



NOT NEWS

2002

Editor: Earl Dudley

Production Team: Jennifer de Livera, Paul Hurley

GOSFORD

by John Brockwell

At the SWPT in 1996, a Canberra player manoeuvred himself into 2♦ doubled and redoubled against Michael Courtney and Dean Scully. The outcome, -3400, was a source of great hilarity. One wit, who was also an authority on postcodes, bestowed the nickname "Horsham" on the player concerned.

For the past 6 years, poor Horsham has been brooding about this fiasco. His state of mind was just slightly relieved last week by a result from Session 5 of the Seniors Teams.

Seniors Teams Session 5
Board 10
Vul: All
Dir: E

♠: AKJ874
♥: -
♦: 95
♣: A7652

♠: QT9 ♠: 63
♥: AKJ98 ♥: QT764
♦: AKQ76 ♦: T83
♣: - ♣: KJ4

♠: 52
♥: 532
♦: J42
♣: QT983

Horsham's partner, North, played 4♠X on the lead of ♠3 for +790. At the other table, Horsham's team mate, West, played ♠6 against the lead of ♣A for +1460. Total swing +2250.

GOSFORD!

SWPT Top Thirteen after 9 rounds

Rydgges Lakeside Hotel (138 teams)

				VP's
1st	3	ZIGGY (Konig, Wallis, Bach, Burgess, Dyke, Richman)		180
2nd	5	CUMMINGS (Cummings, Newman, Beauchamp, Chadwick, Klinger)		178
3rd	1	BRAITHWAITE (Braithwaite, Turner, Wright, Hallberg, Cornell, Jedrychowsky)		173
4th	10	GRYNBERG (Grynberg, Evans, Buchen, Green, Malaczynski, Stern)		172
5th	4	NOBLE (Noble, Brown, Bilski, Gue, Prescott)		169
5th	9	BRAYSHAW (Brayshaw, Mulley, Clark, Rogers, Havas, Ewart)		169
7th	12	SCOTT (Scott, Snashall, Kilvington, Fust, Frenkel, Reiner)		166
7th	66	SMITH (Smith, Cowen, Coales, Cowen)		166
7th	11	BOURKE (Bourke, Bourke, de Livera, Jesner, Ramshaw, Smith)		166
10th	7	KOZAKOS (Kozakos, Hans, Chadwick, Morrison)		165
10th	21	MOSES (Moses, Moses, Zines, Horne, Scudder, Glanger)		165
12th	17	CHRISTIE (Christie, Cooper, Urbach, Sherman, Nicholas, Kemp)		163
12th	22	PETTITT (Pettitt, Pettitt, Hutton, Hutton)		163

Hyatt Hotel Canberra (120 teams)

1st	1	OTVOSI (Otvosi, Borewicz, Erichsen, Romanski, Szymanowski, Gruia)		192
2nd	4	THOMPSON (Thompson, Hughes, Thomson, Bagchi, Rosendorff, Lilley)		178
3rd	2	NEILL (Neill, Roberts Mullamphy, Fruewirth, Smith, Yovich)		177
4th	3	HAFFER (Haffer, Reynolds, Peake, Kanketkar)		175
5th	15	WESTLAKE (Westlake, Stark, Howe, Gurfinkiel, Crow-Mai, Leslie)		173
5th	8	COURTNEY (Courtney, Gill, Dalley, Courtney, Lloyd)		173
7th	5	WALSH (Walsh, McDonald, Griffin, Hughes, Gumby, Lazer)		170
7th	13	GIURA (Giura, Morgan, Krochmalik, Hughes)		170
9th	6	ROTHFIELD (Rothfield, Rothfield, Browne, Blackstock, Henry)		164
10th	11	HOFFMAN (Hoffman, Hoffman, Beale, Van Riel, Sawicki, Doran)		163
11th	41	WILSON (Wilson, Wilson, Norris, Mortimer)		159
11th	9	GOLD (Gold, Ebery, Thompson, Evans, Antoff, Simpson)		159
11th	10	DE LUCA (De Luca, Frodham, Lasocki, Lusk, Lusk)		159

A RUFF TIME WAS HAD BY ALL

by Marcia Scudder

On some hands, the cross-ruff can be a source of tricks for declarer. On others, it can assist the defence to sink an otherwise unstoppable contract. This hand is unusual because all of East, West and South get involved in the ruffing game.

