mary played in all 41 congresses from 1962 until her death in 2002. Tim, all bar 1964 (in his absence Mary, with Ruth Eaton, won the Pairs and was in the winning team) until his health started to fail. Over 80 congresses between them! Their success rate, mainly together, in both pairs and teams, was staggering, their demeanour always pleasant and their sportsmanship unquestionable. In 2002, the year Tim felt to be Mary's last, the pair were appointed to the GCC Roll of Honour.

Now, after Tim's death, it's time to do something more, something we can all share in. Let's have a great entry for the inaugural Mixed Teams for the Seres-McMahon Trophy. We hope it will be a fitting tribute to their memory. It will be a great honour to be the first winners. So, get a team together and 'have a go' at our new event - the 2008 'Tim and Mary'

## MEET THE PLAYERS - KATE MCCALLUM

Kate aka Karen is one of the finest bridge players in the world. She is well known for her aggressive style as well as her well founded theories on the game. She was born in born in San Francisco and has confessed to being just into her sixties. She moved to New York City (Greenwich Village) in the early 1970's and settled in an old white farmhouse in a tiny town in New Hampshire since the mid 1990's. Even though I didn't ask the question - my omission of course - she is happily married to the man of her dreams for 29 years.


When she was around 20 her first (short-lived) husband was a graduate student at Ohio State when she was a freshman (in those days it was probably a freshwoman). She was appropriately in awe of his Notre Dame credentials and his bridge prowess (which turned out to be nil, but what did she know at the time?). He played nearly every night in their living room with 5 or 6 of his Notre Dame buddies so she pretty much had to learn - or get rid of the husband (she did both!). The guys used to put her in the game occasionally when they needed a fourth, and then yell at her for everything she did. She learned perforce but resisted all the way hating it because of the behaviour (not much has changed there in 40 years)

Kate quit bridge again in 1972 and kibitzed for a few years when she moved to New York. She would have been terrified to play among the likes of Al Roth, Edgar Kaplan, B.J. Becker, Ira Rubin, Victor Mitchell, Tobias Stone, Sam Stayman among others especially
as she was, by her standards, a novice. Although she knew the rudiments, Matthew Granovetter really taught her the game during that time - so she regards him as her true teacher.

She quit again in 2003 - because of the dreadful behaviour of the players but was dragged back kicking and screaming in 2006, by her "so-called" friends who say they couldn't win without her - she admits to being subject to flattery every time

Kate is an avid reader of bridge books reading almost daily. She keeps books by Terence Reese next to her bed. Her most recent book was Krzysztof Martens - "Dynamic Declarer Play" while her favourite book is Victor Mollo's "Confessions of an Addict"

Kate plays professionally 3 to 4 days a week and with that schedule doesn't really have time for 'social' games but would in Australia where bridge is still fun. Kate's love of bridge is sparked by good opposition and/or fun people and learning - there's always a new discovery.
Her most memorable bridge moment was running 2nd place with one board to go in the London Sunday Times Invitational (1992) with Sally Brock. In a star-studded field (she considered that they were the pigeons!), and never lying below 5th place throughout the event they faced Boris Shapiro and Irving Gordon (Haggis) who bid a terrible grand slam against them on the last board (on a bidding misunderstanding!). Their trump suit was AQJ53 facing T64. Haggis made it with good card reading - used his only entry to play low toward the AQJ53 and picked up her singleton King. (As usual, she had done too much advertising in the bidding to make this a distinct possibility!) They lost 200+ IMPs across the field (the biggest loss suffered by any pair in the entire event), and ended up 10th. But it was a moment...

What makes Kate a good player and good partner? Tenacity and Workaholism (her word). She never gives up, not even when they are getting buried. Her strength lies in competitive bidding and weakness definitely in declarer play. She confesses to being a terrible partner, too critical and too much of a perfectionist. But she loves her regular partners dearly (Lynn Baker, Kerri Sanborn and Matthew Granovetter) so she works very hard on controlling her weaknesses - but, as she says "they keep coming back so I must be somewhat successful in communicating to them that it's not the sort of partner I want to be."

If she could play with anyone in the world it would be Zia - but she's done that. It's so much fun that she doesn't mind losing when she plays with him - and his bridge is highly entertaining as well. She describes him as creative, a perfect gentleman and very kind to opponents and while she has been lucky enough to play with most of the world's best - Zia is a standout favourite.

Strong influences on her game have been: Victor Mollo, Matthew Granovetter, Kit Woolsey, Kerri Sanborn.
She is very keen to play in a Bermuda Bowl (Open world Championship) but doesn't think it will happen. She also wants to continue teaching and helping her students develop and hopefully win a world championship with Lynn Baker, her friend and partner who has worked hard for it for many years.
Kate's tips for the improving bridge player:

- Bid more aggressively
- Be a good partner - understand your partner's point of view when there's a mistake
- Talk bridge with better players whenever possible (and listen)
- Play within your partnership - have what your partner expects you to have - EVERY time. Don't have solo flights of fancy
- Enjoy bridge - it's only a card game!


## BAKER'S' DOZEN BY KATE MCCALLUM 13 TIPS FOR WINNING

Kate has played regularly with Lynn Baker for many years, and has agreed to share 13 of their favourite agreements

## 1. POINTS DON'T TAKE TRICKS.

You can take tricks with high cards: aces, kings and queens, etc. You can take tricks by trumping. You can develop a long suit for tricks. The better your hand fits with partner's, the more tricks you will be able to take by ruffing in one hand, or both. You can even take tricks on power with 7's and 8's sometimes - when all the high cards are played on one or two early tricks in a suit.

But in all the years I have played bridge I have never seen a point take a trick!
Stop relying on the high-card point count as your only, or primary, guide to the value of your hand. Look at your hand's trick-taking potential. Look at the degree of fit with partner, at the spot cards, at the positional value of your cards (are your kings behind their aces, does it look like the finesses are onside for you, or offside?). Look at your stoppers in their suits.
Of course, high-card points can also be a useful guide to the value of your hand, particularly on balanced hands. It's hard to make 3NT with two balanced hands unless you have something pretty close to the old- fashioned Goren requirement of 26 points. But you can take a whole lot of tricks, with very few HCPs, when your hands are unbalanced.

You can count your high-card points if you want to (I don't unless my hand is balanced), but make that only one of many factors you consider in your bidding decisions.
Example: Here's a five-point grand slam, admittedly not so easy to reach.

## Did We Find You

The organisers of the Gold Coast Congress keep in contact with players via email and regular post

If you got details of the event by one or other of these mediums then more than likely we have your correct details.

If you didn't receive any information then it seems we do not have your email or postal address and would appreciate your contacting the reception desk to remedy this situation.


Six clubs is a great slam East-West, but goes down because of a diamond ruff or two. Meanwhile, $7 \boldsymbol{A}$ is cold the other way!

## 2. IF IT'S NOT IN THE NOTES, WE DON'T PLAY IT.

Even if you've discussed a cute idea that you and your partner want to try, one of you may be unsure about whether you've agreed to actually play it. If you make this rule in your serious partnership(s), it will save you from many unnecessary accidents. Until it's written down in your partnership notes, assume you don't have an agreement. You may both know that you should be playing it, and that you want to, but it's better to agree to stick to your notes and play what's written there, despite system discussions in between notes-updates.

