

canadian bridge digest

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION
FEDERATION CANADIENNE DE BRIDGE



NOVA SCOTIA
NOUVELLE-ECOSSE



YUKON



TERRE-NEUVE
NEWFOUNDLAND



PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND
ILE DU PRINCE-EDOUARD




NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
TERRITOIRES DU NORD-OUEST



QUEBEC



ALBERTA



ONTARIO



NEW BRUNSWICK
NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK



MANITOBA



BRITISH COLUMBIA
COLOMBIE BRITANNIQUE



SASKATCHEWAN



Canadian Bridge Digest

ISSN 0317-9281

87 Grandin Village
St. Albert, Alberta
T8N 1R9
Phone (403) 458-7332

Published quarterly.

Issue XXX Vol. 10 No. 4

Deadline for next issue is
December 10th, 1980.



**Ron
Bass**



**Jill
Savage**

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION

EXECUTIVE

President	Judge James Harper
Vice President	Helen Shields
Executive Secretary	Dr. Alvin Baragar, 6608-84 St., Edmonton, Alberta T6E 2W9
Treasurer/Director	Aaron Goodman, 326-1396 Ste. Catherine West, Montreal, P.Q. H3G 1P9

ZONE	EXPIRES	DIRECTOR
1	82	Judge James Harper, Room 107, Justice Bldg. Queen St., Fredericton, N.B. E3B 5C8
2	82	Anna McRae, P.O. Box 1166, Place Bonaventure, Montreal, H5A 1G5
3	81	Andrew Altay, 6 Duplex Crescent, Toronto, Ont., M5P 1J2
4	81	Helen Shields, 1103-405 Waverley St., Thunder Bay, Ont., P7B 1B8
5	80	Jack Murphy, 55 Cawder Drive N.W. Calgary, Alta., T2L 0L8
6	80	Sandra Borg, 7622 Sussex Ave., Burnaby B.C., V5J 3V8

NON-VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

David Holgate, 419-37 Silver Birch, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., P6A 5T3
George Reteck, 1650 Le Maisonneuve 2021, Montreal, P.Q. H3H 2P3

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION CHARITABLE FUND

Maurice Gauthier, 7474 Churchill Road, Montreal, P.Q. H3R 3C2

JOINT EDITORS

Ron Bass & Jill Savage, 87 Grandin Village, St. Albert, Alberta



EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

Knowledge comes readily to me (but always after the fact...or so it seems).

Take the decision to recruit articles for the column "Hear it from the experts". Well, it suddenly occurs to me (three months later) that I might not personally know all the experts in Canada. A mere oversight due to geography, of course.

Similarly, it suggests itself that the probitious people I choose might not necessarily be well known to the reading audience at large. However, true to my desire of self-immolation, I will now state that the profesionados whose material you will be reading are players who are definite candidates for the Valhalla of bridge.

It is a known fact anyway that the bridge world exists simultaneously on so many levels of opinion due to expertise, or the lack of it, that mutual agreement is virtually impossible.

Consider the Canadian Bidding Contest and its quest for panelists. You will note that some of the most outstanding players have not been included yet. This is not an oversight, but merely a desire to integrate full fledged experts with some of the lesser known rising stars to compliment each other and modulate the panel. If you happen to fall into the first category (one of Canada's best) your time will come!

Embellishing on that fact, it must be stated that the selection is rather random and certainly does not start at the top of the expert list and work its way down, or to further confuse the issue, does not start or finish from any list...

Special thanks to Al Simon for doing such an admirable job on the Canadian Bidding Contest. May he live forever.

All the contributors to this edition deserve much thanks, but Eric and Sharyn Kokish warrant a great deal of appreciation for compiling such interesting reports of the Women's and Open Team Trials. The only regret is that due to so much copy in this issue, it was necessary to severely edit both their articles. If space had permitted, you would have enjoyed (as we did) reading many more well-analysed hands with interesting comments!!!

Canadian Charitable Fund

Maurice Gauthier (Chairman of the C.B.F. Charitable Fund), reports that in the last Canada-wide charity game, 74 different clubs held games; there were 931½ tables at play and \$6,675.30 was added to the Fund. Reconciliation of these figures was as follows:

Provinces	No. of Games	No. Tables	Receipts
Ontario	24	383	\$2,792.90
British Columbia	14	163½	1,164.70
Quebec	10	121	843.50
Alberta	7	98	681.00
Saskatchewan	6	59	430.50
New Brunswick	6	50	354.70
Manitoba	2	21	147.00
Newfoundland	2	20	140.00
P.E.I.	1	8	56.00
Nova Scotia	1	5	35.00
Army Post (Lahr)	1	3	30.00


Carling O'Keefe Breweries-Sport O'Keefe; Bols Liqueurs and Royal Bank of Canada provided trophies and awards for winners.

24 different cities took part in the special inter-city matches competition held in conjunction with the tournament. Participants in Lagos, Singapore and Hong Kong were links in the Duplicate Bridge Chain Around The World.

Recapping the background of the Canadian Charitable Fund, Mr. Gauthier further advises that in 1966, Eric Murray of Toronto was authorized by the ACBL to establish a charitable fund in Canada so that all charity funds raised in the Canadian games would go to Canadian charities. The Canadian Charitable Fund was established in 1966.

The following is the list of the beneficiaries of the Canadian Charitable Fund since its inception:

1967	Canadian Cancer Society	\$20,000
1968	Canadian Association for Retarded Children	14,000
1969	Canadian Heart Foundation	14,000
1970	Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation	16,500
1971	Multiple Sclerosis Association	15,000
1972	Canadian Arthritis & Rheumatism Society	17,000**
1973	Canadian Cerebral Palsy Association	20,200
1974	Canadian Mental Health Association	21,200***
1975	Kidney Foundation of Canada	24,300
1976	Canadian Arthritis & Rheumatism Society	25,000**
1977	The Arthritis Society (formerly Canadian Arthritis & Rheumatism Society)	30,000**
	Total for Canadian Arthritis	\$72,000,00**
1978	Canadian Mental Health Association	35,000***
1979	Canadian Mental Health Association	36,000***
	Total for Canadian Mental Health	\$92,000,00**



Barth Witterwaall accepts a cheque for \$15,000 on behalf of the Canadian Diabetes Association, presented by Maurice Gauthier, Chairman of the CBF Charitable Fund. The Canadian Diabetes Association is the CBF Charity for the year 1980.

Rookie of the Year (0-5 MP's)



**Roz
Citron**

Beauty, brains and bridge ability, the winning combination for "rookie of the year" Roslyn Citron. The beauty is obvious; as for the brains, Roz holds a Master's degree in Administration, and her bridge ability was displayed by winning the title with 122 points for the year.

Ms. Citron, from Willowdale, Ontario, was not introduced to the game of


bridge until the late 1970's, and it was love at first game. Unlike so many other bridge addicts, Roslyn was able to get through University and complete her education without learning to play bridge (no mean feat).

Roz now takes the game very seriously and became a certified director in May, and is also a partner in one of Canada's largest bridge studios, so that now she teaches the game and holds regular classes in the how to's of bridge, complete with humor.

Roz is also quick to admit that because she refuses to read books on bridge technique, she has learned a lot playing with experienced, patient players. She now has all her gold points and hopes to pick up her L.M. this year.

With this young lady's determination, this is undoubtedly an accomplished feat by now. Good luck, Roz.

Bridge Workshop



By Pat Lopushinsky

RESPONDING TO A ONE NO-TRUMP OPENING BID

Once partner has opened the bidding with one no-trump, the onus rests on the responder to determine whether the partnership belongs in game, slam or a part-score, and to a large extent, the denomination that the partnership will play in. Thus it is very important that both partners understand fully which bids are forcing, which are sign-off and which are invitational. Of course, should there be any interference, it is always the responder who decides whether or not to double or to bid on. The opener should not make another call if responder is silent, as he has already described his hand.

WHEN CAN YOU PASS THE OPENING ONE NO-TRUMP BID?

Obviously a pass will normally end the auction, unless the opponents bid, and so it will usually be made with a hand of 7 or less high card points, and a flat hand. If you have eight or nine points, you can visualize game if partner has a maximum, and so you should invite game, by bidding two no-trump.

Holding less than seven points, but with a distributional hand, it is wrong to

pass the opening bid, as these weak hands will usually play better in a suit contract. Your hand will often be useless to partner in a no-trump contract, as your hand has very few entries and opener will have to play almost entirely out of his own hand.

Therefore, a suit bid at the two level by responder is simply an attempt to remove from no-trump and is a SIGN-OFF bid. The opener is instructed to PASS, regardless of his holding in the suit bid. He has guaranteed at least two cards in that suit for his opening bid of one no-trump. Responder is simply saying that he thinks two of his suit will play better than one no-trump. The ONLY time that the opener may take another call, is with a maximum and four card support for responder's suit, when he can then raise to three. This applies in all suits but clubs, which is the Stayman convention, to be discussed fully later.

BIDDING DIRECTLY TO GAME

Often the responder can tell immediately, at which level and which denomination the hand should be played, and therefore a bid of game is made which the opener will pass. This may be either three no-trump, made with a flat hand, and between 10 and 15 HCP, or a bid of four of a major, which requires a six card or longer suit, and at least a good eight points.

INVESTIGATING SLAMS

With a hand of between 16 or 17 HCP and a flat distribution, usually with no four card major, a QUANTITATIVE RAISE of four no-trump is made. This is really an asking bid, and requests the opener to pass if they hold a minimum and to bid six no-trump with a maximum. It is never construed as Blackwood when used directly over the open-

ing no-trump bid. If you want to check for aces, the Gerber convention is normally used, where a direct bid of FOUR CLUBS asks partner how many aces he holds. The responses are of course bid up the line. Four diamonds would mean none or all four aces, four hearts would show one ace, four spades two aces and four no-trump three aces. If the response is followed by a bid of five clubs, this is asking for kings and the responses follow the identical pattern as for aces.

With hands of between 18 and 19 HCP and a flat hand, responder can tell immediately that the partnership holds between 33 and 36 HCP and that six no-trump should be made.

With an even stronger hand, sometimes the responder can tell that they must play in at least 6 no-trump, but that seven may be possible if partner holds a maximum. The correct way to ask partner this question is to bid 5 no-trump. This is another type of quantitative raise, but the opener has two different options. With a minimum hand, he must bid 6 no-trump, which responder has guaranteed can be made, but with a maximum he bids 7 no-trump.

FINDING MAJOR SUIT FITS

Often the responder will know that the hand belongs in game, but will not know whether to play in a major suit or in no-trump. Holding a strong hand and a five card major suit, the correct bid is three of the major, which asks opener to choose between the two games. If the opener has only two of responders' major, he simply bids three no-trump, which will often end the auction.

However, if opener has either three or four cards in responders' major, he should bid four of the major with a minimum, or even consider a cue-bid, with a maximum.

e.g. Partner responds with three hearts over your one no-trump opening bid. You hold: Kx; KJxx; AQx; Axxx.

You know the hand should be played in hearts, but you also have a fine maximum in terms of high cards and controls. You should bid 4 Clubs over 3 Hearts, which confirms the heart fit, and also shows the ace of clubs, while denying the ace of spades.

If this were your hand: Qxx; KQx; KJxx; Axx, you should just raise three hearts to four. You have good trump support, but the hand is minimum in strength and you have no ruffing value, and few controls. Do not encourage partner to think your hand is better than it is.