SWPT Session 6
Board 12
Vul: NS
Dir: W

♠: A
♥: 952
♦: K962
♣: AKJ82

♠: QT97 ♠: 54
♥: A ♥: KQJT876
♦: QT8753 ♦: A
♣: T3 ♣: Q7

♠: KJ8632
♥: 3
♦: J4
♣: 9654

The bidding was short: 1♣ by North, 4♥ by East, 4♠ by South (following the maxim: "Always bid 4♠ over 4♥").

The play went as follows:

♥A (♥K from East as a signal for a diamond)

♦7 to ♦A

♥Q ruffed by South (club pitch from West)

♠A

♦K ruffed by East

♥J ruffed by South (club pitch from East)

♠K

♣4 ruffed by West

♦Q ruffed by South

♣5 ruffed by West

♦T ruffed by South

♣A

♣K ruffed (perforce) by South

4♠ was 2 off with 8 of the 13 tricks being ruffed by one of East, South or West.

Ten tricks were taken by trumps and the other three by Aces!

TABLE TALLY

as of Midnight 23/1/02

4954

SWPT Rydges Datums

BD	Rnd7	Rnd8	Rnd9
1	100	-190	190
2	460	400	150
3	360	-50	-620
4	1340	-120	-10
5	1170	90	-390
6	270	100	160
7	-1220	-660	200
8	120	-50	-70
9	-360	30	420
10	0	-70	400
11	300	60	280
12	1360	-20	0
13	50	-530	620
14	120	290	330
15	190	180	580
16	-520	-90	50
17	-150	0	430
18	90	-300	500
19	500	70	-460
20	-50	-1360	840

SWPT Hyatt Datums

BD	Rnd7	Rnd9
1	70	270
2	480	190
3	470	-700
4	1260	-10
5	1250	-470
6	270	300
7	-1200	0
8	130	-50
9	-370	450
10	70	290
11	300	230
12	1320	-10
13	30	630
14	100	170
15	50	580
16	-550	90
17	-210	350
18	150	540
19	490	-310
20	20	1120

UPCOMING EVENTS

What are you planning to do on Friday night? Why not come and watch the top teams fight it out for a place in the quarter finals of the National Open Teams.

It starts at 8.00pm on Friday night at Rydges Lakeside Hotel. The Canberra Bridge Club will be presenting a Vu-Graph of the first 20 boards. It is anticipated that ten boards from each of the leading qualifier's matches will be featured.

Prizes and trophies for winners of all events decided up to this time will be presented prior to the start of the Vu-Graph.

Then on Saturday and Sunday the Australian Mixed Teams Championship is being held at Rydges for those who haven't had enough bridge already and missed out on qualifying for the Finals of the NOT.

THE DOUBLED PART-SCORE

by Willie Jago

It is well known that a wise policy at IMPs is not to double part-scores unless you are certain of a two trick set.

For those unfamiliar with this principle consider the following. Suppose that you double 1NT, 2♣ (or 2♦), 2♥ (or 2♠), 4♥ (or 4♠) and they all make. At Matchpoints you will get a zero or near zero. At IMPs it is a different story.

The difference between 1NT or 2♣ doubled making and the same contract undoubled is 3 IMPs. Doubling a game contract will cost 5 IMPs if it makes. However, doubling 2♥ will cost 8 IMPs if non-vulnerable and 11 IMPs if vulnerable.

This assumes the contract makes on the nose. Overtricks are more costly in doubled contracts.

In summary, doubling 2♥ is a disaster if it makes. You have doubled your opponents into game and you have set them the task of securing 8 tricks and not the normal 10 tricks.

Board 10 SWPT Session 3 was a case in point.

SWPT Session 3

Board 10

Vul: All

Dir: E

♠: A95	
♥: KQJ6	
♦: Q43	
♣: AJ5	
♠: KQ	♠: T876
♥: A72	♥: 84
♦: K85	♦: JT72
♣: Q7432	♣: 986
♠: J432	
♥: T953	
♦: A96	
♣: KT	

W	N	E	S
		P	P
1NT(1)	X (2)	P	P(3)
P			

(1) 12-14 notrump

(2) Yumms.... 17 HCP and we play Cappalletti (double is for penalty), AND I have a clear cut opening lead.

(3) Respecting partner's opinion. Besides it can't cost much if we're wrong.