## 3. CHOICE OF GAMES COMES BEFORE SLAM BIDDING.

Bids below game are designed to get to the right game, or to 3NT from the right side of the table if that is an option. Example:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ | $3 \&$ | pass |
| 3 | pass | $3 \vee ?$ |  |

This $3 v$ bid is not a cuebid in support of diamonds. It's fishing for 3NT, asking West to bid it with anything resembling a half- stopper. Yes, if East later comes back in diamonds, the $3 \vee$ bid could be reinterpreted as an "advanced cuebid" but at the point it's bid, it's simply looking for the best game.

## 4. DON'T SELL AT THE 2-LEVEL WHEN THE OPPONENTS HAVE A FIT

In other words, don't defend at the two level if either side appears to have an 8 -card fit. When is the last time you got a good board for defending $2 \vee$ when they had $8+$ trumps?

I can't remember myself. (OK, this doesn't always apply - when they bid 1^-2^, you might be vulnerable without a decent fit. But it usually applies.)

## 5. A PARTNERSHIP IS ONLY AS STRONG AS ITS WEAKEST LINK

If you or your partner are not feeling strong, you won't play your best game. This applies to teams as well. If one of your team-mates is weakened, for whatever reason (physically or psychologically), your team is handicapped. So get your team-mates and partners playing their very best by being a good, supportive, loyal partner and team-mate. Your partner is your best friend.

## 6. DON'T BE AN EASY OPPONENT

If you pass a lot, and rarely pre-empt, and always have your bids, your partner will find you an easy partner to play with. But your opponents will love you even more. They won't have any problems reaching their best contracts against you. And your partner won't make as many good leads against them as your more active counterparts do, because he won't know as much about your hand.

## 7. PAY ATTENTION TO THE LAW OF TOTAL TRICKS

If you don't know it, learn it. If you know it and don't believe in it, take a second look - you won't regret it. In the 25+ years l've used LOTT as a guideline to competitive bidding, l've rarely seen a hand where it was wrong.

However... there are a lot of misconceptions out there about LOTT. It is much abused. Contrary to what I frequently hear, LOTT does not mean that you can just count your trumps and blindly contract for that number of tricks (i.e., 9 trumps means that we're safe to bid to the 3 -level). If it were that simple, we would all have given up bridge a long time ago.
The Law of Total Tricks is merely an observation of the phenomenon that the total number of tricks available, to both sides, is usually equal to the total number of trumps held by both sides. If we have 9 hearts, and they have 10 spades, there will usually be 19 total tricks. But they may have 12 of those 19, and we would have only 7 . Or, we may have 11 tricks and they will be able to take only 8.

CAUTION: There are several factors that can affect the total number of tricks available. For example, when there's a great deal of distribution, total tricks will usually be higher, by one or even two tricks. When the hands are flat, total tricks will often be lower. In other words, there will sometimes be one more, or one less, trick available than the total number of trumps. It's important to learn what to watch for so that you can make an educated guess about the number of tricks available. It takes practice, but you'll find that your "guesses" will be fairly accurate in time.

While it is true that, because of LOTT, you are usually safe to bid to the level equal to the number of trumps your side holds, that's a common over-simplification that will lead to bad results. You have to do some thinking, don't just blindly bid to the 4-level every time you have 10 trumps.

For example, if you're not Vul opponents have most of the HCP's with an 8-card fit, and you are Vul with your 10 trumps, it won't be a good idea for you to go -1100 at the 4-level, even if they can make a slam. If they have 12 tricks, you have only 6 (18 trumps, 18 tricks). You have to use LOTT with some common sense.

The best way to begin to apply LOTT is to add methods to your partnership that make it easy for you to know how many trumps you have (for example, use support doubles), and how many cards you have in their suit. Then think about the scoring table before you bid again in competition. Frequently, this will entail stopping at the 2 -level with 8 trumps, bidding to the 3 -level with 9 trumps, or to the 4-level with 10 trumps, etc.

A great way to learn LOTT is to take Larry Cohen's course at Bridgetoday.com.

## 8. MAKE THE OPPONENTS MAKE THE LAST GUESS

Bid as high as you can as fast as you can. Bid to a level where you aren't sure what it's right for them to do. In other words, see \#6 and \#7.

## 9. PARTNER NEVER HAS THE RIGHT HAND.

If you have a tough bidding decision to make on your own, without enough input from partner, then assume that your partner does not have the cards you need. Sometimes he will have them and you'll miss a good contract. But the vast majority of the time he will have the wrong hand, and you'll find yourself going minus.
Last night I held:
$\uparrow-\vee A K x x \bullet x \& A K Q J 10 x x x$.
The auction was $2 v$ on my left, pass from partner, $2 \wedge$ on my right. It's very tempting to bid a slam, but following my own advice, I didn't play partner for the perfect hand. I knew that, if she had the $\checkmark$ A, I could gamble that I would find something useful and make 6\&, otherwise l'd play in $5 *$. And I had the tool to find out. We play Specific Ace Blackwood. If I bid 4NT, she'll bid $5 \&$ with no ace and I can pass. She'll bid $5 \diamond$ with the $A$ and I can bid a slam. But if she bids $5 \uparrow$ with the $A$ A, I will almost certainly be too high. Accordingly, I disciplined myself (not easy) and bid $3 \uparrow$ (ostensibly asking for a stopper for $3 N T$ ), then followed with $5 \star$ to show a powerful hand. My caution was rewarded when dummy produced: $\uparrow 8 x \times x x \vee J x \bullet x x x x x \& x$.

I made 5\& on the nose.

## 10. BE AGGRESSIVE ABOUT BIDDING GAMES AT IMPS

Particularly vulnerable games. But otherwise bid games conservatively. At matchpoints you can often get a good score by making overtricks - you don't need to bid thin games. And you'll get a bad score when your pushy games go down.

The scoring table doesn't really make not Vul games at IMPs an odds-on proposition, so it doesn't really pay to be too aggressive. But when you're Vul, the scoring table is very much in your favour. So bid those thin games and win some imps.

## 11. BID SLAMS CONSERVATIVELY.

A lot can go wrong, even with a "cold" slam. Be particularly conservative about slam bidding at matchpoint scoring, where going down in a bad slam will be close to a zero.

Also, be cautious about bidding slams when the opponents are in the bidding at a high level - the suits are not going to be breaking well. The rocks of distribution have defeated many a good slam.
I once heard Bob Hamman say that if he never bid another slam, he'd probably be doing better than he does now. And Bob Hamman is usually right.