CHOOSING BETWEEN THE MAJORS

Sometimes responder will hold a hand with two five card majors, and will want to play in whichever one opener has three card support for. The way to bid these hands is to start off with a bid of three spades, and opener will either bid three no-trump, if they have only two spades, or bid four spades with three or four card spade support. If the opener does bid three no-trump, you can now bid 4 hearts, and opener must have three of these, as it is very unlikely that he will open one no-trump with only 2 - 2 in the majors.

FINDING A FOUR-FOUR MAJOR FIT

The Stayman convention is designed to find four - four major fits after no-trump has been opened. This is a bid of 2 clubs by responder, which asks the opener to bid a four card major if he has one. With no four card major, the opener simply bids 2 diamonds. With EITHER of the majors, he simply bids two of that major, and with BOTH majors, he should bid two spades and plan on showing the hearts if responder goes back to no-trump. Obviously the responder must have had a reason to use Stayman, and if he did not fit spades, he must have had hearts.

The main mis-use of the Stayman convention comes when responder is too weak. You must know where you are going if partner responds with two diamonds.

For example, you should not use Stayman with these hands.

Kxxx; Jxxx; xxx; xx; you have no where to go if partner bids two diamonds. You are too weak to invite by bidding two no-trump, to pass could put you in a worse spot than one no-trump, and to bid a major now would show a five card suit.

x; Kxxx; Jxxx; xxx; with this hand you are much too likely to hear a response of two spades if you bid Stayman, and if this happens, you have no way out. You must simply pass the opening one no-trump bid and hope for the best.

However, if you are five - four in distribution in the majors, you CAN use Stayman, even with a weak hand, as you will always have a safe spot to go, no matter what partner responds.

e.g. You hold Kxxx; Jxxx; xx; xx; partner opens with one no-trump. You can bid 2 clubs - Stayman. If partner responds with either two hearts or two

spades, you are happy to pass. However if partner responds with two diamonds, you can bid two hearts and play on the five - two fit, and partner will pass. Bidding this way will find the four - four spade fit, where one exists, and will not get you into trouble even if partner has no four card major.

Of course the main disadvantage of the Stayman convention is that you can no longer bid 2 clubs naturally. This means you need to find a way to bid very weak hands with a club suit. The best way to handle this is to start with a Stayman call of two clubs, which partner will be forced to respond to. You then bid 3 clubs, which will tell partner that you have a weak hand with a club suit, and to pass. If you have a good hand and a club suit, you can bid 3 clubs directly over the no-trump opening.

In general, all the above mentioned treatments can be used over an opening bid of two no-trump, or in the sequence 2C - 2D - 2NT, where a bid of 3 clubs would be Stayman. The exception to this is that a new suit bid at the three level over an opening two no-trump bid is FORCING.

The Bridge Player's Friend



George
Oliver

The Alberta Bridge Player's Association is doing an excellent job of promoting bridge in the province of Alberta, and much of the credit for its success goes to the chairman of that organization, George Oliver of Medicine Hat.

George has served in that capacity since 1978 and has been responsible for helping establish new clubs in Wetaskiwin, Brooks, Innisfail, St. Paul

and Whitecourt (small communities within the province that might otherwise have not known the enjoyment of duplicate bridge).

Besides establishing new clubs, the ABPA also financially assists those players who have qualified to represent Alberta Units in National play-downs

Although Mr. Oliver first sat down at the bridge table at age ten, he never began playing seriously until his late 20's. He placed first in the men's pairs in the first bridge tournament in which he participated. This willing volunteer spends an enormous time working for the ABPA, he still is able to play in about 20 tournaments a year (a notable feat by this popular Saskatchewanian turned Albertan.)

Hear it from the experts

Play Your Percentages—At The Table!!!

Editor's Note: Part of the pleasure of being educated by this excellent player is knowing that his ability in statistics (probably gained somewhere along the line while picking up his Masters in Engineering) is truly represented in his play at the bridge table, as well as at the backgammon board, much to the chagrin of opponents. Vish ranks among Canada's top experts according to any formula that might be devised for determining them.



By S. (Vish) Viswanathan

Lest the title mislead you, this article is not about the computation of probabilities. I will not tell you the best way to pick up the Queen holding eleven cards, nor when to apply the Rabbi's rule. Any mathematician can tell you all the basic facts you ever need to know about distribution, so, for the purpose of this column, knowledge of these facts on the part of the reader is presumed.

But, let's keep in mind that few bridge

players are mathematicians and vice-versa.

The point is that percentages are not a fixed quality, determined by mysterious and immutable laws, to be mechanically applied at the table. Just as a hand is evaluated and re-evaluated as the auction proceeds, the likelihood of the location of a particular card, or the distribution of an unplayed suit changes as the play proceeds. We should adopt future lines of play to the latest available information. The new information may take the form of a revealing discard, or the particular line of defence adopted; and for those of you who pride yourselves on your table presence, an out-of-tempo play by a defender. Here is an example:

North	South
S J532	S AQ10986
H 6532	H KQ7
D A10	D 86
C 982	C A4

You reach 4 Spades in an uncontested auction. Your opponent deliberates for awhile and then tables the Jack of Hearts. East ponders momentarily, and then puts on the Ace. The shift is to the Queen of Clubs. How do you proceed?

The obvious line of play is the Spade finesse (a 50-50 proposition). Lead to the Ace of Diamonds and run the Jack of Spades if not covered. You could also lead to your ten, hoping that if it loses the defence will not cash their tricks in the right order, allowing you to stuff your loser on the 4th Heart in dummy later. But this is an inferior line, since it also gives up on the Kxx outside.

The alternative is to cash the Ace of

Spades and, unless the King drops, depend on a 3-3 Heart break. Since the *a priori* probability of a 3-3 break is only 35.5%, this line is not much better than the finesse.

Or is it? Let us go back to the play at trick one. West did not have an automatic lead, say, from J109x. If he leads from shortage, East might have held up his Ace or tried to give partner a ruff at trick two. Similarly, if East were short, he might have continued Hearts in the hope of a ruff himself. The inference that the Hearts are behaving is so strong that you should reject any idea of a finesse and lay down the Ace of trumps. It is true that East could have made it harder by holding up the Ace, but the problem may have been a different one from his point of view.

Here is an even more subtle application; you reach six Diamonds on this layout:

North	South
S Q8742	S A
H 9	H A874
D AJ86	D K7542
C AK9	C J102

The opening lead is a helpful trump, picking up the Queen under your King. You lay down the Ace of Spades and cross over to the dummy with a trump, all following. After ruffing a Spade, you lead the Jack of Clubs to the King, drawing small cards. When you ruff a second spade, West discards a Heart without apparent thought. Since you cannot set up the long Spades, do you fall back on the Club finesse? West has 8 unknown cards to East's five, so the finesse is an odds-on favorite to win.

North	South
S Q8	S -
H 9	H A874
D J8	D 7
C K9	C 102

Actually, there is a much better line of play available. Cash the Ace of Hearts,

ruff a Heart, ruff a Spade and ruff another Heart with your last trump. Now play your last Spade endplaying East. How do we know he does not have a Heart to cash? The key lies in West's discard when you ruffed the second Spade. Since he started with doubletons in Spades and Diamonds, his probable distribution was 2-4-2-5 or 2-5-2-4 (conceivably 2-6-2-3 as well). It would take an imaginative defender indeed to sluff a Heart, holding only four of them, and even then he might have thought about it. Playing against mere mortals, it is a virtual certainty that the recommended line will work.

Simply based on table nuances, a technically inferior line of play is sometimes indicated. Even in a World Championship, an Italian expert, needing four tricks with Q109xx opposite Ax, finessed the ten on his way back. Not the percentage line, but he backed his hunch successfully.

Do we follow our instincts in these cases, or do we try to win the post-mortem? It is a matter of personal experience. Playing in a knock-out match sometime ago, I was considering rejecting the invitation to 3NT, based only on a hunch. Actually, I was tip-top maximum for my opening bid, but since we were not vulnerable and behind in the match, it was not a terribly anti-percentage action. After some deliberation, I overruled my hunch. The good news was that 3NT rolled home, so that I had avoided an adverse swing. The bad news was that knowing the full odds, and going with them, we lost the match anyway...

Bridge Bolts

Those who take whist as a lover,
invariably wed the harridan,
bridge.

The Canadian Women's Team Trials

FOR THE 1980 WORLD BRIDGE TEAM OLYMPIAD

by Sharyn Kokish,
Montreal

As nearly everyone knows, the ACBL finally granted Canada its own annual Teams Championship. The new event selects our Open Team for Olympiads and our Bermuda Bowl Trials Team in the odd years. The new event does absolutely nothing for women, per se. This would not be the end of the world if women and men were dealt with exclusively on equal terms as bridge players. That, however, is not the state of the art.

Now the Women's Trials was a very strange beast. Essentially, everyone could play...if she could afford it...and if she didn't live in the host city (Toronto). Since there was no Women's event to parallel the CNTC (that would have been a drain on potential CNTC revenues), the CBF decreed that any team could play in the Final if they paid the \$200 entry fee and announced their intent to appear. Since it was easy to show up in Toronto if one lived there, it was written that the host city could have only as many teams as the next most prolific Zone (i.e. eight if, say, B.C. could send eight teams) but at least four teams no matter what. Notice how difficult it would be to get the best players to attend. There were no preliminary stages to raise money and no announced expense allowances to help the faraway teams.

Let's look at what the conditions of contest produced. The Final attracted eight teams, four of them ostensibly from Toronto. British Columbia had a sixteen team trial to come down to two teams (remember that they could have sent all sixteen). One of the two qualifiers couldn't make it, and the other team was subsidized by a calcutta held in Vancouver. At least there was some enthusiasm, but this wasn't surprising.

To my knowledge Vancouver is the only Canadian bridge centre that runs a women's IMP league, and theirs is a very popular one. That's CBF Zone VI.

Zone IV sent a team (Thunder Bay is within driving distance). There were no preliminary trials, of course.

A Kingston-Ottawa combination (Zone II) appeared. So did one Montreal team (also Zone II), sponsored by the unit. The Montreal Bridge League offered the following incentive: the unit would provide up to \$1000 for as many as two teams who wished to compete in the Women's event and were willing to play intact in the CNTC and who finished in the top 15% of all the teams who competed in the unit. Three all-women teams started in the CNTC in Montreal.

The team that earned the unit's funding did it in great style, finishing third overall in the Unit Final and qualifying handily for the Zone II Final. I think Montreal has the right idea, and I regret not being able to have played in the CNTC with my goup. Perhaps next time the CBF will make this possible. Still, despite the Montreal Bridge League's efforts, the turnout was appalling for a unit with so many female players. Perhaps they didn't realize that there were Red Points available in the CNTC.

The Maritimes (Zone I) and the Prairies (Zone V) were not represented at all. Little wonder. It was a long way to Toronto.

THE TEAMS

ZONE II

Ed Bridson, NPC: Joan Eaton, Joyce Lemoine, Noreen Sugarman, Laurie McIntyre, Mary Edney

Peter Hollander, NPC: Anna McRae, Julie Fajgelzon, Nancy Koffler, Beverly Goldstein

ZONE III

Roisin O'Hara, Captain: Rene Becker, Leah Milgram, Evelyne Parker, Wendy Geyer, Shelagh Paulsson

Peter Nagy, NPC: Karen Allison, Pam Bridson, Francine Cimon, Mary Paul, Dianna Gordon, Sharyn Kokish
Mike Cummings, NPC: Cecile Fisher, Amy Biggar, Ruth Gold, Lynda Wynston, Gilda Kaplan, Mollie Silverstein

Steve Aarons, NPC: Irene Hodgson, Abby Heitner, Syd Isaacs, Katie Thorpe, Sandra Fraser, Renee Mancuso

ZONE IV

Helen Shields, Captain: Marj Hobson, Dr. Marlene Bloom, Siobhan Arnot

ZONE VI

Diane Kinakin, NPC: Sandra Borg, Marcia Kostumyk, Jennifer Paynter, Julene Johnson, Debbie McCully, Lynn Kangro

DAY I (Friday, the 13th)

No wonder the field is small. Who, but the bravest, would show up to play on Friday, the 13th.

