

# *canadian bridge digest*

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION  
FEDERATION CANADIENNE DE BRIDGE

Meet our Ladies' Olympiad Team p. 3



# Canadian Bridge Digest

ISSN 0317-9281

1339 Hamilton St. N.W.  
Calgary, Alberta T2N 3W8  
Phone (403) 289-0161

Published Quarterly  
Issue LVI, Vol. 19, No. 1

**Deadline for next issue:** March 10



**Editor:** Allan Simon



**Associate Editor:** John Armstrong

## Editorial

Last August, we asked you for some feedback. Do you want this kind of magazine? What can we do differently? Which features do you enjoy? How about the English/French ratio? To make it easier to respond, we even made up a little questionnaire. All you had to do was check off a few boxes.

Unfortunately, very few readers took the trouble to respond. Therefore, as any statistician will tell you, the replies we did receive are of limited use since the sample is too small. The "Canadian Bidding Contest" and "Inside the CBF" seem to be our most popular features, while most of the regional correspondents drew only a neutral "not familiar with this item". A couple of readers questioned the need for a "Canadian Bidding Contest" and pointed out that The Bridge World runs a similar feature. Fair enough, but we wish we knew how many of you feel this way.

The only significant trend had to do with the English/French ratio. Exactly five readers thought it was "just right". Of the others, 75% wanted "more English" and 25% "more French". We'll stubbornly cling to the present proportions. After all, our québécois friends pay fees too. And many of them can't even enjoy the ACBL Bulletin.

In response to suggestions, we are making two cosmetic changes: We are doing away with the "goofy maple leaves" as one person called them, along the side of each page, and we now have normal page numbers, instead of the cryptic "98cbd24" designations. Thanks to Gary M. McPherson of Bramalea for his advice in this matter.

Il y a six mois, nous vous avons demandé ce que vous pensez du Canadian Bridge Digest. Hélas, un nombre minime de lecteurs a répondu à notre appel. Nous vous prions de nouveau de nous faire parvenir vos opinions et surtout de nous laisser savoir quels changements vous aimeriez voir dans ce magazine.



## Meet our Ladies' Olympiad Team

*Last summer in Edmonton, the team of Mary Paul-Francine Cimon, Gloria Silverman-Katie Thorpe and Dianna Gordon-Sharyn Reus successfully defended the Canadian Ladies' Team Championship. As a result, they were designated as our representatives at this year's Ladies' Team Olympiad in Venice. Many cognoscenti feel they have a legitimate shot at the gold medal. Meet the champions, in conversation with Digest editors John Armstrong and Allan Simon.*



**Francine Cimon**

**Digest:** Où et quand avez-vous commencé à jouer au bridge?

Cimon: C'était lorsque j'étais étudiante à l'Université du Québec à Montréal, en 1969. Un jour, à la cafétéria, il manquait un joueur. Alors je me suis assise, on m'a expliqué qu'un as valait quatre points, un roi trois, etc. Deux jours plus tard, on m'a emmenée au Club Château et j'ai joué au duplicata pour la première fois. Mon "professeur", pour ainsi dire, et aussi mon premier partenaire régulier, était François Gauthier. Je lui dois beaucoup. En 1976, à Monaco, j'ai participé à ma première Olympiade, avec Sharyn Kokish (maintenant Sharyn Reus) comme partenaire. En 1980, en Hollande, j'ai joué avec Mary Paul. En 1984, à Seattle, Sandra Fraser était ma partenaire et l'année prochaine, à Venise, je participerai à ma quatrième Olympiade d'équipes, de nouveau avec Mary Paul comme partenaire.

*continué à la p. 16*



**Mary Paul**

**Digest:** Congratulations on winning the CLTC again! What is it like to be on top?  
Mary: You're under pressure. You can't come second.

**Digest:** Please tell us what it is like to play with Francine Cimon.

Mary: Francine is a terrific bridge player. She gives her soul. She concentrates, makes very few mistakes, and knows a lot about the game. She played for many years with François Gauthier who is a good theoretician. Playing the hand is her forte.

We're both emotional, so we understand each other when one blows up! When she gets upset, it's because she has made an error; when I get upset, it's because I have made an error. We just say, "Forget it. It's only one hand." Even if we are both upset, we don't let it affect the next hand.

**Digest:** What keeps you in this game?

Mary: I love the thinking. It's a braintwister,

*continued on p. 16*



## Katie Thorpe

**Digest: Congratulations on your third CLTC win! Please tell us about your preparations for the 1988 Olympiad in Venice.**

Katie: Thank you. Gloria and I are going to tighten our system to make our competitive sequences much more specific. For example, what a double means, when it is forcing, when it is competitive, and what it shows when you are a passed hand and when you are not. Bergen has many suggestions. We need to be sure what sequences show three trumps, two small, three to an honour, two to an honour, and so on.

We also need to be ready to defend against unusual bids because there are many at the world level. In Seattle in 1984 it was the first time most of us had played against the "non-spade" opening which shows 0-7 HCP and nothing about distribution, as well as about seven variations on that. We need to get our philosophy straight so that we won't have to discuss every particular new bid. There isn't time. Even though the systems are filed ahead of time at an Olympiad, you get them only the night before or the morning of the match, and there are 27 matches. There are three pairs on each team; they don't all play the same conventions and we won't know which pair we are going to play against until



## Gloria Silverman

**Digest: Congratulations on your repeat win in the CLTC! Please tell us what it is like to play with Katie Thorpe.**

Gloria: The most important thing in our partnership is implicit trust in what we tell each other. Katie almost always has what she says; I can be a little imaginative sometimes! Unless I have been really bizarre, she can figure it out.

We don't argue at the table to try to lay blame for a poor result. We discuss it afterward, unless it is a misunderstanding that arose because of our conventional use of a bid and we need to make sure that both have the same understanding for the rest of the match.

For the World Olympiad Katie and I will try to improve our system. We will need to become familiar with the bidding methods used by the other teams. Katie has saved all the system notes that the other teams gave her team in the last Olympiad. We will also talk to some Canadian players, such as George Mittelman, who are known for their expertise and theory. We will bid hands together regularly and play in the Regal-St. Clair IMP league and likely the CNTC. We will play practice matches.

Katie is really easy to play with. We are

*continued on p. 29*





**Sharyn Reus**

**Digest: Congratulations on your CLTC win! Please tell us about yourself.**

Sharyn: Thank you. I'm from Montreal. After two or three years of playing bridge, I began playing with Dianna Gordon and we have been playing together ever since.

Dianna is a good partner who is always calm and cool, and is never flustered at the table. She is always very polite, and there are never any arguments. She is a very co-operative partner and she bids, plays, and defends well.

Dianna has superb table presence. She is able to smell out the cards from the way opponents react; it isn't just the cards they play that helps her.

Every year that I have been playing in the trials for national teams I've noticed that women's bridge in Canada is getting tougher. The women sit at the table not as if they are coming to get killed any more. They concentrate well and they are reading more now. They are real fighters – more than in the past. There are more regular partnerships practising together.

I'm looking forward to playing in the Olympiad in Venice. It is a beautiful place to hold a tournament. If we win, I'm going to feel on top of the world. It's been a dream



**Dianna Gordon**

**Digest: Congratulations on the CLTC win! Please tell us about yourself.**

Dianna: Thank you. I am from Toronto and I learned to play at the University of Toronto. I met Sharyn through George Mittelman about ten or twelve years ago.

We became very good friends and the friendship has grown at a steady rate over the years. I believe that friendship takes high priority in any partnership; in our case each of us is rooting for the other. It is as if we are an entity.

Sharyn is a totally well-rounded player and what ties it all together is her incredible concentration.

It always feels wonderful to represent our country. It begins with the opening ceremonies and all the flags. Knowing that we are playing for Canada really gets us going.

It will be a thrill to play in Europe again; I have enjoyed playing there in the past. Fortunately it will be the "low" season when we arrive in Venice. It has been one of the most expensive places in Europe this past summer. It is remarkably attractive and pictures do not do it justice. I am looking forward to it.