## 12. IF TWO PEOPLE AT THE TABLE THINK I'M GOING DOWN, AND I'M ONE OF THEM, I DON'T PLAY THERE.

For example, partner opens $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and you find your side doubled for penalties after:

| West | North East | South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \wedge$ | Pass | Pass | Double |
| Pass | Pass | ?? |  |

If your hand as East is something like

you know you are in big trouble in $2 \uparrow$, and your RHO thinks so too. So you should try to improve the contract. It isn't going to cost much if you're wrong. Consider it a "Free Chance." You could redouble, or bid 2NT, either one will be interpreted as "Help!!!!"
Similarly, If RHO opens $4 \boldsymbol{v}$, and you choose to overcall $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ holding:

you won't be surprised to go down when LHO doubles 4a. You and LHO are in complete agreement $-4 \boldsymbol{A}$ isn't going to make. So get yourself out of it. You could bid $5 \diamond$ or, again, you could redouble, just in case partner has long clubs. If he doesn't he'll bid 4NT and you can try $5 \uparrow$. (But be sure you're playing with a partner who agrees that this is an SOS redouble before you try it.)

## 13. BE A DISCIPLINED PARTNER.

Have what your partner expects you to have. Whatever your agreements are, stick to them.
CAUTION: "Disciplined" does not mean "sound." It means just what it says - disciplined. It's just as bad to pass when partner expects you to make a light overcall, as it is to overcall on a light hand when partner expects you to be sound. Despite the myriad of systems and styles employed by expert players around the world, from very sound to very aggressive, from highly artificial to totally natural, there is very little systemic edge for any one approach in the long run. Good players who are playing well will win with any methods. But no matter how well they are playing, the most important factor in winning is partnership. You can't win if your partner doesn't know what's going on.

Stay within your agreements, whatever they are. Stick to them like glue so that your partner knows exactly what to expect from you at all times. He'll make better decisions and your scores will improve.

## CALL THE SHERIFF

Those players who know me also know that I have an interest in appeals and that I often sit on appeals committees. However this recent director's ruling from the USA gives me some comfort in the sanity of such committees - if not the directors.
In the recent tournament the following took place. When asked the meaning, East said, "I don't know." West said, "No agreement." It seems that the director ruled in favour of the non-offending side on the basis of 'differing explanations' - go figure. The Appeals Committee saw sense and restored the table result, i.e. against the non-offending side.
If anybody is in doubt about why the game may not be expanding perhaps this is a good example.

## LAURIE'S LEGALITIES <br> Role of the Director

The duties performed by directors at this congress are not dissimilar to what happens in your local club. The Gold Coast Congress is simply a different order of magnitude!

The Laws say that, "The Director is responsible for the on-site technical management of the tournament." When the Laws say 'Director' they really mean the 'Director in Charge'.

Among the Director's duties are requirements to:

- Ensure the orderly progress of the game.
- Administer and interpret the Laws and advise the players of their rights and responsibilities.
- Rule upon and (sometimes) adjust disputes.

The scale of this event requires a number of directors, scorers and floor managers all performing various different duties. While the Laws allow for delegation, they do not relieve the Director in Charge of any of the ultimate responsibility. So if I appear to be preoccupied or distracted at times during the week - there is probably a good reason!

## HANDS FROM THE FINAL PAIRS SESSION

| Board 2 Open Final Session 3 |  |  | Contract | N/S Score | N/S \%age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |
| Dealer East Vul N/S | A 72 <br> - 1043 <br> - J 98653 <br> \& J 7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 109865 \\ & \vee 85 \\ & \text { K } 7 \\ & \& 10832 \end{aligned}$ | 3NT S | +630 | 96.2\% |
|  |  |  | 2NT S | +150 | 3.8\% |
|  |  |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |
| AJ J 3 <br> -J762 <br> - Q 42 <br> \& AK 4 |  |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  | 2NT S | +180 | 15.4\% |
|  |  |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |
|  | A $A K Q$ |  | 2NT S | +150 | 3.8\% |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKQ 9 |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |
|  | - A 10 |  | 3NT S | +630 | 96.2\% |
|  | * Q 965 |  | 4 H N | +620 | 84.6\% |
|  |  |  | 3NT S | +600 | 50.0\% |

OK! You have looked at the hand and wondered what is so interesting about this hand. I guess I am reporting why I am so rarely seen in the finals of events, especially pairs events. I kibitzed Jamie Ebery on this hand and saw the auction unfold as follows:

| North | South |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $2 \boldsymbol{2 *}$ |
| 2* | $2 N T$ |
| 3* | $3 *$ |
| ?? |  |

Now I am not a spiritual person by nature but I would be praising the Lord when my partner manages to bid my 6 card suit and allows me out of this auction and would have passed as quickly as my pen could reach the bidding pad. No doubt however at many tables it may have gone $2 \boldsymbol{6}: 2 \mathrm{BNT}$ which is why so many pairs have reached game but given the opportunity to bail out in 3 I would have been given the opportunity to score a bottom board!

## DIRECTOR SHOPPING

Director, Peter Marley was called to a table in the Open Pairs. On arrival he was told that "we have already had that nice Irish Director (Joe Murray) who gave us a ruling but we couldn't understand a word he said, could you please translate?" Peter, although of Irish background himself, was able to provide an excellent translation of what was no doubt an excellent ruling.
Joe is part of the international director's 'exchange program' which sees selected directors invited to other parts of the world to exchange ideas which lead to a better understanding of how tournaments are run in different parts of the world.

|  |  |  | Contract | N/S Score | N/S \%age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | d 5 Open Fina | ession 3 | 4^ E | -450 | 50.0\% |
| Dealer North | - --- |  | 4a E | 100 | 100.0\% |
| Vul N/S | - K 8532 |  | 6\% N | -200 | 80.8\% |
|  | $\text { A } 3$ |  | $5 \vee \mathrm{~N}$ | -100 | 92.3\% |
|  | \& AK8732 |  | 4AX E | -690 | 3.8\% |
| ^KQJ 96 |  | A A 1087543 | 5AXE | -650 | 15.4\% |
| $\checkmark 96$ |  | - AQ 7 | 54 E | -450 | 50.0\% |
| - K 1075 |  | - J 6 | 54 E | -450 | 50.0\% |
| \& Q 4 |  | \& 9 | 4^ E | -450 | 50.0\% |
|  | A 2 |  | 54 E | -450 | 50.0\% |
|  | - J 104 |  | 5\%) ${ }^{\text {N }}$ | -200 | 80.8\% |
|  | -Q9842 |  | 6\%X N | -500 | 23.1\% |
|  | \& J 1065 |  | 5\% N | -450 | 50.0\% |
|  |  |  | 4\%) | -690 | 3.8\% |

This looked like a tough hand to me. At the table where Ron Klinger sat North the bidding went:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \&$ | 1A | Pass |
| 4A | ?? |  |  |

Problem number one. A double seems best here but are you really prepared to defend 4A if partner passes. But then again, what is the alternative. The auction proceeds

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1\& | 1A | Pass |
| 4^ | X | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{5}$ |
| Pass | Pass | 5^ | Pass |
| Pass | ?? |  |  |

Back in that hot seat again!! Why me!! Point one we note is that partner has not doubled 5 so he seems disinterested in penalising this contract even though he might expect me to have a better defensive hand. Point two and worst of all we are vulnerable against not. At any other vulnerability bidding 6\& looks like cheap insurance but here - who knows.