Paul Heitner, the Trials organizer, was given \$2000 by the CBF and he's taken in another \$1600 in entries. Not a fortune, but we should be treated decently while we're here, at the Muir Park Hotel. In fact, there's plenty of coffee, lemonade, orange juice and ice water. Very promising. It seems we will get hand records where the Open participants did not. Very classy. But then there's this strange Victory Point scale. The Open was played on an 80 VP scale for 14 boards; we're fighting for 20 over 32 boards. In the upper regions it takes about 10 IMPs to get another VP, yet it takes only 59 IMPs for a blitz. We are informed that there are VP penalties for tardiness and slow play, but that these are assigned to the pair and they occur only after a warning. Each pair gets one warning and then the roof falls in. In the Open there was something to be said for

penalty of one VP on an 80-scale, but here the whole match was only worth 20! Paul assures us that the WBF uses the same rules. That doesn't make them right.

Well, tomorrow is now. Mary Paul is suffering from a cold and Francine Cimon from a heavy case of post-Open depression, but the smell of battle overcomes everything. Karen and Pam are raring to go. Bring on the opposition.

The opposition is, in fact, Shields, the team from Thunder Bay.

Everything goes wrong for Thunder Bay in this first match. We build an 87-13 lead. I am responsible for their 13 IMPs when I commit the cardinal sin-failing to lead a singleton. So what if I hold Ace-fourth of trumps.

The second half is a bit more tame, but our side picks up another 32 IMPs, a comfortable blitz.

Another wild set (or so it seemed) with a million IMPs flying around. We are on the right side of most of the swings and build an 80-20 lead against O'Hara. This board brings in 15 curious IMPs:

BD : 9
DLR: N
VUL: E/W

North
J987432
K7
Q43
7

West
65
A
AK1096
AKJ42

East
AKQ
Q96432
J5
108

South
10
J1085
872
Q9653

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Becker	Kokish	O'Hara	Gordon
	P	1H	P
2D	P	2H	P
3C	P	3NT	P
4C	P	5D(!)	P
6D	P	P	P
Cimon	Milgram	Paul	Parker
	3S	P	P
4NT	P	P(!)	P

Against 6D, I lead the "unbid suit" and my stomach revolts when I see dummy. I fear that our possible heart trick has just gone away. When Dianna follows with the ten of spades, my fears disappear. Playing upside down signals, I know that it is Dianna and not declarer who holds the singleton. The jack of diamonds is run to my queen, and I give Dianna the marked ruff. She exits with a heart to the blank ace and declarer tries to cash the ace and king of clubs, intending to ruff the third round in dummy. I am able to ruff the second club, though, and exit with a trump. Declarer loses three more club tricks, going down five in a freely bid slam which had started out as a very reasonable bet!

At the other table, Mary Paul takes a real shot and passes her partner's minor suit takeout bid. 4NT comes rolling in, \$630 to go with \$500. See, it's not always good bidding that triumphs! Mary doesn't do things like this very often, but when she does, she's invariably "right".

This left Cummings first with 37 VP; we had 35 and Hollander (Montreal) stood third with 25.

To round out an 80-board day, we start the third match against the Kingston-Ottawa connection captained by Pam Bridson's husband, Ed. Talk about conflict of interest. Perhaps, fortunately for Ed, Pam and Karen do nicely and so do Francine and Mary. We retire with a useful 31-IMP lead.

We (Eric stayed over to supply some moral support) are rooming with George and Barbara Hania, wonderful hosts who also happen to be very lucky kibitzers for us. I wince every time one of them leaves for a breather. Our fortune always seems to change for the worse. Fortunately, one Hania or another always seems to be nearby, and our luck stays pretty decent.

DAY 2 (Saturday, the 14th)

Back to war at noon. Another long day ahead. The second half of the Bridson match features a lot of slam zone hands. Nobody gets them right. They are all pushes.

We've moved back into first place with 55 VP.

Our next match was against Hollander, our friends from Montreal who had earned their expenses to this event by doing so well in the CNTC. They kept up their tough play in the first half, taking a 21-IMP lead. It might have been worse but for:

BD: 11
DLR: S
VUL: None

North
65
94
J63
Q109754

West
QJ9743
83
982
J8

East
AK1082
AK107
AK4
3

South
void
QJ652
Q1075
AK62

Both Wests are driven to 6S after they overcall 2S over 1H. This appears to be a no-play slam and so it proves where

Mary and Francine defend. With no help, declarer fails.

Where Karen Allison declares, though, an accident occurs. North leads the nine of hearts. Karen wins in dummy, draws trumps and leads dummy's club. South wins this trick, but apparently misses her partner's card (or something), for she exits with a low diamond, nine, jack, king. This effectively isolates the diamond guard in the South hand, and Karen takes full advantage of the position. She crosses to a trump, ruffs her last club in dummy, cashes the ace of diamonds, and runs the trumps. South cannot hold both the high diamond and her heart combination and that is 980. Karen's strange Vienna Coup is worth 14 IMPs, a winning battle in a lost war.

We have some decent opportunities in the second half, but I misguess a vulnerable game and overbid a two-suiter in a competitive auction, convincing Diana that it is safe to defend 4Sx when it is anything but safe to do so. We regain only three IMPs to lose 7-13. It's time for dinner, but we are less than hungry. Things could be much worse.

DAY 3 (Sunday, the 15th)

A slight reprieve for Father's Day - only 64 boards. Two big matches, Kinakin and Aarons.

We sit out the first set and come back from the park to some good news. Our girls have picked up 20 IMPs.

We go in to play against Sandra Borg and Marcia Kostumyk, who promptly put on a Belladonna-Garozzo display.

We do well on the remaining swings and pick up 10 IMPs on the set to win 15-5.

Standings: Nagy - 96; Hollander - 83; Kinakin - 75.

We are now supposed to start the final match and then break for dinner, but there is a change in plans. It would seem that the only team within striking dis-

tance is Hollander, but Aarons feels that his team still has a mathematical chance at 71 VP since they are playing against us and could blitz us minus five. Unfortunately, his girls can only get to 71 VP if they win a protest, and that protest must be decided immediately to allow Aarons to plan his strategy. We are all told to take a hike while the committee meets to decide on the rather interesting protest. At least we get to eat now.

The committee once again sees the situation differently than I would. Being awarded 670, Aarons has 71 VP. They can tie us by burying us in this match. Of course Aarons also needs Kinakin to score no more than 15 VP and Hollander no more than 7. Then they would have to win a tie-breaker against us. Well, that's better than no shot at all! What could we expect?

Aarons tells his troops to play their best aggressive bridge. Unfortunately, the first 16 deals are not ideal for aggressiveness. A lot of bad breaks and offside finesses (among other things) sends Aarons 20 IMPs in the hole at the half-way mark.

The excitement mounts as Hollander takes a 40 IMP lead against O'Hara. If the Montreal team blitzes, we're OK if we lose no worse than 8-12. This translates into a 37 IMP "magic number" from where we stand after 16 boards.

We start accurately, bidding and making 3S. Perhaps this will set the tone. Then:

VUL: None

DLR: W

	North	
	QJ1065	
	AQ3	
	A762	
	4	East
West		97
843		void
J10764		Q54
983		K10976532
J8	South	
	AK2	
	K9852	
	KJ10	
	AQ	

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Heitner	Gordon	Isaacs	Kokish
P	1S	P(!)	2H
P	3H	P	4NT(1)
P	5S(2)	P	5NT(3)
P	6C	DBL	6D
P	6H	(all PASS)	

- (1) KCB
 (2) 2 KC plus trump Q
 (3) guarantees all KC, looks for extras.

West leads the club jack and when the dummy comes down I regret not being in 7S (where I can ruff out the hearts if they're 4-1). I'm getting set to claim when East shows out on the first trump. The bidding has already taken about ten minutes, and I know the play is going to take me awhile. Syd is getting itchy and finally complains to the director. I can't blame her, but I refuse to be bullied into going down. There must be some way to make this thing and make up in part for my terrible bidding.

Finally I work out that Abby (West) will have to follow to three spades and three diamonds (unless I play Syd for precisely 9-8 doubleton in diamonds), and exactly two clubs...meaning that Syd had failed to act over 1S with 2-0-3-8 pattern, not vul! Maybe that obscure position is more likely after all. Nah! I cash the second club and three rounds of spades. So far so good. Perhaps Syd did not bid because she held something defensive...the queen of diamonds. I play her for it and she has it. The suit is 3-3. It's easy now. Abby and I are down to trumps. I lead to dummy's ace and with K98 remaining to Abby's J107, I duck on the way back and take the last two tricks. A very unlikely combination. Still, 6H making is better than 6H down one. Much better, I was to learn later. Sandra Fraser and Renee Mancuso were in 7S and someone mis-guessed the diamonds for one down. Very lucky for us. A mere 25-IMP swing. There isn't too much more in the cards, but I enjoy this little partscore near the end:

VUL: None
 DLR: E

North
 Q10
 KJ874
 A5

West
 J8
 Q953
 J109842
 3

East
 A6532
 A102
 K
 Q852

South
 K974
 6
 Q763
 AKJ9

Syd, East, opens 1S and everyone passes. Dianna, like me, would rather defend than offend! I lead a trump, eight, ten, deuce. Dianna continues with the spade queen and Syd wins the ace. She tries the king of diamonds, but Dianna wins and returns the 7 of clubs (second highest from bad suits). I win the 9, draw two more trumps and exit with the queen of diamonds (since Dianna had shown something good in hearts).

Syd ruffs with her last trump and cashes the ace of hearts. She would do one trick better to exit with a low heart before cashing the ace, but she doesn't. When she leads a second heart now, we take the balance, down four. I know we can make a lot of notrump, but you don't get to set someone four tricks at the one level every day. Somehow we win 6 IMPs on the board.

We gain 21 more on the set, a 15-5 win. Very satisfying.

The final standings:

1. Nagy	111 VP
2. Hollander	97
3. Kinakin	79
4. Cummings	77
5. Aarons	76
6. O'Hara	54
7. Bridson	40
8. Shields	-6

Needless to say, we are all elated.

Some of us still have not come down to earth, but we will do so in time to catch the bus for Valkenburg. We fully intend to do our best for Canada, and I think that we have a team that can realistically hope to win. Hope is a wonderful word.

A special vote of thanks to our ex-captain, Peter Nagy, without whom we might never have survived one another.

Thanks also to Paul Heitner, who did his best to make an unclassy event classy. There's a lot of potential for this event, and we have not given up hope. The CBF is a young organization and will surely learn from experience. Hope is indeed a wonderful word.

Thanks also to Canadian bridge

players all across the country. You are the ones who make it possible for us to attend the Olympiad. We promise not to disappoint you.

EPILOGUE

A week after the Ladies' Trials, we selected a captain. George Hania of Toronto has already taken a number of steps to ensure that we will be prepared when we arrive in Europe. We are going to have copies of all opponents' systems a month before we leave. We will be practicing in Toronto and Montreal with great diligence. We will be bidding hands produced graciously to our specifications by Paul Heitner. We will be ready. That, my fellow women, is a promise.