Declarer made 3 tricks for -1100. At the other table North overcalled 1NT after a 1♠ opening and this was the final contract making 9 tricks for 150 and a 14 imp swing.

LIGHT AND SLENDER OR PUSHING THE BOUNDARIES

by Eva Hardy

Heavyweight people are frowned upon nowadays. The fashion is to lose weight with models looking anorexic. This attitude has permeated into the game of bridge with a proliferation of weak openings such as Multi's etc., and even values for opening bids at the one level pared to the bone.

In the old days you needed 25+ HCP for game in No Trumps. Now game and slams are bid on the slenderest of values.

Consider the following hand:

SWPT Session 7

Board 15

Vul: NS

Dir: S

♠: QJ83		
♥: 2		
♦: 987		
♣: AK942		
♠: KT765	♠: 94	
♥: KQ	♥: JT6543	
♦: T42	♦: AJ3	
♣: Q65	♣: J7	
♠: A2		
♥: A987		
♦: KQ65		
♣: T83		

North: R. Ellery
South: E. Hardy

The bidding at our table proceeded:

W	N	E	S
			1♦
P	2♣	P	2NT(1)
P	3♠!	P	3NT
All Pass			

1. 12-14 HCP

Contract: 3NT by South
Opening Lead: ♠6

The opening lead was taken by the table's ♠Q. The contract hinged on making 4 club tricks allowing for 1 loser in the suit.

At Trick 2, declarer led a low club from the table to West's ♣Q. West now led another spade to declarer's Ace. The clubs were then cashed, East discarding a diamond and 2 small hearts, declarer 2 small hearts and West 2 small spades.

East now covered the ♦9 with the ♦J, declarer's Queen winning. A second diamond was taken by East's ♦A, which was now bare. East exited with ♥J to declarer's ♥A. Since the diamonds were 3-3 originally, the contract was fulfilled for +600 to NS.

At the other table, EW (June Grigg and Anne Paul) were allowed to play in 3♥ for -50 translating into +550 or 11 IMPs to the Grigg Team.

Like many similar contracts bid and made by the Victorian Youth at the 2001 ANC, this contract was made on the most slender of values (indeed much less than most would feel comfortable with).

A typical auction at club level would probably be:

1♦	1♠
1NT	2NT(??)
Pass.	

ONCE IS AN ACCIDENT - TWICE IS A TREND

by Paul Marston

In the first round of the Australian Open Pairs, I was twice dealt the combination of KQ8x opposite A9x in dummy. Both times I pulled the nine from dummy and RHO covered, once with the Ten and once with the Jack.

I won the King, returned to the Ace and led dummy's last card in the suit. RHO followed. Do you finesse the eight, playing RHO to hold JTxx, or do you rise with the Queen playing for a 3-3 break?

AOP Session 1 Qualifying
Board 9
Vul: EW
Dir: N

♠: K74
♥: A4
♦: KJ54
♣: KQ84

♠: AQ82 ♠: JT96
♥: JT ♥: Q95
♦: Q97 ♦: A632
♣: JT53 ♣: 76

♠: 8543
♥: K87632
♦: T8
♣: A92

North	South
1NT	2♦
2♥	3♥

East led ♠J taken by West with ♠A and a spade was returned. I won ♠K, cashed ♥A and ♥K before playing ♣9 from dummy covered by West's Jack. I won ♣K, went back to the ♣A and played the third club to which West played low.

I was reluctant to pin all my hopes on the finesse because all it would do is relieve me of the diamond guess.

So I rose with the ♣Q. East trumped and made it easy for me by cashing the ♦A. Nothing lost but there was a lesson for me.

AOP Session 1 Qualifying
Board 29
Vul: All
Dir: N

♠: A85
♥: KQ94
♦: KQ82
♣: J5

♠: 42 ♠: KQJT73
♥: 87 ♥: JT6
♦: JT63 ♦: 54
♣: K9742 ♣: T6

♠: 96
♥: A532
♦: A97
♣: AQ83

North	South
1NT	2♣
2♥	4♥

East led the ♠K. I won the Ace and drew trumps in three rounds, ending in dummy. Now ♦9, Ten, King – back to the Ace and ♦7, low from West and ...

This time the finesse did make a difference and as you might have guessed, I fell from grace by rising with the Queen.