So there are three choices, (1) double (2) pass or (3) $6 \%$. Ron elected to bid $6 \%$ and went -500 when both heart honours were offside - perhaps a blessing as this meant that 5A would make with a fairly easy diamond guess.

| Board 6 Open Final Session 3 |  | Contract | N/S Score | N/S \%age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3NT E | -690 | 42.3\% |
| Dealer East <br> Vul E/W | ヘ J 7 <br> - K 109875 <br> - 53 <br> \& 875 | 2AX S | -300 | 92.3\% |
|  |  | 6•E | -1370 | 15.4\% |
|  |  | 3NT E | -660 | 65.4\% |
|  |  | 3NT E | -660 | 65.4\% |
| A 8 <br> - 432 <br> - J 1064 <br> \& AKJ 109 |  | 6*E | -1370 | 15.4\% |
|  |  | 3NT E | -690 | 42.3\% |
|  |  | 3NT E | -660 | 65.4\% |
|  |  | 6 E | -1370 | 15.4\% |
|  |  | 5\% W | -600 | 84.6\% |
|  |  | 6\% W | -1370 | 15.4\% |
|  |  | 6•E | 100 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | 6*E | -1370 | 15.4\% |
|  |  | 3NT E | -660 | 65.4\% |

So I have kibitzed just 2 rounds and this is the third interesting board to come my way. I looked at the hand and felt that it was likely that E/W would reach 3NT and make 11 or 12 tricks depending on what risks they were prepared to take and the order in which they took their finesses.
Then I realised that many pairs play that a 2NT opening followed by a 3A bid is minor suit Stayman showing at least $5 / 4$ in the minors and suggesting a singleton major. But hey even if West bids that, East has 14 of 20 points in the majors so should he/she be looking for slam in a minor - assuming at pairs that five of a minor is not a consideration.

| TWO VOICES <br> Barbara Whitmee with Apologies to Alfred, Lord Tennyson <br> The round concluded, most moved away But two at the table decided to stay Absorbed about their bidding and play <br> Hand record before them, one became incensed Back and forth their voices fenced Ceased a while then recommenced <br> "See! On board six you failed to bid The stopper in hearts, down the field we slid 'Cause we did not get to game as others did" <br> "Look I'm as disappointed as you <br> Yes! It was a mistake, but quite easy to do Did you notice how well I played board two?" <br> "Yes, but i discouraged when you led on board 8 <br> You failed to switch till it was too late <br> These small mistakes, they seal our fate" <br> "Let's not continue along this path Or there could be an aftermath Let's start off afresh, not have a blood bath!" | A LITTLE SWINDLE IN THE NIGHT <br> Peter Hainsworth <br> Both Souths played this hand in 3NT from the first session of the pairs final. At My table, partner led the $\leqslant 2$, queen from dummy and my king. I switched to the J which declarer eyed with suspicion and won with the ace. Without a moment's thought declarer played a diamond to the ace dropping my bare jack making 12 tricks. <br> At Roberta Tait's table a heart was led to the Ace, a spade to dummy and the 10 passed to East's KING. Not surprisingly declarer took the marked finesse in diamonds losing to the well concealed jack going two down. |
| :---: | :---: |
| GET WE <br> Dianna Dick has had to withdraw from the tea in Hospital. As a regular at the GCC we wish Long and all at the Congress. | SOON <br> due to recent surgery and is recuperating $r$ all the best for a speedy recovery - Keith |

## BAR SERVICE WEDNESDAY EVENING

The GCECC have kindly agreed to open the bar at the southern end of the Ground floor commencing Wednesday $27^{\text {th }}$ February. The hours will be 6:00pm until midnight. However their preparedness to continue this service will be a function of your patronage on Wednesday.

## IT'S SIMPLY NOT IN THE MANUAL

Being a sometime captain of Australian international bridge teams I have a lot of interest in team strategy and how to tune your team to win events. It is with this background that I am in the middle of reading Silver for Ireland.

The book details the exploits of Ireland's European Silver Medalling Team in Warsaw in August 2006. Put together with the full co-operation of the individual members of the team, the book reveals a lot of the disciplines needed to win tough bridge events.
Since I learned that Tom Hanlon was up drinking till 7:00am on the morning of his win in the Gold Coast Congress Open Pairs I have decided to throw the book out the window and look for better training techniques for my future teams (as well as writing to David Jackson his captain and asking whether this is an "undocumented feature" of the Irish Bridge Team).


Tom Hanlon \& Hugh McGann Winners 2008 Gold Coast Congress Pairs

| Leading Scores Final A Open |  | Leading Scores Final F Open |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H McGann, T Hanlon | 1238 | A De Luca, G Fallon | 1215 |
| B Haughie, D Lilley | 1189 | S Coleman, S Mabin | 1181 |
| G Ware, M Ware | 1186 | S Emerson, A Fallon | 1171 |
| J Ebery, N Rosendorff | 1171 | Leading Scores Final G Open |  |
| G Bilski, T Brown | 1171 | K Dalley, T Kiss | 1295 |
| M Moren, N Francis | 1166 | A Buchanan, N Woodhall | 1257 |
| J Alabaster, J Cormack | 1160 | D Osmund, J Varmo | 1164 |
| J Snow, S Browne | 1130 | Leading Scores Final H Open |  |
| Leading Scores Final B Open |  | J Howard, P Hollands | 1206 |
| K Rubins, N Veksa | 1252 | A Sarten, M Watts | 1179 |
| P Gue, P Wyer | 1232 | R Broughton, M Geddes | 1161 |
| P Benham, B Cleaver | 1163 | Leading Scores Final J Open |  |
| I Del'Monte, A Bach | 1143 | C Ritter, S Hans | 1303 |
| V Gardiner, J Zhao | 1130 | J Pugh, A Wells | 1211 |
| M Mullamphy, V Cummings | 1122 | D Skipper, D Skipper | 1210 |
| R Hills, K Colbert | 1110 | Leading Scores Final K Open |  |
| W Wang, J Ran | 1098 | R Parker, J Summerhayes | 1255 |
| Leading Scores Final C Open |  | M Phillips, S Phillips | 1174 |
| A De Livera, I Robinson | 1196 | D May, P Heazlewood | 1150 |
| I Clayton, C Clayton | 1193 | Leading Scores Final L Open |  |
| I Moore, P Moore | 1182 | D Johnson, J Watson | 1205 |
| Leading Scores Final D Open |  | R Trollope, T Walford | 1159 |
| J Magee, T Strong | 1183 | P Tall, D Wilderness | 1156 |
| J Johnson, B Hobdell | 1168 | Leading Scores Final M Open |  |
| C Geromboux, S Yuen | 1165 | J Steele, J Steele | 947 |
| Leading Scores Final E Open |  | P Hale, J Wood | 900 |
| $J$ Millington, B Jones | 1248 | D Marler, J Franco | 898 |
| O Camp, A Sharmi | 1185 | ONYX RESTAURANT BROADBEACH $10 \%$ discount on drinks to all bridge players |  |
| F Zhong, L Gardiner | 1173 |  |  |