The Bid's The Thing

by **Ady Koffler,**
Montreal

In pairs events, most matchpoints are won (or lost) in the bidding. Opportunities for pick-ups appear in the most unlikely places. The following hand came up in the ladies' and men's pairs at the Can-At in Fredericton. Looking at the North-South cards, there seems to be little scope for heroics, but watch:

NORTH

S A Q J 9 2
H J 8 6 4
D K 8
C A 5

WEST

S 10 6 3
H A 7 2
D Q
C Q 10 7 6 3 2

SOUTH

S K 7 4
H Q 9
D A J 10 7 2
C K J 8

In the ladies' pairs, where my wife

Nancy (North) was playing with Anna McRae, the auction unfolded as follows:

South	West	North	East
1D		1S	
2S (1)		3H	
3NT		4C	
4D		4S (2)	
5C (3)	Dbl	6S (4)	All Pass

(1) Always raise with three good trumps and a ruffing value.

(2) Having made two slam tries and lacking a heart control, it's time to sign off.

(3) One more try!

(4) Suddenly, after the double, a heart control is immaterial. Unless East has both the Ace and King of hearts, the opening lead will be a club.

Dutifully, East led a club, and after some prayers for the diamond suit, declarer took the first twelve tricks ... and all the matchpoints.

In the men's pairs, where I (South) was playing with Gilles Boivin, the auc-

tion took a slightly more pedestrian route.

South
1D
1NT(1)
3S
P(3)

North
1S
3H
3NT(2)

(1) Protecting the tenaces

(2) Good spades, indifferent hearts, and the minor suit honors make no-trump an attractive choice.

(3) Expecting minor suit fillers, no trump should play well.

West led his fourth best club ... received no tricks and half a matchpoint.

Editor's Note: The moral of the story is no accolades for the bidding, but hot coals for the defenders. When you double an artificial bid for a lead director with such an anemic holding, you had better be prepared to double the final contract, to tell partner to find a more profitable opening lead, such as in this case, a heart...



Maurice Gauthier (CBF Charitable Fund) presents a cheque for \$21,000 to Richard Stephenson, National V/President of the Canadian Mental Health Association. This cheque brings the total donation to CMHA 1979 charity of the year) to \$36,000.

Canada's First Mail Order Bridge Supply House

- Playing cards & Duplicate boards
- Scoring supplies & Teaching aids
- Hardcover bridge books & paperbacks
- Home duplicate sets & Pencils
- Autobridge sets & Bridgette

In fact almost everything for the bridge player whether for home games or large tournaments. Please write for free catalogue.

CANADIAN BRIDGE SUPPLIES

Box 2467 Station "R" Kelowna, B.C. V1X 6A5

(604) 765-1812

Excerpts from the minutes of the meeting of the Trustees of the Canadian Bridge Federation Charitable Fund held in Fredericton, June 26, 1980.

1) Maurice Gauthier (Chairman) reported on the status of the Fund as of December 31, 1979.

For 1979:

Total receipts	\$42,995.02
Total expenditures	\$38,528.00

The net grant to the Canadian Mental Health Association for 1979 was \$36,000. There was a grant of \$200 to the Centre for Creative Living, and a grant of \$500 to Doris McLure for a prison bridge program. The net worth of the Fund was \$49,097.40. (This includes \$5,000 that was committed to a Vietnam refugee family that was not issued.)

Moved by Harper (Murphy) that the gift of \$5,000 to sponsor a Vietnamese family be rescinded, as there is no manner in which the original intention can be implemented at this date.

Carried without dissent.

The two Canada-wide games had about 4100 and 4200 participants respectively and raised \$7,300 and \$7,200.

Harper recommends that major grants should not have only local consequences but should have a national impact, with its concomitant publicity for bridge.

2. Registration

The fund is now registered with the number 0135939-05-13.

Moved by McRae (Murphy) that clarification of the requirement that 90% of profits be given to charity in any one year be obtained from the government (the civil servant who registered the Fund).

Carried without dissent.
Gauthier is to write.

Moved by Altay (Borg) that receipts for income tax purposes for donations greater than or equal to \$10 be routinely issued, and for lesser amounts on request.

Carried unanimously.

3. Sponsorship

The three sponsors and their form of sponsorship are:

- Carling-O'Keefe - Four trophies for each Zone for open games
- Bols Liqueur - Eight trophies for the inter-city match
- The Royal Bank - Four trophies for the novice games.

A District 1 game was organized by Anna Kinsella, and a District 2 game by Norm Hall. Ted Horning promoted the charity game for four consecutive columns before the game.

Moved by Altay (Borg) that all requests for financial assistance from the Charitable Fund be directed to the secretary of the Fund (Baragar) for decision (in consultation with the president of the CBF) for amounts not exceeding \$200. The Trustees will be informed of such contributions.

Carried unanimously.

The Lung Association has been advised that the next year for which a major charity is to be chosen is 1982.

7. Gauthier indicated that he would like to consider retirement from the chairmanship.

Moved by Harper that the Chairman of the Fund, Maurice Gauthier, be thanked for his many years of meritorious service.

Winkle, Winkle Little Star

★ Reprinted from *The Dorbitzer/The Kibitzer* (Ontario Unit 166 bulletin, edited by John Carruthers and Robin Wigdor)

by Steve Aarons

While playing in the Open Pairs in Brantford with Paul Heitner, I came across a hand which produced a very cute ending. I held the following assortment of goodies: Qx 108x KQJx AKJx.

The bidding went pass, pass to me and so naturally (adhering totally to the Moo-Cow★ philosophy) I opened one no-trump, and the auction proceeded rapidly to three no-trump with Paul bidding forcing Stayman along the way.

The opening lead was the SJ and the dummy greeted me with: A9xx Jxx Ax Qxxx. Now, as all can plainly see, there were nine top tricks for the taking (and certainly no more than nine if the opponents saw fit to lead hearts - Irene Hodgson's rule★★ proves right again). At IMPs you simply assure your contract, take your nine tricks and go on to the next hand, but as Paul so aptly put it "at matchpoints you have to go for everything that's not nailed down". If LHO were leading from the SK I had ten tricks, so I ducked the J in dummy and RHO won the SK. Now I was on my way to at least one in the glue! Out of nine top winners, I had managed to create at least five top losers. (Matchpoints is such a silly game; we should have stuck to IMPs).

However, RHO failed to find the heart shift, returning a spade. (Matchpoints is not such a bad game after all.) I proceeded to take my winners, cashing four rounds of diamonds, pitching two small hearts from dummy, RHO following to all four diamonds. LHO pitching a small heart on the fourth diamond. Next came four rounds of clubs ending in dummy, RHO following to three, and pitching a small spade, while LHO pitched a small heart and the heart Q on the

third and fourth clubs.

This was the three card ending:

	S A9	
	H J	
	D -	
	C -	
S 10x		S -
H K		H A9x
D -		D -
C -	S -	C -
	H 108x	
	D -	
	C -	

I played the heart J from dummy, producing a double winkle: If RHO won the heart Ace, he was endplayed in hearts to my hand, and if he let LHO win the heart K, LHO would be endplayed in spades to the dummy. With all the chivalry of a Knight of Round Table, RHO ducked the heart Ace and allowed partner to surrender to dummy. Making 5NT for a clear top. (Did I mention that matchpoints is a great game?)

This was the entire hand:

	S A9xx	
	H Jxx	
	D Ax	
	C Qxxx	S Kxx
S J10xx		H A9x
H KQxx		D xxxx
D xxx		C xxx
C xx	S Qx	
	H 108x	
	D KQJx	
	C AKJx	

- ★ Who cares if 2 suits aren't stopped?
- ★★ When in doubt, lead hearts against NT.



Canadian Bidding Contest



by Allan Simon

August Honor Roll

Only seven readers, out of 133 entries, managed to top the 500 mark in August. They were:

1. Mark O'Hara, Toronto, Ont. 570
2. Evelyn Richards, Fredericton, N.B. 560
3. Dodi Henderson, Agincourt, Ont. 550
4. Ivan Verba, Prince George, B.C. 510
5. Roslyn Ritz, Hampstead, Que. 510
6. Prent Glazier, Toronto, Ont. 500
7. Mrs. J.G. Wren, Toronto, Ont. 500

Mr. O'Hara received a copy of "The Tough Game", by Hugh Kelsey, courtesy of Camel Bridge Supplies of Vancouver, and he joins the expert panel this month.

November Panel

In the customary alphabetic order, here is our fearless dozen:

MICHAEL BETTS (Fredericton, N.B.) is not yet well known in central Canada. But he is a regular winner in New Brunswick tournaments.

ED BRIDSON (Toronto) has emerged as one of Toronto's strongest players; he

performed with distinction at the New Orleans Olympiad and in the Spingold.

NEIL CHAMBERS (Vancouver) was the coach of the Canadian team at the Olympiad held recently in the Netherlands. He has won countless Regionals throughout North America.

JIM DONALDSON (Squamish, B.C.) is another internationalist. He is a veteran of two Pairs Olympiads, 1970 and 1978, with different partners.

SANDRA FRASER (Montreal) is a welcome presence on the panel, since her credits include, besides the usual list of Regional triumphs, a superb record in the annual International Bidding Contest. One year, Sandra and her husband Doug placed second in the world!

AARON GOODMAN (Montreal) is ACBL Life Master No. 213 (and No. 5 in Canada). He won the National Men's Pairs in 1942 (half our panel wasn't born then) and after four decades at the top, he is still going as strong as ever.

MAUREEN KAUFMAN (Winnipeg) is one of Winnipeg's top woman players. Leave out the word woman, and the sentence remains true.

MAURICE LAROCHELLE (Quebec, Que.) is well known as the author of daily bridge columns in "Le Soleil" and "Le Quotidien".

MARK O'HARA (Toronto) the winner of the August contest, writes "I am not surprised at my victory since I always knew I was a great bidder. Now my partners will have to believe me."

JOHN ROSS (Flin Flon, Man.) is perhaps typical of the many fine players who have not yet built a national reputation because they live in smaller towns. Yet in his infrequent sorties to Prairie Regionals, Ross has a phenomenal winning percentage.

S. "Vish" VISWANATHAN (Edmonton) is a charter member of the superb Edmonton team that has been making a farce of Western Canadian

team competition for seven years.

BERT WINGES: (Ottawa) has won no less than 14 Regionals and consistently places high on the McKenney list. In 1973, his team won its zone in the Grand National Teams.

NOVEMBER SOLUTIONS

(A)IMPs, neither vul., South holds:
S:Q42 H:AKQ862 D:6 C:986

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
-	-	1D	1H
Pass	4NT	Pass	5D
Pass	6D	Pass	?

Scoring:

Action	Panel Votes	Points
Pass	8	100
7H	3	50
6H	0	30
Abstain	1	-

VISWANATHAN made a grumpy comment and abstained. That's his privilege, I guess, but I reserve my admiration for the panelists who knew exactly what partner's bid meant.

KAUFMAN: Seven hearts. Six diamonds is a grand slam try in hearts.

WINGES: Pass. He who Blackwoods places contract.

The latter interpretation is, in fact, the one preferred by most experts, although few sounded as cocky as Winges.

BETTS: Pass. He has many ways to show a heart fit. I am sure he has diamonds. I hope.

GOODMAN: Pass. Very confusing, but if my partner can't spread for six diamonds, I shall be shocked, and even prepared to shoot.