**Digest: We know you will represent Canada**

*continued on p. 29*

# BERMUDA BOWL DIARY

by Michael Schoenborn (*The Shoe*)

You will forgive me, please, for making this a highly personal account. In bridge terms I have ever had only two dreams: to win the CNTC and to play in the Bermuda Bowl. The former occurred in Ottawa in 1986 and qualified us to play off with Mexico and Bermuda for the right to participate in the 1987 Bermuda Bowl in Ocho Rios, Jamaica.

**Feb. 1987.** "The team" (David Turner, Greg Carroll, Arno Hobart, Marty Kirr, Harmon Edgar, and Mike Schoenborn) arrives in Mexico City with new NPC, George Mittelman. Everybody plays well and we win the final over Mexico by a tidy 100 IMPs. We are in!

**15 September, 1987.** The event really begins with the arrival, four weeks in advance, of a 2 kg (5 lb) parcel that turns out to be the cumulative convention cards of the 30 or so pairs involved. 30% of them play Fertilizer bids (FERTS), where a pass shows an opening bid and one of the opening bids (usually 1♦ or 1♣) shows a pass. The ACBL in its wisdom has banned these bids at all levels, so we are essentially novices at defending such systems.

We schedule several practice matches. Greg and Dave invent as their defence to FERTS – "Canadians Against Systems That Antagonize" (CANASTA). Harmon and I come up with "First Action Ambiguous Relay Transfer System" (FAARTS over FERTS).

In addition, Harmon and I are the only pair in the field who don't play some form of MULTI (usually 2♦). This bid, too, is on the verge of being outlawed here. Consider this an earnest plea that ALL systems be permitted in Zone finals and higher so that whoever emerges may at least have seen such conventions used in actual play at *some* time.

**8 October, 1987.** The team arrives in Jamaica. The excitement is somewhat lessened by our first view of our hotel room. They have just finished gluing down the new carpet and the furniture is still in the



Mike

Schoenborn

hall. For the next week we have the option of sniffing glue or negating our airconditioning by opening the window.

**11 October, 1987.** Play begins. Our opponents for the first day of the 8-team double round-robin are Jamaica and New Zealand destined to finish last and second last respectively. Consensus is that this is a good draw, as we are likely to be nervous in the new surroundings. Personally, I would have preferred to meet these guys after they were a little more tired and discouraged.

**ROUND 1: Jamaica.** The Jamaicans play very well against us. Slam hands look as though they are going to feature prominently. On the first slam I made a bad decision but Harmon played beautifully to get me off the hook. The Daily Bulletin wrote up the hand and had the decency to give me credit for Harmon's outstanding play.  
none vul.

## North

♠ K  
♥ AJ105  
♦ J64  
♣ AKQ104

## West

♠ 7654  
♥ 76  
♦ 1092  
♣ 9732

## East

♠ AQ2  
♥ 9843  
♦ 875  
♣ J86

## South

♠ J10983  
♥ KQ2  
♦ AKQ3  
♣ 5



West	North	East	South
<i>Carby</i>	<i>Harmon</i>	<i>Ziadie</i>	<i>Shoe</i>
pass	1♣ (1)	pass	1NT (2)
pass	2♣	pass	2♠
pass	3♥	pass	4♦ (3)
pass	4NT	pass	5♦ (4)
pass	6♦ (5)	pass	6♥ (6)
all pass			

- (1) 17+ HCP, forcing
- (2) 4 controls
- (3) undiscussed
- (4) one ace, two kings
- (5) if 4♦ was natural, this is to play; if not, it is a grand slam try
- (6) naive. Could work if a club ruff is needed

On the auction, Ziadie had no problem finding the double dummy lead of the ♠A and continuing with the ♠Q when the ♠K dropped.

Harmon had no choice but to ruff. He then cashed three high clubs, discarding two high diamonds from dummy. Then he needed only a 4-2 diamond break, followed by a low diamond ruff in dummy, claiming the rest on a high crossruff.

Had Ziadie been able ruff the third diamond, it would have been necessary to cash one spade from dummy. For this to fail, Ziadie had to be 2-6-2-3; ie. hearts had to be 6-0. This nice play meant we won 2 (tainted) IMPs instead of losing 14. The final score was Canada 73, Jamaica 65 (16 VP).

Harmon  
Edgar



**ROUND 2: New Zealand.** All three New Zealand pairs played FERTS and we had to defend against relay systems as well. We were prepared, but our lack of confidence was among the factors evident in the final score: New Zealand 105, Canada 79 (11 VP).

Nevertheless, we had the chance to bury that team until the first of several grand slam swings came along. Harmon was on lead against the following auction:

West	North	East	South
<i>Harmon</i>	<i>Crombie</i>	<i>Shoe</i>	<i>Reid</i>
pass	pass (1)	pass	2♣ (2)
pass	2♦	pass	2♥
pass	2♠	pass	2NT
pass	3♣	pass	4♣
pass	4♦	pass	6♣
pass	7NT	dbl	all pass

The initial pass (1) was forcing, and 2♣ was a transfer positive in *diamonds* (2). The rest of the auction was relays and, in the end, Harmon is informed that North has not shown anything and that South is 2-3-6-2 with 6 controls and two of the top three spades, hearts, and diamonds, plus one top club. Partner doubles to show you he is not entirely dazzled by the machinery. Unfortunately, it's Harmon's lead, since RHO responded 2NT. He has:

♠43 ♥J1098 ♦J642 ♣752

What would you have led? The hand made for lovely discussion in numerous post mortems, but the result was less charming. It would seem that the double rules out a spade lead, which would have been a safe lead *without* the double. Dummy's first bid suit is diamonds and so is the most unlikely lead, but if they've really had an accident, isn't a diamond lead the only one that will let them make six diamond tricks? Can they really make 13 tricks *without* declarer's six-card suit? What would you have led?

Harmon, and the vast majority of international players, led the ♥J. That, alas, is -13 IMPs instead of +15. The hand:

**North**  
♠ A108652  
♥ A65  
♦ void  
♣ KQ104

**West**  
♠ 43  
♥ J1098  
♦ J642  
♣ 752

**East**  
♠ J97  
♥ 763  
♦ A73  
♣ 9863

**South**  
♠ KQ  
♥ KQ2  
♦ KQ10985  
♣ AJ

We finish the first day below average against the two weakest teams in the event. As a reward we start Day 2 against Chinese Taipei, who are leading overall.

**ROUND 3: Taipei.** Turner and Carroll have back-to-back solid sessions. On this hand both sides reached 3NT, both vul.

	<b>North</b>	
	<i>Kirr</i>	
	<i>Shen</i>	
	♠ AJ	
	♥ Q1086	
	♦ K1052	
	♣ A75	
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>
<i>Tai</i>		<i>Huang</i>
<i>Turner</i>		<i>Carroll</i>
♠ Q10		♠ K983
♥ A5432		♥ 97
♦ Q9874		♦ AJ6
♣ 2		♣ J1043
	<b>South</b>	
	<i>Hobart</i>	
	<i>Kuo</i>	
	♠ 76542	
	♥ KJ	
	♦ 3	
	♣ KQ986	

This was essentially a defensive problem. Greg Carroll gave the defence a chance by leading the ♥9, won by David Turner with the ace. He shifted to the ♠Q and it was impossible for declarer to make more than seven tricks. At the other table Huang gave the defence no chance by leading the ♣3. Note that the hand goes down at least two tricks if East leads fourth highest from his longest and strongest suit – the ♠3.

The final score was most gratifying – a perfect 25 VP against the leaders. Canada 93, Taipei 33 (25 VP). Total: 52 VP.

**ROUND 4: Great Britain.** Another top team. Everyone had seemed to play well in the last match, so Greg and David sat out in rotation even though they had probably been the best pair up until then. Marty and Arno picked a great time to round up into top form, and carried Harmon and me through a so-so session.

They were featured in a FERTS auction during the second half playing against Britain's #1 pair, Armstrong and Forrester.