| Leading Scores Final A Novice |  | Leading Scores Final D Restricted |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C Francis, N Moore | 548 | J Griffith, M Irving | 785 |
| C Stone, J Brown | 518 | M O'Donohue, P Thompson | 729 |
| F Campbell, H Grant | 517 | M Land, F Duncan | 690 |
| Leading Scores Final B Novice |  | Leading Scores Final E Restricted |  |
| L Humphry, W McKenzie | 576 | H Kerr, C Kerr | 686 |
| P Bugler, J Kelly | 546 | N De Mestre, P Collins | 672 |
| C Boyd, C McWilliam | 531 | J Oxley, K Potter | 645 |
| Leading Scores Final C Novice |  | Leading Scores Final A Seniors |  |
| M Jones, K Watson | 515 | T Jackman, T Hutton | 1204 |
| R Innes, K Murray | 511 | H Thomson, R Freeman-Greene | 1179 |
| B Hunt, R Rooney | 498 | D Smee, D Smith | 1157 |
| Leading Scores Final A Restricted |  | Leading Scores Final B Seniors |  |
| D Featherstone, N Mclvor | 1247 | S Mendick, J Mott | 1242 |
| N Browne, A Simon | 1201 | R Lorraway, J Dooner | 1213 |
| A Michl, H McGrinder | 1167 | P Rickard, J Twigg | 1201 |
| Leading Scores Final B Restricted |  | Leading Scores Final C Seniors |  |
| R Hurst, E Leach | 1292 | P Rutherford, L Smyth | 1216 |
| E Baker, T Wotherspoon | 1230 | M Pogany, L Varadi | 1212 |
| C Makin, K Makin | 1223 | A Doddridge, J Wilson | 1158 |
| Leading Scores Final C Restricted |  | Leading Scores Final D Seniors |  |
| C Bergman, R Young | 1208 | P Scott, S Jackson | 825 |
| R Binsted, J Scholfield | 1172 | M Millar, J Millar | 801 |
| E Beatson, N Grove | 1129 | M Jefferson, A Ashman | 801 |

## YOU ASK WE TELL

A very successful session of you ask we tell was held in the playing area at 11:00pm Monday Evening. Attended by 80 players the panel of Ron Klinger, Jack Zhao and Kate McCallum answered questions from the floor mainly around hands played that evening. Some gems put forward during the discussion included:
Kate: If two people at the table think I am not making a contract and I am one of them then I am running (see Kate's Baker's dozen above)
Jack: If the opponents show two suits, a direct double shows preparedness to double one of their suits. However a pass followed by a double shows preparedness to double BOTH of their suits.
Here is one of the interesting hands that the audience wanted to know more about:

$2 \checkmark$ was a general force which prima facie asked for a stopper or a better description of overcaller's hand.

The panel felt that South was certainly worth a mild slam try by bidding 44. This would show a 6-5 in $\leqslant s$ and $\uparrow s$. There is little downside to this as 4 NT by partner would be to play.
Join us for our second you ask we tell session after play today (Wednesday) around 11:00pm in the main playing area. The guests will likely be Ish Del'Monte, Paul Marston and Mike Cappelletti Jr. from the USA.

## TEAMS RESULTS

After 2 Sessions - Maximum Score 50 VPs

| LEADING SCORES OPEN TEAMS |  |  | SCORES SENIORS TEAMS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88 | (Shannon) James Shannon, Betty Priestley, Eve Manns, Margaret Wear | 50 | 5 | (Bock) Steven Bock, Martin Bloom, Les Grewcock, Alex Yezerski | 48 |
| 20 | (Rubins) Karlis Rubins, Natalja Veksa, Siegried Konig, James Wallis | 50 | 9 | (Yovich) Dennis Yovich, Hilary Yovich, Richard Grenside, Sue Grenside | 48 |
| 7 | (Cummings) Valerie Cummings, Matthew Mullamphy, Pauline Gumby, Warren Lazer | 50 | 2 | (Scott) Walter Scott, Boris Tencer, Robert Gallus, Stan Klofa | 44 |
| 14 | (Beale) Felicity Beale, Robbie Van Riel, Margaret Bourke, Richard Brightling | 50 | 49 | (Rutherford) Pat Rutherford, Lynne Smyth, Elizabeth Grieve, Gay Bradbury | 44 |
| 9 | (Hung) Andy Hung, Nye Griffiths, Michael Whibley, Justin Williams | 50 | 3 | (Robson) Mike Robson, Betty Lee, John Brockwell, Eric Ramshaw | 43 |
| 26 | (Finikiotis) George Finikiotis, Andrew Markovics, Simon Stancu, Michael Mihu | 49 | 47 | (Doddridge) Alan Doddridge, Jenny Wilson, Judy Plimmer, Lorraine Inglis | 42 |
| 112 | (Pringle) Rita Pringle, John Kearns, Ralph Smith, Phil Gallasch | 48 | 6 | (Drake) Margaret Drake, Ashraf Chaudhry, Tony Skinner, Bal Krishan | 41 |
| 1 | (Marston) Paul Marston, Karen McCallum, Tom Hanlon, Hugh McGann | 47 | 44 | (Thomson) Tony Thomson, John Evitt, Helen Thomson, Robyn Freeman-Greene | 40 |
| 3 | (Rothfield) Jessel Rothfield, Seamus Browne, Ishmael Del'Monte, Tony Nunn, Kieran Dyke, Ashley Bach | 47 | 4 | (Smee) David Smee, Don Smith, William Westwood, Gary Lane | 40 |
| 82 | (Barnard) Janet Barnard, Pauline Andrews, Amelia Herbert, JO Clark | 47 | 17 | (McElhinny) Mike McElhinny, Robyn Griffiths, Noelle Kebby, Tony Woolford | 39 |
| 126 | (Heyting) Gary Heyting, Irma Heyting, Josie Ryan, Phillip Morris | 47 | 10 | Varadi | 39 |
| 49 | (Milward) Robert Milward, Helen Milward, Berenice Folkard, Ross Folkard | 46 | 22 | Kelly | 38 |
| 57 | (Schwabegger) Charlie Schwabegger, Kerrin Daws, Jane Rasmussen, Margaret Walters | 46 | 1 | Puskas | 38 |
| 18 | (Gardiner) Valeri Gardiner, Brian Callaghan, Christine Duckworth, Justin Howard, Peter Hollands, Cathy Mill | 46 | 18 | Bloom | 38 |
| 13 | (Gaspar) George Gaspar, Bob Richman, Jan Cormack, Jan Alabaster | 46 | 13 | Lyons | 38 |
| 27 | (Brown) Fiona Brown, John Clarson, Luke Matthews, Edward Barnes | 45 | 14 | Back | 37 |
| 15 | (Noble) Barry Noble, Michael Prescott, George Bilski, Terry Brown, Avinash Kanetkar, Michael Capalletti, Jnr | 45 | 12 | Spiro | 35 |
| 2 | (Green) Murray Green, Helen Horwitz, Peter Gill, Fu Zhong, Jack Zhao | 45 | 11 | Raaphorst | 35 |
| 101 | (Healy) William Healy, Wayne Choy-Show, Richard Trollope, Tony Walford | 44 | 16 | Harman | 33 |
| 154 | (Hoenig) Maha Hoenig, Dawn Cullen, Tony Treloar, Peter Evans | 44 | 42 | Ware | 33 |
| 38 | Lenart | 44 | 7 | Marinos | 32 |
| 12 | Giura | 43 | 25 | Munro | 31 |
| 6 | Henry | 43 | 26 | Rhodes | 31 |
| 71 | Moffat | 43 | 29 | Cohen | 30 |
| 110 | Moses | 43 | 20 | Fine | 29 |
| 34 | Jacob | 43 | 15 | Winestock | 29 |
| 21 | Hoffman | 43 | 21 | Jefferson | 27 |
| 119 | Beil | 43 | 43 | Cullen | 26 |
| 113 | King | 43 | 33 | Nimmo | 25 |
| 104 | Cooke | 42 | 48 | Sheehy | 25 |
| 55 | Buchanan | 42 | 41 | Havercroft | 25 |
| 22 | Jackman | 42 | 24 | Carew | 25 |
| 51 | Goodyer | 42 | 31 | Pryde | 25 |
| 42 | Waldvogel | 41 | 28 | Jenkins | 24 |
| 32 | Jagelman | 41 | 23 | Pulling | 23 |