The finesse would have allowed me to get rid of my losing spade to make 12 tricks beating most all of the other pairs who stopped short of slam. But I ended up with 11 like everyone else.

Looking at it in the cool light of day, it is not surprising that the defenders on both hands covered with JTxx. After all, I might have been missing the King. And who would play the Ten from Txx, or the Jack from Jxx? Either of these plays would not only be most unnatural, it would also cost a trick in many layouts.

So trust a defender who splits in this situation to have JTxx. (Unless it is a Zia or a Wiltshire - see my column in this Saturday's Weekend Australian!)

ALMOST A MERRIMAC COUP

by Tony Skinner

SWPT Session 4
Board 18
Vul: NS
Dir: E

♠: KT87542
♥: A2
♦: 95
♣: J6

♠: 96 ♠: AJ3
♥: J86 ♥: K543
♦: QT632 ♦: J7
♣: A97 ♣: 5432

♠: Q
♥: QT97
♦: AK84
♣: KQT8

South in 3NT ducked the opening diamond, won the return and created a second entry to dummy by losing the ♣K to West's ♣A (West would have done better to duck.)

Winning the diamond return, South then played the ♠Q ducked, entered dummy with ♣J, and exited with the ♠K to my Ace.

I'd always wanted to perform a Merrimac Coup by removing the entry to a hand before its long suit was established, but dummy's spades were now dead.

Still the spectacular play of the ♥K to dummy's ♥A, created a heart entry for partner's established diamonds.

Not a Merrimac Coup, but satisfying nonetheless.

by Paul Weaver

Your partner opens 1 Major (STD/Precision/Acol). Lots of people play Berger raises, which are something like

3♣ = 7 – 9 4 Card Support
3♦ = 10 – 12 4 Card Support

Many also use the Bergen raise if there is an intervening X, but what is the best system after an overcall (presume 1♠ – 2♥ -)

Should 3C and 3D be:
Bergen
Natural Forcing
Natural Non Forcing

What according to the percentages is most likely to come up ?

Do the percentages change if auction goes 1♥ – 1♠ - ?
Or 1♥/♠ – 2♣/♦ - ?

Editor's Note:

I daresay the experts will have strong views on this. For what it's worth, I think it is best to revert to other methods after an overcall such as cue raises. The jump to 3♣ or 3♦ can be used as fit showing jumps.



RYDGES

LAKESIDE • CANBERRA

THURSDAY DINNER MENUS

BOBBY MCGEES RESTAURANT

\$12.00 Per Person Buffet Menu
5pm – 8pm

Leek & Potato Soup

Roast Beef with Gravy

Yorkshire Puddings

Roast Pumpkin & Creamed
Potatoes

Steamed Medley of Vegetables

Selection of Chefs Salads
Crusty Bread Rolls

Double Baked Cheesecake

Tea & Coffee

Bookings Essential Dial 4

BURLEY GRIFFIN RECEPTION CENTRE

\$25.00 Per Person 3 Course,
3 Choice
5pm - 10pm

Tomato & Basil Soup
Chicken & Leek Vol au Vent
Beef Satay Peanut Sauce &
Rice

Fish of the Day
Lamb Cutlets with Mint Jus
Chicken Wellington with
Tomato &
Basil Sauce

Fresh Fruit Salad & Icecream
Chocolate Mudcake
Double Baked Cheesecake

Bookings Essential Dial 4

GOLD COAST CONGRESS

Feb 16-23

Just another reminder. Entries for the Gold Coast Congress will close within a few days. If you do not want to miss out, please enter **NOW**.

PLAYER QUALIFYING POINTS (PQPS)

On Tuesday, NOT News printed the allocation of PQPs for the Seniors Teams at the Gold Coast Congress. First place will receive 10 PQPs and second place 5 PQPs. This allocation will be reviewed later in 2002 taking into account the size and quality of the 2002 field and the geographical origins of the players competing.

HAZARDS OF ARM CHAIR BRIDGE ANALYSIS

by Earl Dudley

The instant analysis of hands has become something of an art form by your Editor who sifts through material presented to him each day for inclusion in the NOT News that gets printed and distributed by 10am the following day.

My analysis has from time to time been flawed or incomplete. I am aware of two instances where we have slipped up.

On the "2 Wild" hand (see below) discussed in NOT News #4 I claimed that 4♥ could be defeated by leading to East's ♠A initially and switching to a heart.