E-W vul

	<b>North</b>	
	<i>Kirr</i>	
	<i>Sheehan</i>	
	♠ 10543	
	♥ A1032	
	♦ K3	
	♣ 954	
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>
<i>Forrester</i>		<i>Armstrong</i>
<i>Turner</i>		<i>Carroll</i>
♠ Q97		♠ A6
♥ 7654		♥ void
♦ 9		♦ AQJ1074
♣ AK1032		♣ QJ876
	<b>South</b>	
	<i>Hobart</i>	
	<i>Flint</i>	
	♠ KJ82	
	♥ KQJ98	
	♦ 8652	
	♣ void	

After a pass by Marty Kirr, East bid a strong pass and Arno introduced 1♠, their regular canapé style opening bid. Forrester, West, made a card-showing double. Marty took advantage of the ambiguous auction and the vulnerability to bid 2♦!

	<b>West</b>		<b>North</b>		<b>East</b>		<b>South</b>
	<i>Forrester</i>		<i>Kirr</i>		<i>Armstrong</i>		<i>Hobart</i>
			Pass		Pass*		1♠
	Dbl*		2♦!		Dbl		pass
	pass		2♣		4♣		pass
	5♣		all pass				

\*alerted

At the other table Carroll and Turner also ran into FERTS, but at the most ineffective level. Sheehan, North, opened 1♣ to deny an opening bid. We found that the best way to deal with a club FERT was to ignore it. (Double = 1♣ bid.)

	<b>West</b>		<b>North</b>		<b>East</b>		<b>South</b>
	<i>Turner</i>		<i>Sheehan</i>		<i>Carroll</i>		<i>Flint</i>
			1♣ (1)		1♦		1♥
	Dbl (neg)		3♥		4♥		pass
	5♣		pass		6♣		all pass

(1) FERT



The heart pre-empt enabled Carroll to make a good judgment about his heart void. In fact, it turned out that even with clubs 3-0, you could make a *grand slam*. The actual result was 13 IMPs to the good guys and we had soundly beaten another of the favoured teams. Canada 81, Great Britain 47 (20 VP). Total: 72.

Our total of 72 left us in sound shape to qualify, second behind Taipei. The only cloud remaining on the collective horizon was the occasional weak play of yours truly and his partner. Who wrote this script, anyhow? But even Harmon and I can point to one outstanding session against Taipei on this much brighter second day.

**DAY THREE – ROUND 5: Pakistan.** Vu-Graph! Isn't this the reason we play bridge in the first place – so we can be on Vu-Graph with Zia? Not so for Harmon and me, who are benched. There are lots of fireworks. Both tables (Marty and Arno for Canada) bid well to reach a cold 7♣. This turns out to be the first board of the *event* where all 8 tables reach the same contract.

Both Pakistani pairs (Nisar and Munir against Greg and David) plus Masood and Zia on Vu-Graph against Marty and Arno, are having good games. Disaster is averted late in the first half when Greg and Dave get to play 1♠ redoubled making two for the rare +1120. That was worth an even bigger bundle when it turned out that no game would make on their combined 28 HCP.

As so often happens, on the next hand their Pakistani opponents bid a slam that was a little better than 50%, and it went down for another 11 IMPs to us. With all these goodies for our side, we still trailed by 7 IMPs at halftime.

Harmon and I were not about to blow this chance once we got off the bench. It looked like we had them buried, making a vulnerable doubled partscore, a doubled 3NT, and scoring 500 against a phantom save. Our opponents, Fazli and Baqai, were not easily daunted, and won most of it back on a good slam, a great defence, and a piggy game that made.

This turned out to be the hand of the match, if not the tournament:

**North**

*Edgar*  
*Masood*  
 ♠ void  
 ♥ AK108532  
 ♦ K862  
 ♣ K6

**East**

*Fazli*  
*Carroll*  
 ♠ K10952  
 ♥ void  
 ♦ Q10743  
 ♣ 1075

**West**

*Baqai*  
*Turner*  
 ♠ QJ864  
 ♥ 96  
 ♦ A5  
 ♣ 8432

**South**

*Shoe*  
*Zia*  
 ♠ A73  
 ♥ QJ74  
 ♦ J9  
 ♣ AQJ9

At our table, after I opened a 14+ to 17 notrump, we had elaborate transfer machinery that would insure that the heart slam would be played from the wrong side.

<i>Shoe</i>	<i>Harmon</i>
1NT	2♦ (transfer)
2♥	3♣ (1)
4♥ (2)	4♣
5♣	6♣
6♥	pass

- (1) re-transfer to diamonds
- (2) minimum; good hearts

It turned out that I had to pass 6♣ (remember, partner bid them at the 3-level). Then again, this rated to be a singleton, and there were heart ruffs around. The mundane 6♥ made +980 against the mundane lead of the ♦A.

At the other table Zia found the pass of 6♣, but he was playing it from the wrong side because he had opened 1♣ on my cards.

<i>Zia</i>	<i>Masood</i>
1♣	2♥
3♥	4♣ (splinter)
5♣ (cue)	6♣ (cue?)
PASS!	

Zia didn't know whether partner's jump shift showed huge club support, so he elected to pass 6♣. David Turner became the only player to beat the slam when he found the *five of diamonds* lead from A5. That was 14 IMPs to us as we won the second half by 15 and the match by 8.

NOTE: Canada played 6♥ and had to play 6♣ to avoid the lead of the ♦5. Pakistan played 6♣ and had to play 6♥ to avoid the lead of the ♦5. Canada 105, Pakistan 97 (16 VP). Total 88.

**ROUND 6: Venezuela.** By the sixth round the Venezuelans were the big surprise, as they were part of a five-way dogfight for the lead. Only Brazil (a favourite), New Zealand, and Jamaica seemed to be out of contention.

We lost this dull match 58-55, then had the committee delete an adjusted score where Harmon had been bamboozled into leading his singleton trump heart queen after a faulty explanation. The committee seemed to feel that the lead was so bad that we deserved no protection.

If I may flit ahead, I got my revenge on the committee in the final match by leading my singleton trump queen, also in hearts, against those self-same Venezuelans. *This* time it was the only lead to beat the contract. What do committees know about leads, anyhow? If they knew about leads, wouldn't they be playing in the event?

The ruling cost us 5 IMPs and a tie. Venezuela 63, Canada 55 (14 VP). Total: 102.

**DAY FOUR – ROUND 7: Brazil.** We finished the first round-robin against hard-luck Brazil, including former world champion Gabriel Chagas. Until now, Greg Carroll and David Turner had been our best and most consistent pair, so it was only fitting that the other two pairs emerged to bury a very good Brazilian team.

There were so many good results that it's tough to find one that's instructive. Eg., all vul, I opened 1♥ (which our system permits) on: ♠652 ♥AQJ75 ♦102 ♣743.

Opponents now had no makeable game and, in fact, played 3NT down two when Harmon led a heart. Marty and Arno made 4NT on a spade lead.

Both sides played 4♠ on this layout:

**North**

Kirr  
Chagas  
♠96  
♥KJ985  
♦K8  
♣AK75

**East**

Edgar  
Avelino  
♠KJ753  
♥1062  
♦J104  
♣Q6

**West**

Shoe  
Barbosa  
♠A1082  
♥A4  
♦AQ752  
♣83

**South**

Hobart  
Mello  
♠Q4  
♥Q73  
♦963  
♣J10942

At our table I opened 1♠ (canapé style). Chagas overcalled 2♥ to get his partner off to the killing lead but unfortunately Chagas would be on lead. After Harmon raised, I canapé'd and Harmon bid game.

It would appear that Chagas did not avail himself of the explanation of my bid. After cashing two clubs he did not see the danger that two of dummy's hearts would disappear on the fourth and fifth diamonds. When he shifted to a trump, he eliminated the trump guess as well, making the hand Shoe-proof.

At the other table the diamonds were in plain view. Arno didn't lead a heart, but Marty won the opening club lead and shifted at once to a heart, guaranteeing one down even after Avelino guessed the trump suit.