| 54 | Tucker | 41 | 39 | Barua | 22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | Walsh | 41 | 37 | Bishop | 21 |
| 78 | Quayle | 41 | 27 | Reed | 20 |
| 213 | Gibson | 41 | 19 | Dowling | 19 |
| 60 | Geddes | 41 | 32 | Joyce | 19 |
| 153 | Parfait | 41 | 45 | Ham | 18 |
| 50 | Camp | 41 | 36 | Congreve | 18 |
| 56 | Strong | 40 | 40 | Parry | 18 |
| 96 | Halmos | 40 | 35 | Davies | 14 |
| 24 | Leibowitz | 40 | 34 | Daniel | 13 |
| 102 | Hart | 40 | 30 | Stringfellow | 13 |
| 35 | Tishler | 40 | 46 | House Teams | 13 |
| 63 | Johnson | 40 | 38 | Bray | 10 |
| 127 | Corkhill | 40 | More Open Teams Scores |  |  |
| 84 | Hyne | 40 | 160 | Kovacs | 27 |
| 40 | Luck | 39 | 196 | Eastment | 27 |
| 106 | Pugh | 39 | 206 | Campbell | 27 |
| 94 | Struik | 39 | 91 | O'Neill | 27 |
| 124 | Dawson | 39 | 271 | Mendick | 27 |
| 45 | Hunt | 39 | 44 | Caplan | 27 |
| 97 | Belonogov | 39 | 85 | Weldon | 26 |
| 211 | Lipthay | 39 | 132 | Valentine | 26 |
| 212 | Bowerman | 38 | 167 | Alexander | 26 |
| 207 | Atkins | 38 | 242 | Cornell-Bray | 26 |
| 67 | Andrew | 38 | 253 | Daglish | 26 |
| 48 | Samuel | 38 | 143 | Weaver | 26 |
| 128 | Johnston | 38 | 92 | Rabey | 26 |
| 8 | Lester | 37 | 201 | Sharp | 26 |
| 53 | Hurley | 37 | 111 | Van Abbe | 26 |
| 108 | Dougall | 37 | 80 | Mason | 26 |
| 4 | Vainkunas | 37 | 156 | Rowland | 26 |
| 83 | Goldstein | 37 | 46 | Hooykaas | 25 |
| 29 | Hammarholm | 37 | 134 | Spurway | 25 |
| 30 | Hegedus | 37 | 270 | Delany | 25 |
| 118 | Spurrier | 37 | 210 | Holloway | 25 |
| 203 | Speiser | 37 | 219 | Whitmee | 25 |
| 93 | Wood | 36 | 163 | Abraham | 24 |
| 28 | Kiss | 36 | 223 | McArthur | 24 |
| 87 | Collins | 36 | 182 | Strasser | 24 |
| 58 | Skipper | 36 | 241 | Pierce | 24 |
| 135 | Travers | 36 | 121 | Mooney | 24 |
| 169 | Turner | 36 | 205 | Suthers | 24 |
| 180 | Rooney | 36 | 258 | Moschner | 24 |
| 105 | Martelletti | 36 | 125 | Johnson | 24 |
| 116 | Berzins | 36 | 236 | McAdam | 24 |
| 200 | McGlashan | 35 | 274 | House Teams | 23 |
| 267 | Kron | 35 | 178 | Farr | 23 |
| 16 | Wignall | 34 | 115 | Andersson | 23 |
| 268 | Smith | 34 | 229 | Colhoun | 23 |
| 68 | Mabin | 34 | 254 | Bailey | 23 |
| 11 | Hirst | 34 | 175 | Sarten | 23 |
| 217 | Tall | 34 | 133 | Ingold | 22 |
| 81 | Mayo | 34 | 146 | Gilfoyle | 22 |
| 75 | Jakes | 34 | 273 | Ashwell | 22 |
| 103 | Palmer | 34 | 73 | Marshall | 22 |
| 189 | Ginsberg | 34 | 95 | Forage | 22 |
| 251 | Adcock | 34 | 129 | Dennis | 22 |
| 107 | Rothwell | 34 | 171 | Gent | 22 |
| 183 | Carmichael | 34 | 215 | Houghton | 22 |
| 99 | Swan | 33 | 140 | Anlezark | 22 |
| 89 | Buch | 33 | 165 | De Nett | 22 |
| 62 | Vaughan | 33 | 158 | Callaway | 22 |
| 161 | Wilkinson | 33 | 174 | Jeffery | 22 |
| 43 | Hutton | 33 | 228 | Power | 21 |
| 204 | Doland | 33 | 76 | Pick | 21 |