BRIDSON: Pass. Sounds like partridge wants to play there. He could have bid a direct five hearts over one heart if he was interested in the heart small or grand slam.

For the uninitiated, partridge is

Toronto-newspeak for what we Westerners call pard. Bridson's second sentence is, if anything, even more instructive.

Readers who voted for seven hearts (i.e. 80% of you) can claim a prominent supporter:

CHAMBERS: Seven hearts. Solid trumps hopefully will be enough. If partner has diamonds, we'll clarify the sequence spectacularly.

(B) Matchpoints, N-S vul., South holds:

S:Q10643 H:95 D:K6 C:10652

West	North	East	South
Pass	2C	3D★	?

★ weak jump overcall

Scoring:

Action	Panel Votes	Points
Pass	9	100
3S	3	60
3NT	0	40
Double	0	20

The South hand has two mildly interesting features: the five-card spade suit and the king of diamonds. I have no idea which feature partner needs. So I'm going to pass for now and let North describe his hand. One panelist with a knack for making a point with remarkable economy of words puts it this way:

CHAMBERS: opponents may preempt partner but I won't.

Other spokespersons for the pass included:

VISWANATHAN: Pass. It is not my turn yet. Besides, I have spades, heart tolerance, diamond control and excellent club support and as is often the case, the most eloquent bid available is the pass.

LAROCHELLE: Pass. If East had passed I would have bid a wait-and-see two diamonds, so I will do the same now by passing.

FRASER: Pass. Not quite strong enough to bid three spades directly.

If you voted for three spades, your allies are:

O'HARA: Three spades. My five card suit and well-situated King of diamonds warrant this bid. If I don't bid now and West bids five diamonds, partner will have a lot of trouble bidding a potential slam.

ROSS: Three spades. (1)You're too strong to pass. (2)For three notrump, partner needs a doubleton spade and Ax(x) in diamonds and should then bid it anyway. (3)For four spades, you need an extra spade and switch your red suits.

(C)IMPs, E-W vul., South holds:
S:J8 H:865 D:AKQJ C:Q763

West	North	East	South
-	-	Pass	1D
Pass	1H	Pass	?

Scoring:

Action	Panel Votes	Points
1 NT	7	100
2H	4	80
2C	1	50
2D	0	40

This problem is unlikely to stir up much excitement in postgame discussions in bridge clubs across the nation. Nobody will come to blows arguing the relative merits of one notrump or two hearts. In fact, this was a downright dull, jejune problem with no right or wrong answers. Let's check with the panel to see if anybody was inspired:

GOODMAN: One notrump. In preference to two clubs or two hearts.

BETTS: One notrump. Probably will not score high, but I believe all balanced hands should be limited as soon as possible.

VISWANATHAN: One notrump. Spades can wait.

Come again, Vish?

BRIDSON: Two hearts. Easy.

KAUFMAN: Two clubs, although I would like to bid two diamonds and say sorry, partner, I had a small club mixed in with my diamonds.

Listen, Maureen. The instructions said very plainly that you're supposed to leave the funny stuff up to me.

(D) Rubber bridge, E-W vul., N-S have 90 partial, South holds:

S:AJ875 H:43 D:AK7 C:AQ6

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1S
Pass	2S	Pass	?

Scoring:

Action	Panel Votes	Points
3C	5	100
3D	2	90
2NT	1	80
3H	1	80
3S	0	80
Pass	3	70

The pass has been downgraded in the scoring, since all other bids are in effect slam tries and the panel, while divided on the question of how to probe for slam, is telling us that the hand is worth a try.

Let's start with the minority this time:

VISWANATHAN: Pass, quickly. I am aware that partner may have a little in reserve, but even with a limit raise, slam will be touch and go. In fact, our best chance for a slam score is for the opponents to bid it for us at the three level.

O'HARA: Pass. I have partners that bid two spades with sub-minimums in these situations.

And here's the majority (or, if you're pedantic, the plurality):

DONALDSON: Three clubs. Part should have seven to twelve points.

Part, of course, is British Columbian for partridge.

FRASER: Three clubs. If partner responds three hearts, I'm in slam; if he rebids three spades, I'll give it one more

shot, with four diamonds. If partner now bids four hearts, I will bid four spades and let partner move if he can.

This approach is marginally more optimistic than:

BETTS: Three clubs. Partner could hold a good hand. Will pass a three spade rebid. Commit the hand to slam over any other call.

WINGES: Three hearts. My controls force me to make one try for slam. I play help-suit game and slam tries.

(E) Matchpoints, both vul., South holds:

S:63 H:Q943 D:AQ108 C:KQ5

West	North	East	South
1S	Pass	Pass	Dbl.
Redbl	Pass	Pass	?

Scoring:

Action	Panel Votes	Points
1NT	7	100
2D	3	90
Pass	2	70
2H	0	30

By the time you read these lines, our neighbors to the South will have elected Ronald Reagan President. More Montrealers visit Ruby Foo's than Chez Bardet. The Blue Lagoon outdraws The Tin Drum. The Dukes of Hazzard flourish while Dick Cavett fizzles. And only two panelists chose to pass. The German poet Schiller once wrote, "What is majority? Majority is nonsense. Intelligence has always been possessed by few." Schiller probably had problem E in mind.

What do the ten bidding panelists think our supposedly expert partner is doing to us? With a nondescript hand like Kxxx Kxx Jxx Jxx he has a clear-cut one notrump bid. With xxx Jxx Kxxx Jxx he should bid two diamonds rather than give us an excruciating problem. No, whether

we have discussed this sequence or not, it is crystal clear that West psyched his redouble and partner made a penalty pass.

Oh, I suppose if I was playing in our Saturday afternoon two-penny game and across the table sat Bruno ("Why you bid so much, partner?") Veeblefetzter, I would grit my teeth and bid two diamonds. But with a good partner, and at matchpoints (and imaginary matchpoints, at that!), never!

ROSS: One notrump. If I could stutter a re-redouble that would be my choice. This legal second choice should describe my hand and keep all doors open for a broke partner.

O'HARA: Two diamonds. Partner has a chance to bid and has refused. He obviously wants me to place a contract.

LAROCHELLE: One notrump. Partner's second pass should be no more for penalties than, say, 1S-Dbl-Redbl-Pass.

But consider the positional factor, Maurice. Partner is sitting over declarer's spades!

BRIDSON: One notrump. Running for my life.

FRASER: One notrump. Since partner did not take an immediate preference, there is a good chance he has spades.

CHAMBERS: One notrump. Or pass, but only if I've discussed it with partner and we play the pass for penalties.

And here are my heroes:

GOODMAN: Pass. I feel that I have good re-opening values, and partner must have fair values to leave the redouble in.

DONALDSON: Pass. The last time I did this, we went minus 1510.

Relax, Jim. That must have been 1NT. One spade is different. Only -1470.

(F) Matchpoints, both vul., South holds:

S:KQ10 H:Q6 D:7 C:AJ98752

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1C
1S	Pass	2D	Pass
2S	Pass	2NT	Pass
Pass	Dbl.	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Which card do you lead?

Scoring:

Action	Panel Votes	Points
Club 8	8	100
Club J	2	90
Heart Q	1	40
Spade K	1	40
Anything else 0		30

This one really happened to me. I led the eight of clubs, a disastrous decision since pard held six hearts to the KJ10 and the singleton king of clubs as side entry. Partridge later claimed the heart lead was obvious (a negative double would show four or five hearts, not six, he said) and he made some silly jokes about my arrogance in writing a bridge column when I couldn't figure out this simple lead problem; he also challenged me to sneak the hand into this contest, assuring me that all twelve panelists would lead the heart queen.

LAROCHELLE: Eight of clubs. If partner has hearts, why didn't he make a negative double?

FRASER: Eight of clubs. Who ate the heart suit? Since partner did not make a negative double, I feel his penalty double is based on strength, with definite diamond values.

WINGES: Eight of clubs. Partner has a balanced eight-count, no heart suit (no negative double) and diamonds stopped. This could be the big one!

DONALDSON: Eight of clubs. Part should have diamonds.

KAUFMAN: Small club. This auction is impossible. North says we can beat this contract so I make my natural lead. Second choice is club jack, catering to a stiff ten in dummy.

ROSS: Heart queen. With two stoppers in spades, there is no rush on the hand. A club lead is almost certain to give away a trick.

Mailbox

The November answers have begun pouring in. The early leader, in an odds-defying repeat performance, is Bobbe McDonald of Prince Albert, Sask., with 560 points. In her only previous attempt, Mrs. McDonald won the February contest.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all readers who take the trouble to write encouraging comments on their answer sheets. I wish I had the time to thank you individually.

One reader queried the method of awarding points for the various problems. Although it may occasionally pain me, points are awarded strictly by the panel's preference. This writer sometimes breaks ties and promotes nearly-equivalent bids.

Several readers wanted to know which bidding system to use. We play five-card majors, 15-17 no-trumps with two-way Stayman, limit raises, Jacoby 2NT, weak two's, and negative doubles through two spades. Michaels and Dormer as well, but they'll never come up. Everything else is natural.

And by a 5 to 1 ratio, solvers told me that the problems were not too hard. One reader who consistently scores in the 100's wrote that the problems were too easy.

Well, everybody, try your luck on the February problems. (A) and (D) are extra tough. Send your answers (no comments required) on a plain piece of paper to:

Canadian Bidding Contest
c/o Allan Simon
1339 Hamilton St. N.W.
Calgary, Alta.
T2N 3W8

The winner will receive: fame and a bridge book and will join the panel the next time around.

FEBRUARY PROBLEMS

(A) Matchpoints, neither vul., South holds:

S:K4 H:QJ65 D:10763 C:Q52

West	North	East	South
-	1NT	Pass	2C
Pass	2S	Pass	2NT
Pass	3C	Pass	?

(B) IMPs, both vul., South holds:

S:K5 H:8 D:K10873 C:J10976

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	Pass
1S	2H	Dbl★	?

★penalty double

(C) Board-a-match, E-W vul., South holds:

S:Q H:KJ8654 D:AJ863 C:7

West	North	East	South
Pass	1S	Pass	2H
Pass	2S	Pass	3D
Pass	3NT	Pass	?

(D) IMPs, both vul., South holds:
S:1074 H:1073 D:K C:AKJ986

West	North	East	South
-	-	Pass	Pass
Pass	1D	Pass	2C
Pass	2H	Pass	3C
Pass	3S	Pass	?

(E) Matchpoints, N-S vul., South holds:

S:J10 H:QJ543 D:106432 C:Q

West	North	East	South
2S★	Dbl★★	4S	?

★weak two-bid
★★optional double

(F) IMPs, neither vul., South holds:
S:A103 H:93 D:75 C:987643

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	Pass
1D	1S	3NT	Pass
Pass	Dbl	Redbl	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Which card do you lead?

The CNTC National Finals

(a kibitzer's perspective)

by Neil Chambers

The Trials were set up as a 13-team round-robin (scored on a Victory Point scale) with the top four teams advancing to a (single) knockout format to decide the Canadian representative to the 1980 Team Olympiad in Valkenburg. Our B.C. squad got off to a rough start in the round-robin and never fully recovered; so, it was on to the semi-finals as a kibitzer.

Graves (Mittleman, Kokish, Nagy, Murray, Kehela) played Johnson (Johnson, Baldwin, Christopherson, Borg, Connop) and was ahead by 15 at the quarter; 69 at the half; 110 at three quarters; and won by 154. I watched Alberta (Crosby, Viswanathan, Gupta, Chomyn, Pritchard, Brend) versus Ontario (Markotich, Timms, Guoba, Zeller, Balcombe, Taylor). The action started quickly.