How good were the teams in this event? *Not one declarer* misguessed the ♠Q, even though you had to assume from the lead that South had a high heart and, to make the contract, that South had the ♦K. Why hadn't South responded, if he had the ♠Q as well? I was disappointed that no one lost the spade finesse.



We finished the first round-robin second overall and extremely well placed. Our last match was very encouraging. Canada 124, Brazil 29 (25 VP). Total: 127.

The bad news was that the second round is seeded according to finishing places, so we have to go right back at Brazil, where we had just had massive overkill.

Greg  
Carroll



**DAY FIVE – ROUND 8: Brazil.** How bad can it be, going back against a world class team you just beat by 95 IMPs? On Board 1 Greg and David bid a slam that's about 50% and go one down. No one else is there. -11 IMPs.

Then comes the magic of Board 4.  
both vul  
Dir W

**North**

Chagas  
Carroll  
♠ 6  
♥ Q6532  
♦ K102  
♣ 8765

**East**

Edgar  
Camacho  
♠ K43  
♥ KJ9  
♦ AQ975  
♣ QJ

**West**

Shoe  
Barcellos  
♠ AQJ87  
♥ void  
♦ J843  
♣ A1094

**South**

Mello  
Turner  
♠ 10952  
♥ A10874  
♦ 6  
♣ K32

In our system I can bid 2♦, showing five or more spades and four or more clubs, but losing the ability to show four diamonds. OR I can bid 1♦ and canapé to spades, when I will almost always lose the chance to show clubs. I opt to show my good suits.

<i>Shoe</i>	<i>Harmon</i>
2♦ (5♠ + 4♣)	2♥ (relay)
2♠ (minimum)	2NT (relay)
3♦ (5-1-3-4)	4♣

With the club finesse inside this easily makes six, so we aren't looking at a really good result in any event. The Brazilians, however, take a *much* rosier view.

<i>Barcellos</i>	<i>Camacho</i>
1♠	2♦
3♦	3♠
4♣	4♦
4♥	4NT
5♠	6♦
7♠!	

7♦ without a club lead needs only the diamond pickup, but 7♠ is actually on three of three finesses *and* no diamond ruff *and* no 5-0 spade break. It rolls home and we trail by 29 IMPs after four boards. Everybody plays pretty well after this, and in the end we win by 12. We could have used some of the IMPs from the previous match! Canada 95, Brazil 83 (17 VP). Total: 144.

David  
Turner



**ROUND 9: New Zealand.** For some reason, whenever we played these guys, there was nothing to be said for it. Marty and Arno picked up four major swings in the first half, getting doubled with an overtrick in a vulnerable partscore, bidding two vulnerable no-play games that made, and collecting 500 off an indiscreet runout.

In the second half Greg and David bid an optimistic slam on this layout on the very last board.

**North**  
 ♠ Q2  
 ♥ 85  
 ♦ K642  
 ♣ 96543

**West**  
*Turner*  
 ♠ AJ10  
 ♥ KJ10973  
 ♦ J3  
 ♣ A2

**East**  
*Carroll*  
 ♠ K965  
 ♥ A6  
 ♦ AQ1085  
 ♣ J7

**South**  
 ♠ 8743  
 ♥ Q42  
 ♦ 97  
 ♣ KQ108

<i>Turner</i>	<i>Carroll</i>
1♥	2♦
2♥ (forcing)	4♥
4NT	5♥
6♥	pass

A club lead would have made this contract somewhat worse than on a diamond finesse, but the opening lead was the bruising ♥8. That was 13 IMPs to the good.

With all this happening against the 7th place team, how could we go wrong? I won't tell you here, but we lost to them again. N.Z. 81, Canada 69 (13 VP). Total: 157.



**Arno**

**Hobart**

**DAY SIX – ROUND 10: Jamaica.** We are in big trouble now. All the leaders but us are blitzing the bottom teams. Jamaica is our last chance to pile up the points. By now we have watched them on Vu-Graph and we know the strategy – don't miss *any* games. We add a point to most hands and the result is that both pairs bring back their best results of the event. At the half we lead 96-26, ten IMPs more than a blitz.

Again we should have saved some, for we lose back an unlikely 14 IMPs in the second half.

Arno and Marty typify what is really going on in this match, successfully shooting 7♥ on this layout:

N-S vul		<b>North</b>	
		<i>Kirr</i>	
		♠ void	
		♥ 974	
		♦ J1094	
		♣ AKQJ72	
<b>West</b>	<b>East</b>		
<i>Chuck</i>	<i>Tai Ten Quee</i>		
♠ K109842	♠ QJ63		
♥ 7642	♥ 10		
♦ K5	♦ 8632		
♣ 3	♣ 10986		
		<b>South</b>	
		<i>Hobart</i>	
		♠ A75	
		♥ AKQJ3	
		♦ AQ7	
		♣ 54	

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
3♠ (2)	4♣	pass!	1♣ (1)
pass	7♥	pass!	6♥
pass			pass

- (1) forcing
- (2) pre-emptive

Arno and Marty made great decisions under pressure. Tai Ten Quee declined to take the non-vulnerable save, which would have been only four down for -800 into -2210. At the other table Harmon and I never entered the auction after South opened with 2NT. The Jamaicans stopped in 6♣ and were scheduled to pick up 11 IMPs for 1390, instead of losing 13.

Despite the big win we were considerably demoralized heading into a key match with Great Britain. We had received more than 100 IMPs in gifts but had failed to post a blitz, which required only 59. Canada 118, Jamaica 63 (24 VP). Total: 181.

**ROUND 11: Great Britain.** We were still solidly in second place, but everyone knew this was a do-or-die match. Because Britain had finished fifth in the first round-robin,

they would finish their schedule against the bottom three teams, while the top four played a round-robin against each other. Britain had stayed within 20 VP, and it looked imperative to widen that margin unless we could produce another solid win against Taipei, who seemed unstoppable against everyone else.

It seemed like the wrong time for a key match. Greg and David, who had been our steadiest pair in the early going, looked like they were fading a bit. Marty and Arno had carried the team lately, and Harmon and I were playing a lot better. But this was an evening match, were were coming off a let-down against Jamaica and a string of weak teams, and it just seemed too early in the event for a key match.

The first half was a virtual tie and our main bright spot came on this hand, both vul

	<b>North</b> <i>Edgar</i> <i>Forrester</i> ♠76 ♥KJ986542 ♦K10 ♣7	<b>East</b> <i>Armstrong</i> <i>Hobart</i> ♠KQ104 ♥A3 ♦8543 ♣K93	
<b>West</b> <i>Kirby</i> <i>Kirr</i> ♠9 ♥7 ♦AJ972 ♣QJ10652	<b>South</b> <i>Shoe</i> <i>Brock</i> ♠AJ8532 ♥Q10 ♦Q6 ♣A84		

TABLE 1:

<i>Kirby</i>	<i>Edgar</i>	<i>Armstrong</i>	<i>Shoe</i>
pass	3♥	pass	4♥

TABLE 2:

<i>Kirr</i>	<i>Forrester</i>	<i>Hobart</i>	<i>Brock</i>
pass	4♥	pass	pass
4NT	pass	5♦	all pass

Increased aggression did not pay off for the Brits on this hand. It was much less attractive to step in over my raise to 4♥ than it was for Marty Kirr to balance into an opening bid of 4♥. Presumably, Brock and Forrester had some way to show a good 4♥ opener, so that Brock did not double the final 5♦ contract. This seems a somewhat schizophrenic decision, since 5♥ rates to be no worse than one down.