| 195 | Greenwood | 32 | 192 | Morris | 21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 86 | Norden | 32 | 173 | Marks | 21 |
| 168 | Dawes | 32 | 176 | Sloane | 21 |
| 74 | Gleeson | 32 | 194 | Stewart | 21 |
| 232 | Foots | 32 | 190 | Hilton | 21 |
| 259 | Davis | 32 | 181 | Webb | 20 |
| 66 | Weathered | 32 | 52 | Cleaver | 20 |
| 109 | Quach | 32 | 188 | Flynn | 20 |
| 25 | Sarten | 32 | 141 | Lamont | 20 |
| 41 | Kempthorne | 32 | 257 | Loth | 20 |
| 100 | Geromboux | 32 | 240 | Burden | 20 |
| 252 | Gunner | 32 | 218 | Cordingley | 20 |
| 31 | Beauchamp | 32 | 151 | Burrows | 20 |
| 33 | Jones | 32 | 120 | Bedford-Brown | 20 |
| 47 | Duxbury | 32 | 164 | Crafti | 19 |
| 162 | Van Der Hor | 32 | 238 | Gage | 19 |
| 263 | Muller | 32 | 256 | Fitzgerald | 19 |
| 137 | Protheroe | 32 | 216 | Yandle | 19 |
| 244 | Theodore | 31 | 155 | Brookes | 19 |
| 90 | Grifiths | 31 | 199 | Langford | 19 |
| 130 | Lee | 31 | 147 | Boland | 19 |
| 250 | Ball | 31 | 150 | Darley | 18 |
| 5 | Wu | 31 | 264 | Southen | 18 |
| 72 | Abbenbroek | 31 | 152 | Rodgers | 18 |
| 77 | Rickard | 31 | 185 | Mann | 18 |
| 117 | Marler | 31 | 266 | Scott | 18 |
| 255 | Wellman | 31 | 239 | Stoneman | 18 |
| 220 | Young | 31 | 144 | Ashman | 18 |
| 269 | Guilford | 31 | 226 | Riddell | 18 |
| 10 | Moren | 30 | 23 | McLeish | 18 |
| 98 | Crowley | 30 | 234 | Beresford | 17 |
| 37 | Guy | 30 | 70 | Long | 17 |
| 184 | Schoen | 30 | 249 | Strutton | 17 |
| 36 | Wakefield | 30 | 237 | O'Malley | 17 |
| 79 | Kahn | 30 | 186 | Purbrick | 17 |
| 166 | Hillhouse | 30 | 148 | Allan | 17 |
| 64 | Parker | 30 | 193 | Rawson | 17 |
| 65 | Eddie | 30 | 224 | Allen | 16 |
| 187 | Tyms | 30 | 191 | Larkin | 16 |
| 272 | Thornberry | 30 | 243 | Unknown | 16 |
| 59 | Livesey | 30 | 172 | Jacobson | 16 |
| 123 | Hennig | 30 | 222 | Draper | 16 |
| 202 | Moens | 29 | 261 | Woodfield | 15 |
| 221 | Fanos | 29 | 230 | Blackham | 15 |
| 61 | De Luca | 28 | 198 | Wenham | 15 |
| 265 | Clayton | 28 | 248 | Cockbill | 15 |
| 231 | McGhee | 28 | 225 | Salter | 15 |
| 246 | French | 28 | 157 | Hepburn | 15 |
| 214 | Rose | 28 | 159 | Robinson | 14 |
| 227 | Cohen | 28 | 142 | Lambert | 13 |
| 69 | Paul | 28 | 233 | Winter | 13 |
| 122 | Kilvert | 28 | 245 | Maher | 12 |
| 179 | Alp | 27 | 138 | Purchase | 11 |
| 136 | McDonald | 27 | 235 | White | 11 |
| 139 | Ryan | 27 | 145 | Hurst | 10 |
| 260 | Smith | 27 | 209 | Rogers | 9 |
| 17 | Burke | 27 | 262 | Gross | 9 |
| 39 | Magee | 27 | 197 | Thompson | 8 |
| 131 | Fraser | 27 | 208 | Small | 8 |
| 170 | Synnott | 27 | 149 | Mill | 8 |
| 114 | Phillips | 27 | 247 | Whigham | 7 |
| CONTINUED ON PAGE 14 IN THE ADJACENT COLUMN |  |  | 177 | Vella | 5 |


| SCORES NOVICE TEAMS |  |  | SCORES RESTRICTED TEAMS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | (Waite) Janice Waite, Jan McDonald, Barbara Sanders, Diana Deane | 50 | 44 | (Verver) Jim Verver, Diana McKenzie, Dennis Mattschoss, Ann Mattschoss | 46 |
| 12 | (Bristow) Wendy Bristow, Ivan Schmalkuche, Barbara White, Elaine Crommelin | 45 | 56 | (Henry) Camille Henry, Pam Langford, Sue Crooke, Glenys Look, Caroline Drummond | 45 |
| 5 | (Kanetkar) Lalita Kanetkar, Chris Pippen, Susan McMahon, John Courtman | 39 | 3 | (Mclvor) Nigel Mclvor, David Featherstone, Diane Potter, Terry Potter | 45 |
| 3 | (Page) Charles Page, Chula Naranong, Terry Khoo, Alan Clague | 39 | 26 | (Barton) Beverley Barton, Michael Lawrence, Colleen Bosley, Nicki Taylor | 43 |
| 8 | (Miller) Patricia Miller, Betty Steele, Zara Blackley, Ray Steele | 38 | 53 | (Hawkins) Susie Hawkins, Marilyn Ohlson, Virginia Rugless, Diana Wilson | 42 |
| 17 | Earnshaw | 34 | 46 | (Hoy) Renee Hoy, Lynette Fraser, Yvonne Morris, Judith Scott | 41 |
| 7 | Casey | 33 | 9 | (Isle) Valerie Isle, Judith Selleck, Pamela Smith, Chris Lawrence | 40 |
| 13 | Housden | 30 | 70 | (Innes) Lou Innes, Pat Davis, Sandy Fildes, Shelley Shergold | 40 |
| 21 | Bryant | 30 | 29 | (Barda) J oe Barda, Daryo Muraben, Racheline Barda, Peter Campbell, Ida Muraben | 40 |
| 4 | Pisko | 29 | 19 | (Partridge) Margaret Partridge, Lynn Baker, Sue Scotford, Rodney Scotford, Judith Vessey | 39 |
| 2 | Hirschhorn | 28 | 34 | George | 38 |
| 20 | Beyer | 28 | 52 | White | 38 |
| 11 | Lindenberg | 27 | 69 | Kerr | 37 |
| 16 | Stone | 27 | 18 | Aiston | 37 |
| 18 | Bright | 27 | 24 | Jury | 37 |
| 9 | Hurst | 26 | 25 | Macfarlane | 37 |
| 19 | Trowse | 26 | 13 | Hatcher | 36 |
| 6 | Porter | 26 | 59 | Perrin | 35 |
| 10 | Carson | 26 | 27 | Wetzig | 35 |
| 15 | Heer | 25 | 57 | Geromboux | 35 |
| 14 | Pringle | 23 | 32 | Lloyd | 35 |
| 24 | House Teams | 22 | 73 | Levin | 35 |
| 1 | Innes | 21 | 5 | Francis | 35 |
| 22 | Dudman | 19 | 12 | Sinclair | 34 |
|  |  |  | 1 | Wotherspoon | 34 |
|  |  |  | 14 | Graczynski | 34 |
|  |  |  | 16 | Makin | 34 |
|  |  |  | 68 | Jones | 33 |
|  | An undernourished Caddy |  | 61 | Collins | 33 |
|  |  |  | 20 | De Mestre | 33 |
|  |  |  | 41 | Homer | 32 |
|  |  |  | 72 | Walker | 32 |
|  |  |  | 15 | Ryan | 31 |
|  |  |  | 55 | Scott | 31 |
| RESTRICTED RESULTS CONTINUED |  |  | 6 | Swanson | 31 |
| 67 | Beckett | 23 | 60 | Huntley | 31 |
| 38 | Freeman | 23 | 11 | Eddy | 31 |
| 39 | Browne | 23 | 43 | Field | 30 |
| 54 | Grant | 23 | 42 | Johnson | 30 |
| 66 | Rozier | 23 | 2 | King | 29 |
| 33 | Reynolds | 22 | 50 | Hunt | 29 |
| 17 | Evans | 21 | 10 | Binsted | 28 |
| 64 | Raward | 21 | 47 | Chau | 28 |
| 28 | Campbell | 20 | 37 | Tillotson | 28 |
| 51 | Knight | 19 | 31 | Dawson | 28 |
| 30 | Hill | 18 | 45 | Logan | 28 |
| 49 | Mansberg | 18 | 7 | Kerr | 28 |
| 48 | Leckie | 18 | 35 | Hawken | 27 |
| 8 | Fenwicke | 17 | 36 | Brosnan | 27 |
| 21 | Nothling | 16 | 58 | Knight | 26 |
| 23 | Land | 16 | 22 | Goodrick | 26 |
| 62 | Joseph | 15 | 4 | Johnson | 24 |
| 63 | Roach | 15 | 40 | Owen | 24 |
| 71 | Keddell | 15 | CO NTINUED IN THE LEFT HAND COLUMN |  |  |