Crosby	Guoba	Vish	Zeller
North	East	South	West
--	--	1NT	Pass
2H(trans)	Pass	2S	Pass
3H	Pass	3S	Pass
4S	All Pass		

Zeller led a small heart from Ax xxxx xx-xx xxx, found his partner with a singleton and both minor suit Aces! Down one.

Crosby-Vish made an overtrick in 1NT doubled for 380.

Crosby-Vish collected 800 on a favorable lie of the cards against 1NT.

Crosby-Vish bid to a close game, get soft defense and make it.

Crosby-Vish defend a vulnerable 3NT, beat it four, no, Wait! They didn't cash their spades, down only one.

The first quarter ends with Ontario up by 11 IMPs.

The second quarter starts with this hand:

	North		
	S AKQxx		
	H 108		
	D Q8xx		
	C 9x	East	
West		S J9xx	
S 10xx		H Jx	
H xxxx		D AKx	
D xx		C KJxx	
C Qxxx	South		
	S x		
	H AKQxx		
	D J109x		
	C A10x		

After a one club opener by East, Zeller-Guoba reach 4 hearts. A club is led to the Ace, three rounds of spades (both losing clubs disappear), and a diamond from dummy. RHO wins, returns the fourth spade (declarer ruffs low, holding) and returns a diamond - the defense can't beat him. Dummy will take the long-range tap and the hand with four small hearts began with a doubleton diamond. Plus 620 and 14 IMPs when Gupta-Chomyn bid to a

hopeless 6 hearts.

In the second quarter, the same four players continue in this room.

Zeller-Guoba pick up 14 IMPs in 4 H when Gupta-Chomyn bid to a hopeless 6 hearts.

Vish plays 5 clubs and makes it on a Backwash Squeeze, however 3 NT was cold.

Vish bids 2 clubs over Crosby's opening 1NT with xxxx x xxxxx Qxx; sees a 2 spade response (bidding boxes were in use throughout) and gratefully passes. Crosby goes down one on a 4-1 trump split, but 4 hearts is cold for the opponents.

The second quarter has been even...and I miss the third, but find an excellent cheap french restaurant: Le Select Bistro (under the awning of Jimmy's Barber Shop) on West Queen. The lamb chops were excellent, and over a few cafes of the house wine, Smith, McAvoy and Chambers try to be positive about our non-qualifying experience. A taste of chocolate mousse, capucino, and a cab to the fourth quarter.

Ontario leads Alberta by 14. I'm late. I've missed seeing Balcomb-Taylor bid a good Grand Slam that makes, but I'm just in time to see them make 5 clubs doubled against Viswanathan-Crosby. Ontario wins by 39.

In the finals (Graves vs. Markotich), I arrived at the start of the second quarter with Graves leading 27-12. I watch Nagy (west), Markotich (north), Kokish (east), Timms (south).

The first hand sets the tone for the match:

	North		
	S x		
	H x		
	D AKJ10x		
	C KQ10xxx	East	
West		S Axxx	
S xxx		H AQJ9xxx	
H xxx		D x	
D xxx		C x	
C AJxx			

South
S KQJ10
H xx
D Qxxxx
C xx

West	North	East	South
Pass	2C★	2H	Dbl. ★★
3H	4D	4H	Dbl.
All Pass			

★ Precision
★★ Negative

Markotich was right! 5 diamonds goes for 500, but 4 hearts is cold for 590.

Two hands later, Nagy plays 4 hearts with four losers, but slips a singleton by left hand opponent to the king in dummy. Making four!

Markotich-Timms fail to get to slam with A AKJxxxx Q AQ10x opposite xxx Qx AJ10xx Jxx; but the Kokish-Nagy play 3 diamonds with Axx Void AKJxx KQ10xx opposite KJ xxx Q10xx xxxx. (Clubs were 2-2 with the Ace onside.)

North
S 9xx
H x
D A109xx
C98xx

West
S KQ1065
H KQxx
D J
C KJx

East
S Void
H AJ109x
D Qxxx
C Axxx

South
S AJ87x
H xxx
D Kxx
C Q10

West	North	East	South
Pass	Pass	1H	1S
Pass	2S	Dbl	All pass

Timms made a good pass and a good lead of the King of spades. But after Ace of spades by declarer, followed by a low heart (Timms popped the Queen), he

followed it by returning the ten of spades (misrepresenting his 5 and 6) and later the defense dropped another trick. 200 (minus 10 IMPs) instead of 800 (plus 5 IMPs).

Nagy plays 4 hearts, which could have been defeated. He makes it!

Kokish doubles a cold 4 hearts, but beats it 300 anyway.

Kokish-Nagy miss a good sacrifice (this is not the time!)

Nagy misgusses a part-score; but he and Kokish quickly redeem by bidding to 4 spades needing a doubleton Queen of clubs (missing six). It's there.

Finally, Timms-Markotich bid to 6NT.

North
S AK10x
H xx
D AK9xx
Cxx

West
S Qxx
H QJ10xx
D 10xx
C Jx

East
S Jxx
H xx
D QJxx
C xxxx

South
S 9xx
H AKxx
D x
C AKQ109

Nagy had preempted to 2 hearts over Timms' forcing 1 club. He led the Queen of hearts. Timms won and ducked a spade; won the heart continuation (yes, RHO had two). What now? One high club (all follow), two high spades (all follow, establishing dummy's fourth), the Ace and King of diamonds, the 13th spade, and a club from dummy. Nagy calmly waited until declarer faced the ten, then claimed the balance. Down four, and a 110 IMP lead for Quebec after three quarters.

After dinner, I return to find Quebec has become Team Canada...and this player-turned-kibitzer has enjoyed watching it happen.

Excerpts from the minutes of the meeting of the directors of the CBF held in Fredericton, June 24 to 28, 1980

We would like to draw your attention to several items of considerable interest in the minutes of the meetings of the Directors of the CBF, of the Trustees of the CBF Charitable Fund, and the Delegates of the Units to the CBF.

1) Meeting of the Directors

a) Section 2-h refers to the availability of the bidding boxes.

b) Section 3-a requests bids from Units interested in holding the final of the CNTC.

c) Section 3-c lists the changes in the conditions of contest from those of last year. In the event the new conditions are delayed, the information is here.

d) Section II outlines the trials procedure for the 1982 Pairs Olympiad.

2) Meeting of the Trustees of the Charitable Fund

a) Section 2 gives the registration number (for income tax purposes)

b) In Section 4, a procedure for requesting small grants from the Fund, such as support for bridge games in institutions, is specified.

(A) Meeting of the Directors 2

d) The Canadian co-chairmen of the National Goodwill Committee of the ACBL are Sandra Fraser from Montreal and Virginia McGonigal from Vancouver (from January, 1979 and January, 1980 respectively). They have been appointed for terms of three years.

f) New Horizons Program. These programs must be instituted by local groups of senior citizens for specific programs. CBF Directors might suggest to qualified groups that bridge is an acceptable activity.

h) Bidding Boxes. 16 sets of second-hand bidding boxes (used in New Orleans) were purchased at a cost of

\$430. A new set of refills was purchased from a supplier in Holland at a cost of \$170. The boxes have been appreciated by the players, not only because of the improved image of the CNTC and LTC but as practice for Valkenburg. Goodman has indicated that, in his estimation, the cost was high.

Moved by Altay (Murphy) that the bidding boxes be made available to any responsible bridge organization at a rental of \$1.00 per table per session, plus expenses of transportation to and from the playing site, plus the cost of replacements in the event of loss or destruction. Application is to be made to the Zone Director.

Carried unanimously.

3) The Canadian National Team Championship

a) ACBL management was pleased with the way the event was run. The National Final was run at a net loss of \$8,321.33 this year. Zone I exceeded its assessment by \$436.74, while every other zone met its assessment.

Baragar suggested going to "out of season" resort areas, such as Ste. Agathe, since living expenses now exceed travel expenses. McRae suggest Ste. Marguerite as another possibility. She also suggested that the host Unit (perhaps with the assistance of the host city) should be responsible for hospitality, and in particular, for a welcoming reception.

It was suggested that Units bid for the CNTC final, including hotel and playing space costs, and a statement of what contribution the Unit would be willing to make toward hospitality. Even if this did not yield financial savings, it would add to the pleasure of the participants.

Player's expenses to the CNTC final in 1981 will be covered according to the following schedule:

- a) Travel in excess of 300 miles:
 - i) 75% of Y class (economy) air fare
 - ii) Per diem of the hotel rate (double occupancy) plus \$10 for the number of days plus one
- b) Travel of 30 to 300 miles:
 - i) Travel allowance of 25¢ per mile instead of the above air fare
 - ii) Per diem as above for the number of playing days
- c) Travel of less than 30 miles: the player will not be entitled to any expenses.

Augmented players will be entitled to travel expenses as above but will not be entitled to any per diem.

Cheques will be issued on arrival at the playing site.

Conditions of undue duress will be treated on an individual basis.

There will be a reception for the players on the evening preceding the first playing date.

Stan Tench will be the National Coordinator for the 1980 CNTC.

The final will be held May 21 - 26, 1981.

Altay observed that round-robins followed by KO's have proved to be effective in the past, and so are recommended for the Zone final.

Moved by Altay (Shields) that the previous winner of the CNTC be offered a bye to the national final, but the team must pay all its own expenses. The team is to be intact, and the decision to enter is to be made prior to September 1 of the year in which the event starts.

Carried unanimously.

- c) Changes in conditions of contest
 - i) I-C 1981 replaces 1980 and ends with "...Appendix A."
 - ii) I-D The last sentence is deleted.
 - iii) II-B-3 is to be replaced in its entirety by "50% of the teams entered, plus ties, qualify to continue from each qualifying round site. Teams which withdraw at this stage from further competition will not be replaced.

iv) II-B-4 is to be replaced in its entirety by:

"1) All qualifying rounds in the 1981 CNTC must take place between September 15, 1980 and January 15, 1981, subject to extension by the Zone coordinator.

2) Conditions of contest for intermediate rounds must be approved by the Zone coordinator. It is suggested that intermediate rounds be on a round-robin format."

v) II-C is to be replaced in its entirety by "The dates and sites of intermediate rounds within a Zone will be announced by the Zone coordinator before the start of competition in the Qualifying rounds."

vi) II-D-1 "nature" is to be replaced by "conditions of contest".

vii) II-D-2 is to be replaced by "The conditions of contest for the Zone final must be approved by the national coordinator."

viii) II-D-4 is to read "All Zone finals must be completed by April 15, 1981."

ix) II-E is to read:

"The national final, with 13 or 14 teams participating (the 14th team will be preceding year's CNT champion, if it so elects) will be held in or near Ottawa from May 24 to May 28, 1981, and will consist of a complete round-robin, each team playing a 14-board match against every other team. The round-robin will be scored at IMPs converted to Victory points. The top four teams will play single knock-out with 64-board matches to determine the finalists, who will play a 72-board match for the championship."

x) III-C-2 The last sentence is to read "In qualifying rounds, substitutes may not play the first board and may not normally play more than 50% of the boards played by the team. However, in the case of a serious illness of a member of a four-man team, a substitute may be allowed for one full stage. Such substitute should not noticeably weaken or strengthen the team, in the opinion of the coordinator."

x) IV-C-2 is deleted and replaced by "It is recommended that the Unit final and Zone final be seeded by the participating captains. Any other intermediate round may be seeded by the method selected by the coordinator."