Things did not go our way in the second half. On the very first board the Brits missed a cold heart game, but at the other table the North opened a substandard weak notrump and Marty and Arno reached 5♣ instead. 5♣ was also scheduled to make, but Arno chose to play the notrump bidder for ♣Qxx or ♣Q10x. The hand:

	<b>North</b> <i>Armstrong</i> ♠KJ9 ♥KQ7 ♦Q10986 ♣104	<b>East</b> <i>Kirr</i> ♠A542 ♥5432 ♦A ♣AK85	
<b>West</b> <i>Hobart</i> ♠6 ♥AJ108 ♦752 ♣J9762	<b>South</b> <i>Kirby</i> ♠Q10873 ♥96 ♦KJ43 ♣Q3		
<i>Hobart</i>	<i>Armstrong</i>	<i>Kirr</i>	<i>Kirby</i>
3♣	1NT	Dbl	2♠
4♥	pass	3♣	pass
	pass	5♣	all pass

The opening spade lead was won and a spade was immediately ruffed. The ♣J was then floated and the contract was doomed. That was lose 6 IMPs instead of win 5. Later analysis would suggest that if North can't have four spades, since South showed five or more, the simple line of relying on a heart pickup or a 2-2 in clubs would be preferable. The recommended line is: win ♣A, cash ♣A, finesse heart. Win the return, cash ♣K, and finesse heart again.

The final score, which reflected several further severe punishments for bad luck or tiny errors, reads: Great Britain 80, Canada 50 (10 VP). Total: 191.

By losing 20-10 to Great Britain it has become virtually impossible to beat them in the round-robin, since they are 8 VP behind with a *much* easier schedule. To have any chance, we will need to rout Taipei *and* beat the Pakistanis and the ever-present Venezuelans.

**DAY 7 – ROUND 12: Pakistan.** Harmon and I go from the penthouse to the outhouse in this match. In the first half we have our best card of the event, covering a slightly soft session by Greg and David to lead by 18 IMPs at the half.

We cover ourselves in glory as I hold several vulnerable forcing club bids, only to have a non-vulnerable weak notrump opened in front of me. In all cases we reach the par spot. This was the toughest:

N-S vul

	<b>North</b>		
	<i>Edgar</i>		
	♠ 53		
	♥ 9		
	♦ AQJ532		
	♣ 10765		
<b>West</b>		<b>East</b>	
<i>Munir</i>		<i>Nisar</i>	
♠ 972		♠ QJ108	
♥ 107542		♥ KQ83	
♦ 764		♦ K108	
♣ Q4		♣ J2	
	<b>South</b>		
	<i>Shoe</i>		
	♠ AK64		
	♥ AJ5		
	♦ 9		
	♣ AK983		
<i>Nisar</i>	<i>Shoe</i>	<i>Munir</i>	<i>Edgar</i>
1NT	Dbl	2♦	Dbl
pass	3♦	pass	4♣
pass	6♣	all pass	

Munir chose the imaginative runout to 2♦ on his three-card suit. No doubt Harmon thought he had rather a good double. At the vulnerability I chose to try our game and was surprised to hear 4♣. It seemed to me that

Harmon had nine or more minor suit cards, which meant that, at worst, he'd need a major suit queen. It seemed likely that he had an appropriate hand, as with lots and lots of slow diamond winners *only*, he would have bid 3NT. Six clubs was Harmon-proof and he could have made seven, if pressed. We were the only pair in the field to reach slam. In retrospect, this was probably severe punishment for Munir's imaginative runout.

The Pakistanis themselves, however, had the chance to bid the slam.

<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>West</b>
<i>Masood</i>	<i>Carroll</i>	<i>Zia</i>	<i>Turner</i>
	1NT	Dbl	Redbl*
2♦	pass	2♠	pass
3♣	pass	3NT	all pass

\*alerted

I suppose that Zia didn't have the same inference that his partner had a good hand. But what did he really need?

Harmon and I returned in the 2nd half to a string of bad results, not all of them our fault. We lost back 24 IMPs. Pakistan 63, Canada 57 (14 VP). Total: 195.

**ROUND 13: Taipei.** The fat was really in the fire. If we lost this match, we were not going to beat Britain, and we were already 18 VP behind Taipei. They had one more match with Pakistan and our finish would be Venezuela. We needed a win now, and a big one.

This one looks like it's in great shape, as both Marty and Arno, and Greg and David are putting up solid boards on Vu-Graph. They run off 44 straight IMPs on boards 8 to 15, only to lose 13 on a lead against a slam. You hold:

♠ A76 ♥ KJ3 ♦ 1076542 ♣ 7

<i>RHO</i>	<i>You</i>	<i>LHO</i>	<i>Pard</i>
1♠	1♦	1♠	pass
2♥	pass	3♦	pass
4♣	pass	4♦	pass
4♠	pass	4NT	pass
5♦	pass	6♣	all pass

With hearts bid on your right, you'd better lead the ♠A and wait for your heart trick. All other roads lead to 6♣ making. Since our side played game, when the ♠A was

not led, we lost 13 IMPs instead of winning 12. Even so, the halftime lead was 18 IMPs.

In the second half it was like a replay of Pakistan – we played well, but couldn't avoid disasters at either table, almost always in situations where a *big* pickup turned to a loss. In the end we had lost back 26 IMPs and were left with only a mathematical chance of qualifying. Taipei 79, Canada 71 (14 VP). Total: 209.

**DAY EIGHT – ROUND 14: Venezuela.**

It comes down to this, if we blitz Venezuela, we qualify if Pakistan doesn't blitz Taipei and Britain loses 20-10 or worse to Brazil. For a while these things look possible, but by halftime Britain has a healthy lead over Brazil and we are losing to Venezuela by 18 IMPs.

Harmon and I finish on a positive note, playing absolutely solidly, but three hands from the end the card gods send in an unambiguous message. This is the layout:

none vul

**North**

*Edgar*

♠AJ4

♥KQ4

♦AQ5432

♣A

**East**

*Hammaoui*

♠K987653

♥32

♦J10

♣Q10

**West**

*Caponi*

♠void

♥J75

♦97

♣KJ987652

**South**

*Shoe*

♠Q102

♥A10986

♦K86

♣43

I started the auction with a pass and Caponi opened 2NT, which was a preempt in one of the minors. Harmon, who was still trying for the blitz, violated our system with a trap pass. Hammaoui lacked the imagination to pass as well, bidding 3♣. This was passed back to Harmon, who balanced 6♦! (No doubt influenced by his texture in the trump suit.)

This was passed to me and I was not too shellshocked to imagine that whatever it might be that partner needed, I *had* it. Accordingly, I raised to 7♦. Caponi, my screenmate, doubled immediately. The tray came back a few seconds later, and I was filled with regret, although no one else was tactless enough to blame me. Why hadn't I bid 6♥? It couldn't be to play with a twice passed hand. If I redoubled now, after a five-minute hesitation, Harmon would have to consider 7NT if he had the ♣A. It was truly tough to sit there and lose the event (but keep my soul) by placing the "pass" card in my tray.

The 5 IMPs we won back was sufficient to prevent the Venezuelans from overtaking us, so at least we reached the top half of the field. Venezuela 70, Canada 57 (13 VP). Total: 222.

It was disappointing to have so many chances slip away, but there was some reason for optimism. Playing just as we did, we might well have qualified with a little better distribution of the swing boards. We had finished plus IMPs against the three teams that beat us overall: Taipei 164-112, Great Britain 131-127, and Pakistan 162-160.



**Martin Kirr**

Even more important, we had made many new friends and, amazingly, no enemies. The directing staff complimented us on our department, the Jamaicans had an extra reception for the Pakistanis and the Canadians, and the dreaded international committee went on record, through Mr. Ortiz-Patino himself, to say that the Canadians had shown outstanding sportsmanship and that our only troubles had come when we tried to give the opponents *too much*.

information.

Finally, best of all, the whole team decided to stay together. This year's CNTC leads to the qualifier for the Bermuda Bowl in Perth, Australia. By deciding *not* to waste our accomplishments together, by deciding *not* to go the easy route of blaming partner or another pair, we proved that perhaps we have acquired the missing ingredient toward future success in this greatest of all bridge events. Barring accidents, I hope to report to you next time on our success in Perth.



## Book Review

One of Ottawa's top players has written a remarkable new bridge book\*. Or really, as the title implies, two books in one. The first part presents 70 hands from actual play in quiz format. Most hands are from recent CNTC events and the reader has the opportunity to decide on a bid or a line of play; then you check the answers to see how many IMPs you have won or lost; you can pretend that you are actually playing in the CNTC and see whether you have qualified for the semifinals.