## TIM TEASERS

| Dealer South Vul E/W | A 975 |  | West | North | East | South 4^ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 8642 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - Q42 |  | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  | \& A 64 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sim_{*} 2$ |  | $\wedge$ A 3 |  |  |  |  |
| -KQJ3 |  | $\checkmark 10975$ |  |  |  |  |
| - J 86 |  | -K1075 |  |  |  |  |
| \&J9832 |  | \& K 107 |  |  |  |  |

```
AKQ J10864
* A
-A 9 3
*Q 5
```

While the South hand would be too strong for a four spade opening bid in the first or second seat, it is almost certainly the best choice in third seat.

West led the king of hearts and declarer won the first trick with his bare ace. With only nine winners, he aimed to combine his chances for a tenth trick by working on the minor suits in the right order. Since he needed two entries to dummy to benefit from East holding the king of clubs, he led the eight of trumps to dummy's nine at trick two. East took this with the ace and returned a heart. Declarer ruffed with the king, to preserve the six and four of trumps as entries to table.
After leading the six of trumps to dummy's seven he called for a low club from table. East rose with the king and declarer had ten tricks; he could ruff the next heart high, cash the queen of clubs and then lead the two of trumps to dummy's three to cash the ace of clubs and discard one of his diamond losers.

If the queen of clubs had lost to West's king, declarer would have had to rely on finding that West held the king of diamonds too.

| Dealer South Vul N/S | AK8654 <br> - KQJ5 <br> - A J <br> * Q 7 |  | West <br> Pass <br> Pass | North <br> 20 <br> 4^ | East <br> Pass <br> All Pa | South <br> 1NT <br> 2 <br> s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A A 9 |  | A 103 |  |  |  |  |
| -103 |  | $\checkmark 8762$ |  |  |  |  |
| -962 |  | -107543 |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ AKJ 1042 |  | -9 3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | AQJ 72 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ - 94 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - K Q 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ¢ 865 |  |  |  |  |  |

West leads the king of clubs and East plays the nine.
West counted sixteen points in dummy and a further twelve for South's advertised weak no trump.
Consequently, as East had a barren point count, the only chance of beating had to be by trump promotion!

So West cashed the ace of clubs and continued with the jack of clubs. As declarer could not afford to let East score a ruff, he called for dummy's king of trumps then led a trump to his jack. West took this with the ace of trumps and played a fourth round of clubs.
As long as East ruffed this with the ten of trumps, the defence would score a second trump trick. When the ten of trumps is played South can either over-ruff with the queen and West's nine of trumps is setting trick or he can let the ten of trumps serve that duty. Either way the defence scores a very pretty plus 100 .



## AUIUMN NATIONAL- ANOT WOMENS \& SENIORS SWISS PAIRS \& AUTUMN NATIONALOPEN TEAMS

Run by the SA Bridge Federation under license from the ABF Inc

## CHANGE OF DATES

In deference to all the mothers in Australia, this very popular event has been brought fonward a week. The new dates are:-

Senior \& Women's Swiss Pairs: Open Teams:

1stand 2nd May 2008
2nd to 5th May 2008

Entry forms are now available at http:// www.abf.com.au/ events/anot/ index.html Additional info available from Di Marler (08) 81167282 (W) or 04-1468-9620
PSSST!! WANNA IMPROVE YOUR BRIDGE
After play this evening (Wednesday) there will be a second session of You Ask We Answer (sometimes
called Ask the Experts) held in the main playing area. You are invited to submit any of the hands you played
to the experts for comments.
This is your chance to have some of the finest players in Australia and from around the world guide you on
how to improve your game - highly recommended for ALL PLAYERS. Wednesday Evening's guests will
include Ishmael del'Monte, Paul Marston and Mike Cappelletti Jr.

## THAT'S ENTERTAINMENT

While you're waiting for your opponents here are some puzzles to entertain you. The solutions can be found on the other side of this page - no peeking now.

## TARGET

See how many words of four or more letters you can make from the given nine letters. In making each word each letter only once and must include the key letter. There is one nine letter word. No capitals, hyphen, apostrophes or plural words ending an 'S'. 33 Excellent 26 Good 21 Average


Easy

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

## SUIDO I KU

Expert

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

## RANDOM PUZZLES

Rearrange the following letters to give two different 9-letter words. A C C E H I M N S If solving word puzzles if one of the things at which you are proficient, see if you can think of a 9 -letter word that contains only one vowel.

Who had a hit in 1960 with Stairway to Heaven? Neil Sedaka, Gene Pitney, Paul Anka or Bobby Vee?
Who had a hit in 1965 with Stop! In the Name of Love? The Supremes, Martha \& the Vandellas, The Velvelettes or The Ronettes?
Who had a hit in 1968 with This Guy's in Love with You? Herb Alpert, Sammy Davis Jr, Tom Jones or Elvis Presley?
Leaving on a Jet Plane was a 1969 hit for Peter, Paul \& Mary. Who wrote the song? John Denver, Paul Simon, Stevie Wonder or Paul McCartney?
Cryptic Question just for Kieran Dyke: song and performer required "Place where postmen might struggle?"

33 Excellent 26 Good 21 Average

| been | leone | ness | sense |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| bene | lessen | noble | sneb |
| benne | lesson | NOBLENESS | snee |
| bone | lone | noblesse | snob |
| boneless | loneness | noel | sone |
| bonne | losen | nole | sonne |
| ebon | nebel | none | sonse |
| ennoble | nelson | nose | Words from Official |
| esne | nene | oneness | Scrabble Dictionary |
| leno | neon | seen |  |

## SU I DO I KU - SOLUTION

Easy

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

## Expert

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

## RANDOM PUZZLES - SOLUTION

Rearrange the following letters to give two different 9-letter words. A C C E I M N S - mechanics and mischance.

If solving word puzzles if one of the things at which you are proficient, see if you can think of a 9-letter word that contains only one vowel - STRENGTHS the answer was in the clue.

Who had a hit in 1960 with Stairway to Heaven? Neil Sedaka.
Who had a hit in 1965 with Stop! In the Name of Love? The Supremes.
Who had a hit in 1968 with This Guy's in Love with You? Herb Alpert.
Leaving on a Jet Plane was a 1969 hit for Peter, Paul \& Mary. Who wrote the song? John Denver.

Cryptic Question just for Kieran Dyke: song and performer required "Place where postmen might struggle?" Where the Streets have no name by U2