Moved by Altay (McRae) that the above-mentioned amendments to the general conditions of contest be approved.

Carried unanimously.

d) The P. E. Sheardown Trophy

Moved by Altay (Murphy) that the P. E. Sheardown trophy be awarded annually to the winners of the CNTC, and that Mr. Lebovic and other friends of Mr. Sheardown be thanked for their generous contribution. The CBF is proud to have Mr. Sheardown's name on the trophy. The trophy is to rest in a location designated by the winning team. It is to be presented at the completion of play of the CNTC.

Carried unanimously.

5) Questionnaire

Moved by Altay (Shields) that a questionnaire be prepared to be mailed to every Unit in Canada. Our objectives should be outlined, and the activities in which we are involved should be listed, and input from the Units should be sought to determine where our efforts and funds should be directed.

Carried unanimously.

11) Grand National Pairs

In District 1, the 'split' district corresponds with CBF Zones, and in District 1, the split is close to CBF Zone boundaries. Zones I and IV of the CBF get one pair each, while Zones II and III get two pairs each.

A possible takeover of the GN pairs was discussed. It was agreed that this would not be feasible before the 1981-82 event. In that year, a pairs trials will be needed, not only to qualify pairs, but also to help finance the expenses of the Canadian representatives at the Olympiad.

Moved by McRae (Murphy) that, in

lieu of the Olympiad pairs trials in 1981, the CBF request the Canadian Affairs committee to approach the ACBL with a view to raising the card fees in Canada in the 1981-82 Grand National pairs, by 50¢ per person at the club and unit level to partially finance the Canadian pairs to the 1982 Olympiad. The eight pairs (one from each Zone, plus an additional one from each of Zones II and III) qualifying from this event, would represent Canada in the Olympiad. Such procedure would not in any manner affect the rights of any pair otherwise qualified for the Grand National pairs final.

Carried unanimously.

12. The Rosenblum team event was discussed.

Moved by Altay (McRae) that, in the event that the trials for the 1981 Bermuda Bowl are not changed, the 1981 CNT champion will be qualified to represent Canada in the 1982 Rosenblum Teams, and will be subsidized to the extent the CBF board feels appropriate at its 1981 meeting.

Carried unanimously.

Audrey Grant has proposed a Canadian Academy of Bridge. The CBF has been requested to define the nature of bridge (eg. sport and/or recreation) to facilitate the obtaining of publicity.

Moved by McRae (Borg) that Audrey Grant be invited to submit a Digest article expanding on the concept of a Canadian Academy of Bridge Awards for the promotion of bridge. If the idea is favorably received, further coverage will be available.

Carried unanimously.

14. The National Welcome Program

Borg reported that there was no 1980 Welcome program. The Units generally did not respond, in spite of the fact that the 1979 participants liked the program. The Units must help, since the objective is to get non-duplicate players to try an evening of tournament bridge.

One result of the 1979 game was a 32-table game once a month in Thunder

Bay, where the 1979 non-duplicate players are invited to play with experienced players. Altay suggests a country-wide pro-am day. This needs followup games to maintain interest. Most duplicate players get involved because some experienced player brings him out, and continues to aid his development. In Alberta, the ABPA wants to donate prizes to these games.

Moved by Shields (McRae) that Borg be empowered to plan the 1981 program.

Carried without dissent.

17. Richmond Trophy

Mark Molson of Montreal is the winner of the Richmond Trophy for 1979.

20. Elections

- a) There will be elections this year in Zones V and VI
- b) The director of elections is to prepare a report on electoral reform after con-

sultation with the Units.

22. 1981 Meeting

The 1981 meeting will be held at or near Ottawa May 19-21, 1981, with the meeting of the Delegates on Sunday, May 17, or Monday, May 18. The CNTC final will begin with a reception on May 21.


23. Zone Directors's reports were interspersed throughout the meeting, so no formal reports were made.

24. Election of Officers

Position	Nominee	Nominator
Pres.	Harper	Altay
Vice-Pres.	Shields	McRae
	Altay	Shields
	(Declined with thanks)	
Treas.	Goodman	Borg
Sec.	Baragar	(appointed)

The president was thanked for his efforts.

The Canadian Teams and Valkenburg Olympiad Open Trials



By Eric Kokish

This year's Canadian Teams Championship marked the dawning of a new age for our nation. Canada will no longer participate in the ACBL Grand National Teams. In its stead we will hold

an annual (closed) CNTC with our own conditions and a distinct set of rewards. In Olympiad years, the Canadian Bridge Federation uses the CNTC to select its representatives to the World Bridge Federation competition. In Bermuda Bowl years, the CBF uses the CNTC to select the Canadian entry in the five-team North American playoff, the others being the GNT, Vanderbilt, Spingold and Reisinger BAM winners. 1980 is an Olympiad year and thus the winning team is provided with a juicy plum for its efforts - a trip to the Netherlands with a direct opportunity to do Canada proud.

The teams would compete in a three-day round robin of 14-board matches, each team starting with 40 VP per match. Every IMP would translate into a VP with 80-0 possible (one could not go minus, however, so the "salvage"

element might prove significant in a hopeless-looking situation). In effect, the round-robin was really one long 168-board match, a very good contest. Four teams would survive and move on to a knockout stage with no carryover from the round robin.

Here are a few hands from various stages of the event:

East, on the right, opens 2NT (20-21), both vul. You hold only: S-J1098742 H-void D-J C-AKJ104. What call do you make? If you bash 4S, you probably chalk up 790.

DLR: East
VUL: Both

	North		
	Q65		
	10832		
	K1063		
	32		
West		East	
3		AK	
Q 964		AKJ75	
Q9872		A54	
875		Q96	
	South		
	J1098742		
	void		
	J		
	AKJ104		

Partner, bless him, for once produces a truly wonderful dummy. A strange disaster befell the Silver team on this one. The Silver South overcalled only 3S. West bid 4D (Cimon), North 4S and East (Gauthier) 5H (perhaps believing 4D to be a transfer bid)! This went quietly 3 down, undoubled, for a 10-IMP swing against the normal (?) 790 at the other table.

DLR: East
VUL: none

North
874
9653
75
10964

West	East
J2	109653
108	AQ42
J932	106
KQJ32	87
	South
	AKQ
	KJ7
	AKQ84
	A5

Most Souths reached 3NT after showing a large balanced hand. West led the club king to declarer's ace. Three high diamonds brought a discouraging spade from East. South has two real chances.

Cash two spades and exit in diamonds or cash all three spades first. East would have done better to discard a heart. His spade pitch, suggesting five (at least when East is tired), should tip declarer off to the winning line. We had an unusual disaster. The declarer at our table cashed no spades at all (he was tired, too) before exiting with a fourth round of diamonds. Playing upside down signals, I played high-low in spades. Partner cashed jack and queen of clubs and I threw the encouraging deuce of hearts. Partner played a heart and declarer threw his cards on the table. I thought that I should tell partner what I had, allowing him to work out what to do. Partner thought I would always know what he should do and would signal pure attitude, getting him to play a heart when it was safe to do so,

i.e. when I had nothing in the suit. The Shoe (Mike Shoenborn) was kibitzing and later suggested that the attitude interpretation was probably best, and I think that he's probably right. Still, there must be a situation where East cannot know what West should do. Is it right to set up different treatments for the two variations, relying on each partner's ability to identify which carding method should apply? Interesting, I think.

Following are the final standings for the round-robin:

1. Graves	651	VP
2. Markotich	626	
3. Johnson	589	
4. Crosby	579	
5. Molson	574	
6. Daigneault	558	
7. Benson	532	
8. McAvoy	516	
9. Silver	472	
10. Doane	461	
11. Thorpe	452	
12. Huff	422	
13. Cabay	315	

THE SEMI-FINALS

MARKOTICH vs CROSBY

This one figured to be very close and it was, through three quarters. Markotich jumped out to a 10-IMP lead and held it to the half-way mark. Crosby dropped a further four IMPs in the third, and the stage was set for a dramatic ending.

The whole shooting match boiled down to three slam decisions. Crosby was wrong on all three. The Edmonton guys needed to be right on at least two to pull out the match, but it was not to be.

Here is one of the three crucial deals:

West	East
QJ4	AK10642
A54	8
Q842	AK103
A73	72

(MARKOTICH)

Balcombe	Taylor
2C★	1S
2S	2D
4C	3S
4S	4D
6D	4NT★ (DI)
	6S

(CROSBY)

Chomyn	Gupta
1NT★ (F)	1S
4C	3S
4H	P
5S	5D
	DBL ..

Balcombe knew he had a very good hand, but felt that he wasn't quite worth 4H opposite a limited opening bid. When Taylor continued over 4S, Balcombe would have liked to cue-bid the heart ace, but he would then have had trouble suggesting diamonds as trumps. I think that if he had to bet his life on this hand, though, he would have jumped to 7D, playing partner for what he actually had. Had Chomyn-Gupta reached 7D, the Balcombe-Taylor auction would have looked craven. As it was, the combination of the strange 1NT response and the 3S rebid (rather than 2D) precluded the Edmonton pair's bidding their most profitable trump suit in its natural sense. Both partners could have done more, but surely the best they could have done after the first round and a half of bidding was a push at 6S. Diamonds broke.

The final margin was 59 IMPs after 64 boards. The Cinderella Markotich team would live to play 72 more the next day.

GRAVES vs JOHNSON

DLR: East	North	East
VUL: Both	KJ10	AQ873
	KQ5	J973
	AQ3	1092
	J962	4
West	South	
2	9654	
A106	842	
J874	K65	
AQ853	K107	

West	North	East	South
J J'son	Murray	M J'son	Kehela
		P	P
P	1NT	(all PASS)	

Nagy	Baldwin	Kokish	Ch'son
		P	P
1D [®]	1NT	2D(1)	P
2H	P	P	2NT
P	3C(2)	DBL(3)	(all PASS)

® Precision

- (1) Takeout for the majors, a favorite toy
- (2) Assuming that 2NT was takeout for minors
- (3) Competitive, already limited by failure to double 1NT

Murray had no trouble making 1NT, 90. We were slated to gain 5 IMPs anyway since 2H was going to make at our table. Baldwin and Christopherson had a mixup to reach 3C, but they were a bit unlucky to run into a double. The defense had to take six tricks, 500 and 11 unusual IMPs.

Board 48 was a ping pong match in bidding at our table:

BD: 48
DLR: West
VUL: North/South

North
A1074
K65
Q10
AKQ2

West
K53
AJ3
KJ86542
void

East
J6
984
A973
10763

South
Q982
Q1072
void
J9854

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Kokish	Timms	Nagy	M'tich
1D	Dbf	P	1S
2D	2S	3D	3H
3S	Dbf	4D	P
P	Dbf	P	4S
			(all PASS)

I think Markotich bid it very well, getting in his most relevant suits economically. The auction didn't suggest that 4S would be cold, so we didn't choose to sacrifice. Wrong. The opening diamond lead was ruffed, and Markotich ran the nine of spades to Nagy's jack. Peter got out with a trump into dummy's tenace and Markotich ruffed dummy's last diamond with his last trump and led a club up. I ruffed, but the ace was unblocked and we could take no more than the ace of hearts. This was eight IMPs when Balcombe-Taylor did save at 5Dx for only 300.