The second section analyzes a few key deals. The purpose of this section is to allow the reader to improve his technique in a few specific areas, with particular attention being paid to cardreading and squeezes.

The only criticism we can make is that while perhaps 90% of the material is of interest mainly to advanced players, there is a sprinkling of rather elementary advice, as if the author occasionally loses track of his intended audience.

We found this book very instructive and entertaining. If you are a serious bridge player (anywhere from intermediate to national champion) you will want to purchase a copy.

*\*Rate Your Team Play and Improve Your Analytical Techniques, by Edward Zaluski. Available for \$10 plus \$1 postage directly from the author at 2777 Springland Drive, Ottawa, Ont. K1V 9X2.*



*continué de la p. 3*

### **Digest: A quoi cela ressemble, de jouer avec Mary Paul?**

Cimon: Nous jouons toutes les deux le même style. On est agressives, on aime faire des surenchères assez faibles au premier niveau pour suggérer une entame et Mary joue bien ses cartes. On a aussi un caractère semblable, dans le sens que même lorsqu'une erreur s'est produite, on ne se fera aucun reproche à la table. Evidemment, c'est difficile d'avoir une partenaire régulière qui demeure aussi loin - Mary vit à Toronto - mais notre système est écrit, ce qui nous permet de l'étudier chacune de notre côté et de s'en parler.

### **Digest: Participer à une Olympiade, qu'est-ce que cela signifie pour vous?**

Cimon: J'aime beaucoup cela. Si je joue encore au bridge, c'est surtout pour les Olympiades. C'est très intéressant de voyager pour rencontrer des gens de nationalités et de cultures différentes, reliés par un même amour du bridge, et de voir à quel point tout ce monde est content d'être là. C'est quand même très dur, parce que la compétition est très forte, mais l'atmosphère est toujours très bonne. L'esprit d'équipe est d'ailleurs aussi excellent, tous les membres de l'équipe travaillant au soutien du moral des autres. C'est particulièrement beau de voir comment l'équipe "open" et l'équipe des femmes se supportent l'une l'autre lorsqu'on est à l'étranger.

### **Digest: Francine, merci, et je vous souhaite bonne chance à Venise.**

Paul *continued from p. 3*

and I love that. I like playing behind a screen. I don't have to see when my partner likes or dislikes something. I don't want to know. If we don't have the screen, I never lift my head to look at my partner - ever.

We played well and steadily during the whole CLTC finals. There was nothing really unusual that did or didn't do it for us. Whatever errors the opponents made, they paid for.

**Digest: Thank you, Mary.**

# Tomczyk Wins Big

Gary Tomczyk won the 1987 Richmond Trophy contest, topping his two nearest contenders by more than 200 points. Tomczyk also finished 14th in the *Barry Crane Top 500* race. As Canada's leading player-of-the-year he accumulated 1071 points. Bernie Lambert and Cliff Campbell were second and third with 845 and 814 points.

The Richmond Trophy is awarded annually to the Canadian who wins the most points during a calendar year. Tomczyk scored as the first Canadian to earn over 1000 points in a year. The next highest total of 929 was amassed by Bruce Ferguson in 1976. Players who made the *Top 100* scored 164 or more points during 1987:


1. Gary Tomczyk, Parksville BC	1071
2. Bernie Lambert, Calgary AB	845
3. Cliff Campbell, Thunder Bay ON	814
4. Sadru Visram, Toronto ON	570
5. Mark Molson, Montreal PQ	541
6. Boris Baran, Montreal PQ	482
7. Jonathan Steinberg, Toronto ON	458
8. Leo Steil, Vancouver BC	454
9. Robert Crawford, Vancouver BC	401
10. Bill Sheryer, Kitchener ON	396
11. Ken Gee, Regina SK	386
12. Cameron Doner, Richmond BC	373
13. Douglas Heron, Ottawa ON	366
14. Gerry Marshall, Calgary AB	362
15. Michael Gamble, Ottawa ON	354
16. Greg Arbour, Vancouver BC	349
17. Alan Chapelle, Nanaimo BC	347
18. Doug Baxter, Thornhill ON	331
19. Ken Warren, Pickering ON	321
20. Billy Zerebesky, Saskatoon SK	316
21. Barry Harper, Saskatoon SK	303
22. Donald Pearsons, Winnipeg MB	300
23. Pat Roy, Sherbrooke PQ	292
24. Laurie McIntyre, Ottawa ON	291
25. Ray Chen, Toronto ON	290
26. David McLellan, Thunder Bay ON	287
27. Helene Beaulieu, Sherbrooke PQ	285
28. Jerry Aceti, Sudbury ON	280
29. Anna Boivin, Montreal PQ	278
30. Mark Stein, Mount Royal PQ	271
31. Michael Hargreaves, Victoria BC	271
32. Colin Revill, Burlington ON	269
33. Daniel Doston, St. Leonard PQ	267
34. John Carruthers, Toronto ON	264
35. Nader Hanna, Toronto ON	262
36. Edward Zaluski, Ottawa ON	262
37. Marc Lachapelle, Montreal-Nord PQ	260
38. Jim Riegler, Ottawa ON	260
39. Aidan Ballantyne, Vancouver BC	255
40. Martin Caley, Ottawa ON	255
41. Marc Poupart, Longueuil PQ	251
42. Stephen Willard, Edmonton AB	247
43. Kai Cheng, Winnipeg MB	245
44. Doug Fraser, Mont Royal PQ	242
45. Dan Jacob, Vancouver BC	235
46. David Kent, Ottawa ON	233
47. John Duquette, Oshawa ON	233
48. Gary Mitchell, Regina SK	233
49. Mark Arbour, Scarborough ON	230
50. Gary Whiteman, Don Mills ON	230
51. Stephen Brown, Ottawa ON	226
52. Duncan Smith, Saskatoon SK	222
53. Allan Smith, Peterborough ON	222
54. Richard Anderson, Regina SK	222
55. Mary Paul, Toronto ON	221
56. Sandy McLwain, Vancouver BC	218
57. Lawrence Hicks, Port Moody BC	211
58. Laurence Betts, Burnaby BC	206
59. Gary Brown, Wolfville NS	206
60. John Ross, Flin Flon MB	204
61. Keith Balcombe, Oshawa ON	202
62. David Curry, Nepean ON	202
63. Evelyn Hodge, Burnaby BC	196
64. Haig Tchamitch, Thornhill ON	196
65. Gerald Richardson, London ON	196
66. David Stohart, Ottawa ON	195
67. Mike Hartop, Moncton NB	193
68. Richard Chan, St. Catharines ON	190
69. Wilf May, Surrey BC	190
70. John Bowman, Nepean ON	189
71. Ron Bishop, Willowdale ON	189
72. Judith McGillis, Edmonton AB	187
73. Cliff Puskas, Saskatoon SK	187
74. Michael Kenny, Streetsville ON	185
75. Michael Tyrrell, Saskatoon SK	184
76. Willy Karwaser, Toronto ON	184
77. Janine Rivard, Quebec PC	178
78. Joseph Silver, Hampstead PQ	178
79. Sandra Fraser, Mont Royal PQ	177
80. John Milliquet, Ottawa ON	176
81. Gordon Chippin, Fredericton NB	175
82. Joan Lupovich, Montreal PQ	174
83. Karl Weber, Toronto ON	173
84. Nick Garlandis, Edmonton AB	173
85. Harmon Edgar, Milliken ON	172
86. Maria Weber, Sudbury ON	171
87. Michel Lamothe, Ottawa ON	170
88. Dudley Camacho, Scarborough ON	169
89. Brad Boyle, Toronto ON	169
90. James Luxford, Toronto ON	169
91. John McAdam, Ottawa ON	168
92. Bryan Culham, Brampton ON	168
93. Don Campbell, Saskatoon SK	167
94. Don Brander, North Vancouver BC	167
95. Maurice de la Salle, Edmonton AB	166
96. John Gillespie, Ottawa ON	166
97. Leonard Doerksen, Winnipeg MB	165
98. Pierre Treuil, Ottawa ON	164
99. Eric Ditchfield, Oakville ON	164
100. Robert Lebi, Toronto ON	164

## From our Readers

I was impressed with the position you took in your editorial in the November Digest, particularly with reference to the incidents which occurred in Edmonton at the CLTC's. You mention the possibility of extenuating circumstances, but I can think of no circumstances that would excuse such outrageous treatment of a volunteer official. I hope your report of the appalling behaviour of the two participants in Edmonton will bring into focus the larger problem that it represents. That is, there exists among many average players a general perception that the CBF is an organization that caters almost exclusively to the bridge elite of Canada. Many average players feel that their role in the CBF is to pay through the nose at local qualifying rounds in order to serve as cannon fodder for the experts. The money generated by their attendance is used to subsidize travel to national finals by a small group of experts. Once there, some of this group show their gratitude to the CBF and its members by acting like boors.