Women's/Senior's/Restricted
Session 7
Board 2
Vul: NS
Dir: E

♠: QJT872
♥: 732
♦: -
♣: AQ96

♠: K954 ♠: A3
♥: AQ ♥: 64
♦: - ♦: JT98762
♣: JT87532 ♣: K4

♠: 6
♥: KJT985
♦: AKQ543
♣: -

Several players have mentioned to me that after cashing two winners in trumps West is in fact end-played.

West must switch to a club but now declarer can win in dummy with ♣A and ruff out the ♣K off-side.

Yes that it is true but if West switches to a low club, is it

reasonable to place the short ♣K in the East hand? I don't think so. Hence I think 4♥ is destined to fail in this hand on this line of play.

The second hand where the analysis was faulty is the Peter Jamieson article "Reverse Intra finesse" in NOT News #7. Peter subsequently pointed out to me that 4♠ is in fact cold.

The real point of the hand is the play of a card away from a suit holding, headed by KJT to hold your losers to only one in the suit. That is worth reporting.

On the actual hand East might be able to read the position and rise with ♥Q. However, Peter's suggested defence of punching dummy with ♣K is not good enough to defeat the contract.

It prevents declarer from ruffing the third club, but since the remaining club held by declarer (♣J) is the master card, declarer cannot fail in 4♥.

The following article relates to a deal appearing in the NOT News 2001. It illustrates how easy it is to engage in superficial analysis of a hand.

REFLECTIONS ON 2001 SUMMER FESTIVAL OF BRIDGE RETROSPECTIVE

by Earl Dudley

In my search for interesting hands from the 2001 Summer Festival of Bridge, I examined hands where there was a marked difference in the datums between the two venues. The seemingly simple deal featured in this article intrigued me.

2001 SWPT Session 12
Board 11
EW Vul
Dealer S

♠: AKQ652
♥: 763
♦: 4
♣: T75

♠: J94
♥: 854
♦: K965
♣: Q82

♠: 73
♥: AKQJT9
♦: A2
♣: K95

♠: T8
♥: 2
♦: QJT873
♣: AJ43

A superficial analysis as follows: North will open 2♠ (or a multi) and East will overcall 4♥. Declarer in 4♥ has an easy 9 tricks and needs to find a helpful club shortage in one of the opponent's hands to secure the tenth. No such luck and so I predicted +100 for NS or maybe a little less since some players may stay in 3♥. The datum at the Hyatt (+20) looked right but the datum at Rydge's (-240) was puzzling.

Eventually, it dawned on me that 4♥ far from being doomed was in fact cold (or so I thought). Assume that NS play three rounds of spades, declarer ruffing the third to draw trumps. South is now marked with ♣A and is caught in a minor suit squeeze if she alone controls the diamonds. This has to be very good odds once North shows up with three trumps. Simply play off the remaining trumps to reach the following position with one trump to be played is:

(Irrelevant)

♠: -
♥: -
♦: K96
♣: Q82

♠: -
♥: 9
♦: A2
♣: K95

♠: -
♥: -
♦: QJT
♣: AJ4

Cash \diamond A and play the last trump to finish off South. There is no ambiguity as long as declarer keeps a count on diamonds. Game, set and match.

But I was yet to be fully convinced. South will probably lead a diamond honour or a trump at Trick 1 in preference to a spade. This presents no problem for declarer who draws trumps and proceeds to knock out the spades prior to committing to the critical play to yield the tenth trick. North must win and must continue spades to rectify the count for the squeeze or switch to clubs. The club switch holds no terrors. Simply, play low and if South slots the J, a club to 9 will see declarer home. What about North switching to \clubsuit T on winning the spade? Easy – just cover the \clubsuit T with the King.

Eventually, the real subtlety of the hand presented itself. The club switch is automatic for an expert defender in the North seat, who can visualise the imminent minor suit squeeze. Further, the correct card to play is an honour card. The \clubsuit T switch does not deny \clubsuit J and if North has that card covering the \clubsuit T with \clubsuit K will lead to failure. In short, the \clubsuit T switch forces declarer to make a guess to land the contract.

Of course, I overlooked one other subtlety about the hand. It is just possible that some North players will open 1 \spadesuit , particularly if playing a light opening relay system. Now, what are declarer's chances? Not good.