BD: 59
DLR: South
VUL: Both

North
AQ1076
10875
643
7

West
953
3
K872
KQ1096

East
J4
J
AQJ1095
J832

South
K82
AKQ9642
void
A54

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
Balcmb	Nagy	Taylor	Kokish
			1C [®]
2C	DBL(1)	4D(2)	4H
5C	P(3)	P	5D
DBL	P	P	6C
7C	6H..7H(4)	(all PASS)	

- (1) 5-8 any shape, or 8-10 BAL, no stopper
- (2) Diamonds and a club fit
- (3) suggesting 5-8, useful hand
- (4) Peter did not see Balcombe's 7C bid (we were using bidding boxes); the director ruled that Peter could not double but could change his call (I could not double either). If he passed I would have to also. Peter bid 7H (I think he would have anyway if the match were closer).

Murray Zeller Kehela Guoba
 P 4H (all PASS) 4C(1)

(1) strongish 4H opening ... serious abuse.
 Everyone took 13 tricks, 16 IMPs to Graves.

Graves gained 46 IMPs on the set to win the CNTC by 156 IMPs. Somehow it never felt like a rout.

The Markotich team, averaging only 28 years of age, will be back. Despite Timms' pronouncement that "these guys will have to do it without me next time, I'm getting too old..." Wayne rates to have a few good years left. He's not 40 and he looks 25. Balcombe and Taylor have a very good partnership already, and Ross is still a child (in bridge terms...he can't be much older than 20). Guoba, who's been around a while, is only in his mid-30's, and he brought some valuable experience with him when he was added to the team. I do not know if he and Zeller have any plans to continue together, but both could do worse.

Kehela and Murray found themselves in an unusual position this year. They were participants rather than automatic additions to the winning team. Having bowed out in the Zone III finals, they were added to a very compatible foursome. They got better as the event progressed, and their experience in pressure situations was a big plus for the Graves

team, particularly when Mittelman was unable to play on the last day. Graves and Mittelman were generally tremendous and they've put a lot of work into their partnership, particularly in the game-slam zone and in competitive situations. Through four stages of the CNTC, the team had been strongly intra-supportive, enjoying a sense of camaraderie that is rarely seen at upper levels any more. We all like each other, and if this team doesn't do well, it will not be because of infighting and jealousy.

Nagy, and I enjoyed four sets in the semi-finals and final that one can only dream about. We were running in extremely good fortune and that alone can be tremendous bridge aphrodisiac. With a few months between now and the Olympiad, we will be able to work out some more of the mysteries of a new system. We will all be ready and we believe that Canada will have good reason to be proud of this team. We thank the CBF and all Canadian members for giving us the opportunity to take on the world. We are indeed fortunate.



Bridge Bolts

The Year is 1985



NAC! NAC! Who's there?
 You will be if you're in Montreal
 or Winnipeg...
 Henry Smilie, Vancouver

Editor's Note: No, Mr. Smilie is not pulling your leg. Two North American Championships (Nationals) will be held in Canada in 1985.

Can-At 1980,



Flighted Open Pairs A
1st: M. Denise Roussin-William Bowman, Ottawa



Flighted Swiss Teams A
1st: Patrice Roy-Helene Beaulieu, Sherbrooke, P.Q.



Flighted Swiss Teams B
1st (Tie): Art Clogg, Alice Manzer, Leo Wenigar, A. Laughland, Fredericton



Knock-out Teams
1st: Victor Goldberg, Alan Doan, John Stewart, Halifax




Flighted Swiss Teams B
1st (Tie): Suzanne Grenier, Richard Wildi, Jean Lalonde (Quebec City), Kamel Fergani, Montreal (also 2nd in Knockout Teams)



Two of Nova Scotia's leading players and consistent tournament winners: Eric Balkam (standing), Sharron Balkam (and friend.)

Fredericton, NB



Open Pairs


1st David Colbert-Mike Cafferata, Toronto (also 1st in Open Swiss Teams and 2nd in Flighted Swiss Teams A)

Open Swiss Teams

1st: Michael Kenny, Cote St. Luc, P.Q.-Michael Lorber, Hampstead, P.Q. (also 2nd in Flighted Swiss Teams A)



STANDARD
TAKEOUTS



Masters Pairs Flight B

1st: H.V. Sriharska-R. Skanes, Gander, Nfld.



Women's Pairs

2nd: Helen Shields, Thunder Bay-Sandra Borg, Burnaby

Influenced By Previous Action

by
Mike Dorn Wiss, Toronto

One of the lesser-known attributes of a good partner is the ability (and desire) to entertain at the table while attending to the business at hand. The effect of this quality, properly applied, lends harmony to the partnership while inducing the opponents a marked reticence to begrudge you the IMP's and Match-points you are gathering while they are busy smiling.

In the microcosm of bridge, as in life, where experience of all sorts comes in pairs, opportunity for entertaining table action came twice in a recent Swiss match in Toronto. Partnered by Karen Allison, a friend who shares interests in theatre and music as well as bridge, I found myself seated against two of the many good young players in Toronto with whom I have yet to familiarize myself. Playing with another friend of mine my RHO had trotted to a 226 in the Open Qualifying the previous day, and although his partner today was unknown to me, I assumed he was not to be underestimated.

I picked up a hand containing a Spade suit of AKQ73. In the course of the auction, I had overcalled my suit and we ended up defending 1NT after a balancing action by opener playing negative doubles.

Karen led a non-Spade and dummy displayed a Spade suit of 942. It quickly became apparent declarer had his contract and was merely going for the over-trick when he led the Spade deuce toward his hand. I played my 3 and declarer, holding J1085, securely played the 5 in the knowledge that Karen's stiff honor would come tumbling down.

When she scored her singleton 6 the look on all three faces was worth National card fees for a week (U.S. Funds).

The opponents had a defensive disaster on the following hand; then Karen

picked up this shapely thing:

S: AKJ109x
H: x
D: A987xx
C:

The Bidding:

Karen	Me
1S	3H
4D	5C
5D	5H
6H	P

A small trump was led and Karen tabled her dummy. There was a perceptible electricity in the air; something ethereal was hanging over the table. I could sense the opponents' anxiety from being unable to discern exactly what was troubling them. I called for the small trump from dummy, and stared at RHO's 10 for a few seconds, adding a little dramatic tension to the moment.

Then I smoothly placed the deuce under his 10.

"Did you underlay 100 Honors in trump, Partner?" RHO chimed. Karen's eyes were saucers as she surveyed my poker-faced countenance for a sign - any sign - that I knew what I was doing. (I must now confess that though

CAMEL ENTERPRISES

408 - 1245 Nicola St.
Vancouver, B.C. V6G 2E7

Bridge Supplies

New Books

Bridge Bum - Sontag	\$8.95
Bridge Humor - Kantar	\$3.00
Profits from Preempts	\$4.95
Kamikaze No Trump	\$3.00

Kasino Kem Cards	\$32/dozen
------------------	------------

Postage paid on all prepaid orders.

inwardly grinning impishly, it was the Sade of my nature that refused to waver as it kept my feathers placid).

After due delay coursing from laughter sliding into puzzlement and further into serious thought, RHO tabled a Diamond.

This was my hand: S:Q7; H:AKQxxx; D:Jxx; C:Ax.

I won the Diamond Q with the Ace, entered hand with the Spade Q and drew the remaining trumps, RHO having started with J10xx (100 Honors, indeed!). The Spades handled my losers. I displayed my famous IMPish grin.

“Ouch,” said RHO, “would the joke have been on us if he didn’t have the Ace

of Clubs!”

“Or on him if I’d ruffed the Diamond on the way back,” piped in LHO.

But then 6 Diamonds, which the other table rated to be in, would be down as well. True, the play may have resulted in a push board when there were IMP’s to be gained, but we were ahead, the event itself was out of reach, and the entertainment value far outstripped the likelihood of an 0-4 Diamond break or an 0-5 or 5-0 Spade break.

Besides, how many times does one get a chance to duck an AKQxxx combination twice in the same match?

The flesh was weak, and easily influenced by previous action.

Excerpts of the Meeting of the Delegates of the Units to the CBF, held in Fredericton, June 28, 1980.

1) Harper, in the chair, introduced the directors.

2) Minutes

The minutes were read. Mr. Tench reported that Mr. Kokish had misunderstood the position of District 2 on the pledge of \$1,500 to the CNTC. The intent was to indicate that District 2 would have no trouble meeting its assessment.

3) Business arising from the minutes

Mr. Tench asked about Canadianizing the Grand National Pairs. Altay explained the actions taken at the Director’s meeting. He also explained how ‘split’ districts in the east will affect the use of the Grand National pairs as a trials for the Olympiad.

4) President’s Report

Harper reported on matters covered at the meeting of the Directors that would be of general interest.

Mr. Petek would not like players to be permitted to qualify (in the CNTC) with different teams (a player can qualify for the Grand National Pairs with one partner, and then choose a different qualified partner for the first Unit level). Mr. Tench observed that if qualifying ses-

sions at different clubs overlap (if two sessions in a club are held one week apart), a team would not know whether it had qualified at the first club before the first session was played at the second club. The problem could be solved by requiring a team to remain as a single entity until it qualifies.

Mr. Taylor suggests that further efforts be made to inform Canadian bridge players of the nature of the CBF.

Mr. Drew suggests that redistricting in the west will help develop cohesion.

Mr. Tench (president of District 1) suggests that communications with Districts should be improved.

Mr. Dupuis suggests requesting assistance from the government (for example, travel for our Olympiad team from the Department of National Defence).

Mr. Smilie is reluctant to rock the boat by insisting on redistricting. He observed that last year’s meeting left some of the delegates with the feeling that they have no input to the Director’s decisions. Next year, the Delegates’ meeting will precede the Directors’ meeting.



Who's Holding My Hand?

Editor's Note: This hand comes to us courtesy of "The Matchpointer", the Unit 430 (B.C.) newsletter edited by Doug Andrews. Doug quite admirably refrained from commenting on the auction, so we will follow suit, difficult though it may be.

While the stars were off in Toronto fighting for the chance to represent Canada in Holland, the rest of us decided to have a little old Sectional. Here are a couple of defensive gems from the Swiss Teams (yes, the Open, not the Speedball).

Both vul.

Dummy

A K 8 6 5 3
A K 9 8 7 4 3
--
--

You

J 9 4
Q 2
J 9 6 5
A 10 8 3

to indicate that declarer, not partner, has the club king. Declarer may have a useful club tenace, so continuing a club could be disastrous.

Partner may have the diamond ace.

This possibility seems remote since declarer made a positive response in diamonds and then bid 6NT over 6 hearts. In other words, if declarer has no aces and no heart fit he won't make the hand even if you don't lead a diamond, and if he has no aces and a heart fit he would have passed six hearts.

It is hard to see how a spade lead can gain other than by being passive.

By deduction we've arrived at a heart lead and with this holding, it can't hurt to lead the queen.

The complete deal is shown.

AK8653
AK98743
--
--

J94		1072
Q2		J6
J965		K732
A1083	Q	Q642
	105	
	AQ1084	
	KJ975	

The auction:

Dummy

2 clubs
3 hearts
4 spades
6 hearts

Declarer

3 diamonds
4 clubs
4 NT
6 NT

You lead the club ace, dummy pitches a spade, partner plays a discouraging two and declarer plays the seven of clubs. What now?

The play to the first club trick seems

Declarer won the king of hearts in dummy, unblocking the ten from his hand. Crossed to the Q of spades, cashed the K of clubs and the A of diamonds, discarding dummy's last two small spades. Now he led the five of hearts toward dummy and when you followed low smoothly played the nine of hearts, losing to partner's jack.

I believe the final tally was down five.