Now I know this is an unfair characterization of the CBF but it is unfortunately a view held by many members. I realize that the CBF has come a long way in recent years in trying to make the organization accessible and meaningful to the average player. The annual Rookie-Master game is a good example of this effort. However, as long as behaviour such as you reported is tolerated, no amount of public relations and good work will overcome among average players the perception that the CBF is an organization run by and for the bridge elite.

Matt Smith  
Victoria, B.C.



It seems to me, in looking at the expanded Canadian Bridge Digest, that the way to solve the financial problems is to take a little more realistic approach to what we are trying to accomplish. To put forty pages together, even on a quarterly basis, and trying to compete with the Bridge World in terms of the type of material is certainly too ambitious in my opinion.

It is easily possible to suggest that the Bridge World type bidding contests do not attract a massive number of participants. Unless the number of participants approaches significance relative to the total membership in the CBF, one should consider whether or not continuing this effort is of value.

It is easy to say that we are going to have to raise dues, it is probably less easy to say, "why don't we take a hard look at what is causing the costs to rise", and I would suggest to you that this gradually enlarging issue of the Canadian Bridge Digest is something that I don't feel is worth my donation on an annual basis.

Peter D. Clark  
Orleans, Ont.

# Rapport de l'Est et du Nord du Québec

par Maurice Larochelle, Québec

Lors de son tournoi sectionnel d'octobre dernier, l'unité de Québec se dotait d'un nouveau bureau de direction. Cependant, avant de parler de celui-ci, j'aimerais souligner ici le magnifique travail de Thérèse Gauthier, qui fit partie de ce bureau pendant 11 ans, dont 8 ans en tant que présidente.



Sous sa gouverne, l'unité est passée de quelque 290 membres, dont 24 maîtres à vie, à 502 membres, incluant 62 maîtres à vie, ceci alors que la plupart des unités de l'A.C.B.L. connaissait une diminution de son membership.

A l'époque aussi, la séance typique d'un tournoi sectionnel comprenait environ 30 à 35 tables, versus 50 à 60 tables maintenant, de quoi rendre jalouses certaines "grosses" unités.

Enfin, il y a plus de clubs, plus de professeurs de bridge et une plus grande participation dans les clubs.

On pourrait croire à ce qui précède que Thérèse était avant tout préoccupée par la croissance de l'unité. Il n'en est rien. Son principal souci a toujours été de rendre le bridge plus humain, agréable pour tous. Plusieurs fervents du bridge libre ont été convertis au duplicata par cette dernière.

Terminons en disant que Thérèse est une bridgeuse de grand talent, qui laissera sa marque sur la scène nationale quand elle le voudra bien. En attendant, elle se contente de plumer à l'occasion les supposés "gros" joueurs.

Elle se rappelle avec affection de la donne suivante, qui date presque des débuts de sa carrière de bridgeuse. Elle était en Ouest, en face de son mari Jean-Yves, alors qu'Éric Kokish était à sa droite et Peter Nagy à sa gauche.

## Nord

♠ AD  
♥ DVx  
♦ xxxx  
♣ RVxx

## Ouest

♠ xxx  
♥ xx  
♦ RDx  
♣ Dxxxx

## Est

♠ Vxxx  
♥ Axxx  
♦ V109xx  
♣ —

## Sud

♠ Rxxx  
♥ Rxxx  
♦ A  
♣ A10  
9x

Ouest	Nord	Est	Sud
Thérèse	Nagy	Jean-Yves	Kokish
-	-	-	1♣
Passe	1♦	Passe	1♥
Passe	3♣	Passe	3SA
Passe	Passe	Passe	

Il est vrai qu'on avait alerté la réponse de 1♦, puisque pour Nord-Sud il fallait une majeure cinquième pour la montrer sur une ouverture à 1♣, mais il faut tout de même donner tout le crédit à Thérèse pour avoir jugé que l'entame à pique était moins prometteuse que celle du roi de carreau.

Quoiqu'il en soit, paraît-il que l'ami Kokish grimâça encore plus quand il jugea de jouer un trèfle vers le roi, au lieu d'encaisser l'as. Moins deux!

Nous profiterons d'un prochain article pour faire part des objectifs et priorités du nouveau bureau de direction, qui se compose de :

- Jocelyn Bernier: président;
- Laurence Bouchard: vice-présidente;
- Richard Wildi: secrétaire;
- Janine Rivard: parties spéciales;
- Louise Ménard: recrutement;
- Marie-Paule Massé: publiciste.

Et comment fut votre trimestre?



# Canadian Bidding Contest



Sandy McIlwain

## NOVEMBER HONOUR ROLL

1. Lance Connell	Regina	590
2/3. Mike Hartop	Moncton	570
Allan Simon	Calgary	570
4. Joe Handles	Toronto	560
5-7. Simone Aubin	Chicoutimi, P.Q.	540
Lou Bozzer	Timmins, Ont.	540
Harold Hansen	Burnaby, B.C.	540
8-10. Ray Grace	Calgary	530
Howard Jacobs	Willowdale, Ont.	530
Doug McAvoy	Hamilton	530
11-15. Joseph Doucet	Toronto	510
Mark Golding	Salisbury, N.B.	510
Mark Moore	Windsor, Ont.	510
Tony Reus	Roxboro, P.Q.	510
J.R. Henderson	Lambeth, Ont.	510
16-18. Richard Bickley	Calgary	500
Sallie Caty	Oakville, Ont.	500
John Thompson	Peterborough, Ont.	500

Thanks once again to the many readers who took the time to answer, and to those of you who made comments, kind and otherwise. Congratulations to Lance Connell, who joins our February panel and will receive, sometime, an "expensive, recently popular" bridge book. Remember that we are always on the lookout for good problems, and that any submitted by readers that we use will be so acknowledged.

N.B. Please make sure you answer all six problems, and print your name very clearly with your answers.

## THE FEBRUARY PANEL

Before introducing this month's panel, I'd like to thank them all for the time and effort they spent on their responses. There are still some areas of the country where Canada Post has failed to make inroads, it appears, but I'll keep trying.

LANCE CONNELL (Regina): is our reader-champ. He says this is the first bidding contest he has entered. He has only been playing duplicate for 2½ years, mostly at the club level, but promises to be around for the "next 40-50 years".



SHEILA DICKIE (Richmond, B.C.): began playing duplicate in 1967. A supporter of improved bridge for women, Sheila has represented B.C. in the CWTC since its inception. She says she has received many Blue Ribbon invitations over the years, but doesn't remember why.

DANIEL DOSTON (St. Léonard, P.Q.): is only twenty-six, and has been playing bridge for thirteen years. His most recent success was winning District One of the NAOPC with Marc Lachapelle.

GREGOIRE GARINTHER (Montréal): has won four regionals and several sectionals, although he only began playing bridge in 1980. He was fifth in the 1986 CNTC, and in 1983 was the City of Montreal Non-Life Master Player of the Year.

JACQUES RIBEYRE (Port Alberni, B.C.): is something of an institution on Vancouver Island. He played rubber bridge in Europe for many years before taking up duplicate in Canada. He is proud to be learning new bidding methods in his sixties (and doing rather well with them). He played in last year's CNTC Final.