Subscribe Now to Australian Bridge
your national bridge magazine.
Only \$66 for 11 issues by mail.
Go to australianbridge.com
Phone 02 9327-4599

DICING WITH DEATH IN DIAMONDS

by Lilli Allgood

SWPT
Session 1 Board 15
Vul: NS
Dir: S

<p>\spadesuit: - \heartsuit: AJ93 \diamond: KT94 \clubsuit: KQJ86</p>	<p>\spadesuit: T842 \heartsuit: 6 \diamond: AQ8753 \clubsuit: A9</p>
<p>\spadesuit: AKQJ7653 \heartsuit: K2 \diamond: 6 \clubsuit: T5</p>	<p>\spadesuit: 9 \heartsuit: AT8754 \diamond: J2 \clubsuit: 7432</p>

W	N	E	S
			4 \spadesuit (1)
P	6 \spadesuit (2)	All Pass	

- (1) As everybody in the room doubtlessly did!
- (2) With the speed of greased lightning!!

Lead was \clubsuit K grabbed by \clubsuit A with lightning speed, and led a low spade to hand. Then the diamond finesse was taken and then on \diamond A the club was discarded.

The next diamond was ruffed with high spade. Securing the entry to dummy via low spades, the operation was repeated until all diamonds were out, and then the hearts were both discarded, for a pretty +1460

P.S.
And if the diamond finesse fails?
Ugh! Doesn't bear thinking about!!

GIVE DECLARER ENOUGH ROPE

by Earl Dudley

Neil Ewart showed me this little gem from Session 5.

SWPT Session 5
Board 7
Vul: All
Dir: S

<p>\spadesuit: J543 \heartsuit: 8754 \diamond: QT3 \clubsuit: JT</p>	<p>\spadesuit: Q9 \heartsuit: QJ96 \diamond: A9 \clubsuit: A5432</p>
<p>\spadesuit: A87 \heartsuit: K3 \diamond: KJ84 \clubsuit: K976</p>	<p>\spadesuit: KT62 \heartsuit: AT2 \diamond: 7652 \clubsuit: Q8</p>

3 NT is the obvious contract for EW. If East declares, the contract is simple but it is decidedly shaky if West declares and a spade is led. Still with spades 4-4 and clubs 2-2, in the NS hands, the contract is safe. Or is it?

Playing against the top seeds at the Hyatt, Ian Thomson (North), led a small spade against West's 3NT quickly establishing 3 tricks for the defence. Declarer cannot get home without heart tricks and elected to play a heart to \heartsuit Q at Trick 2 which Richard Brightling (South) won.

After a moment's thought, Brightling switched to \clubsuit Q, Thomson following with \clubsuit T won by the \clubsuit A in dummy. Declarer now took the "marked" club finesse for one down. Good stuff.

COLUMN 8 (NOT)

PRACTICE MAKES PERFECT

Some boards got out of order after a long day, but we finally got to play all of them.

In the score up, our partners scored (Board 12) a vulnerable slam +1430 and we made game +650, for +19 IMPs. Next board -140 versus team mates -620, ouch 13 IMPs out.

Further analysis revealed that the +650 score could not be correct because we were not vulnerable EW for the particular hand..

Rechecking shwd that we had played Board 13 twice with different results, no one realising the error.

East held:

♠: AJ8763
♥: K2
♦: AQ95
♣: 7

The first time the board was played, East overcalled North's 1♦ opening with 1♠, his partner raised to 2♠ and he rebid 4♠.

On the second occasion, East passed when North opened 1♦ and only came into the auction when NS had located their heart fit. NS were then able to buy the contract in 3♥.

And they call this "Duplicate" Bridge. The Team Number for one of the pairs was provided to NOT News but will not be published to prevent acute embarrassment to those involved.

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠

Rydges have located the missing pair of pyjama pants. Husband and wife are back on speaking terms.

♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠♥♦♣♠

Postscript to our lead article: Overheard last week at the Hyatt:

Horsham: I'm going to eat brain-food for dinner tonight.

Horsham's team mate: Fish?

Horsham: Yes.

Team mate: Have a big piece.

WHERE TO PUT YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE 2002 NOT NEWS

You can either email us at bridge@accsoft.com.au or leave your articles or comments in the NOT NEWS boxes at either venue.

Feel free to contact us at any time after 5 O'Clock, you can call us on **extension 2388 at Rydges**.

The NOT NEWS will be posted daily on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.abf.com.au/>