BILL SHERYER (Kitchener, Ont.): took up duplicate seriously in 1980 after earlier exposure in university. He has amassed almost 2000 masterpoints in that time, making the Top 500 list in 84, 85, 86 and 87.

JOSEPH SILVER (Hampstead, P.Q.): is the seventh-leading masterpoint holder in Canada with over 6000 points. He has won innumerable events, including the Spingold in Vancouver. Well-known throughout North America for his "Life in the Fast Lane" columns in the NABC Daily Bulletins.

SADRU VISRAM (Toronto): is a native of Tanzania who learned bridge at the University of Manchester. He has been playing duplicate seriously for only three years, but won well over 500 points in 1987 and was eighth in the Blue Ribbon Pairs in Anaheim.

## THE NOVEMBER SOLUTIONS

### A) IMPs. N-S vul.

♠ K ♥ 85 ♦ J976543 ♣ Q52

West	North	East	South
1♣	1♦	Dbl.*	?

*This was the first of seven in a recent regional Swiss match, and there seemed to be more than several options available. Clearly, we might bid some number of diamonds. Two, maybe?*

GARINTHER: 2D. Although 3D, 4D and perhaps 3NT?!! are possibilities. A preempt doesn't seem right as the hand contains more defense than you might think, and 3NT by our side is still a potential spot.

*Anyone for three diamonds? No? How about four?*

VISRAM: 4D. Despite the vulnerable overcall, I doubt we can make game in diamonds. North may have some defense against a major-suit game. My bid may effectively cut off their communications.

*Five diamonds was the popular choice.*

SHERYER: 5D. First inclination is to pass, or bid 5D and hope the opponents are short of points for slam. However, taking away Blackwood may be important despite the risk of -800.

CONNELL: 5D. Even at this vulnerability I would make the opponents guess. They surely have a major-suit game, perhaps a slam. My next choices would be tactical bids (1S, 1NT, 2C), but in team games I like to keep partner's confidence.

RIBEYRE: 5D. Pass may be best, but I'll bid and hope it doesn't go for a big number.

SILVER: 5D. I have no idea what anybody can make, but this gives the opposition a tough guess at little risk to us.

*But you don't have to bid diamonds every time you hold them.*

DOSTON: 3S. Splinter. I don't really want

to preempt as I don't know what the hand is worth and won't know what to do over four of a major. I'll show an offensive hand, although I wish my spade king were somewhere else.

*And really, who says you have to bid at all?*

DICKIE: Pass. With my regular partner I would bid 2S, a splinter. But without this understanding I'll pass and decide what to do when I find out where the opponents are going. A 3S splinter is too aggressive, unfavourable at IMPs, and any raises just take up room without telling the story of this hand.

*It sure looks as if the opponents have a play for something, but if they don't then we sure do. 5D will smoke someone out, but might yet be a phantom. 3D, 4D, etc. may leave us back where we started at our next turn.*

*In case you wondered, I chose an investigative sally of 1NT, raised to three, eventually +630, unfamiliar opponents rather stoically clutching picture cards at conclusion. Partner had three aces and a doubleton club, so you made 5D also.*

Scoring:	Action	Votes	Score
	5D	4	100
	4D, 3S	1	70
	2D, Pass	1	60
	3D	0	50
	1NT	0	50 (+ satisfaction bonus)
	1S, 1H	0	30

#### B) Matchpoints. None vul.

♠AKQJ7 ♥A10987 ♦6 ♣K3

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1♠
2NT	3NT	Pass	?

*Someone stuck this one in my hand late one night, and I still don't know what to make of it. Judging from our panel's choices, I'm not alone, for a change.*

DICKIE: Pass. Partner is slow and flat or would have bid differently. Hearts may be a disaster, but may make more tricks than No Trump. If partner had four hearts he might have bid them [*It's the weather out here, folks -SM*]. I've been wrong before.

DOSTON: Pass. Partner should be square with good minor stoppers, and is unlikely to have the cards for slam. My spot cards should help establish hearts.

*Many discussed playing hearts, but only one bid them.*

CONNELL: 4H. Forward-going, and an accurate description of my major suit holding.

*Four clubs was a reasonable choice, although some confusion seemed possible here.*

GARINTHER: 4C. Why didn't partner double? I think he has something like xx xx AKJ10xx Axx. [*This hand might produce a few defensive tricks -SM*]

VISRAM: 4C. Gerber? I hope partner will respond aces. Depending on his response I might bid 6H next!

RIBEYRE: 4C. Looking for the best slam. Could be cold for seven as partner must have hearts.

*An old favourite rounds off the list.*

SHERYER: 4NT. Blackwood. Partner should be fairly balanced, and 6S or 6NT should be playable. If he passes 4NT, we should still get a good matchpoint score.

SILVER: 4NT. North's action puzzles me. Why not double at this vulnerability, rather than give up the chance of a large penalty? Since I can't both bid hearts and make a reasonable slam try, I'll opt for a natural 4NT, while still puzzling over the bizarre 3NT bid.

*I'm not surprised people passed, as the other actions seem to rely on partner's good judgment, which may already be somewhat suspect. It's clear that a penalty-oriented auction would have been more to our liking, as an immense penalty was possible, so we might as well try to get to slam to beat the 500's and 800's. Partner should not be heavily stacked in the minors, leaving room for some heart cards, so slam is a good bet.*

*As for what is ace-asking, I think 4C is Gerber. Some people would play 5C here as ace-asking.*

Scoring:	Action	Votes	Score
	4C	3	100
	4NT	2	80
	Pass	2	70
	4H	1	60
	5H	0	50
	Slams	0	20



C) Matchpoints. None vul.

	♠ AKQJ54	♥ QJ	♦ QJ74	♣ 9
West	North	East	South	
-	-	-	1♠	
Pass	2♠	3♣	?	

*Queens and jacks, Part 10.*

SHERYER: 3D. Partner might have either or both red aces, making 4S reasonable. If he has a max with club values, 3NT may play.

DICKIE: 3D. If partner can show a heart card, I'll try the spade game.

CONNELL: 3D. 3NT is possible.

GARINTHER: 3D. Fairly straightforward. Partner has to cover two of your five losers.

VISRAM: 3D. Shows extra values and may get a help-suit response. LHO might apply pressure with 5C, which case I'll let North make the decision. [*Can we ever expect to make five opposite a simple raise? -SM*]

SILVER: 3D. There is no guarantee partner's values are in the right places. In fact, if three is the limit of the hand, I'll get a better match-point score for my 140 than for getting to game when it makes.

RIBEYRE: 3D. I'm afraid of 5C, but, what the heck, maybe we can buy the hand. I'm always going to bid 4S later.

*Doston went Ribeyre one better:*

DOSTON: 4S. I don't think partner will be able to evaluate his full potential over 3D, and I don't want to hear 3NT from him.

*Ribeyre astutely mentioned the opposition's chances for +130 or even +400, a thought which makes 4S a more attractive call.*

*Partner will certainly make a constructive call with an ace and a king, and should bid 3H with the two red kings, so missing game is certainly not the problem here.*

Scoring:	Action	Votes	Score
	3D	7	100
	4S	1	60
	3S	0	40

D) IMPs. N-S vul.

	♠ 83	♥ Q964	♦ 876	♣ AQ42
West	North	East	South	
		Pass	Pass	
1♦	1♠	Pass	?	

*This was pretty much a standoff. Partner overcalls, and you can pass or dredge up a call. If you bid, you might pick:*

GARINTHER: 1NT. Even though the values are minimal and the stopper non-existent, game is still possible, and we will be better placed to compete should the bidding become competitive.

SHERYER: 1NT. Close between 1NT, Pass, and 2S. Only flaw here is the lack of a diamond stopper. Pass is wrong when partner has four hearts. 2S may induce the wrong lead from partner.

RIBEYRE: 1NT. With too much to pass, the only logical choice.

*The question of diamond stoppers seems to keep coming up. If you can't overlook its absence but must bid, how about:*

VISRAM: 2C. I would hate to bid 1NT and hear 3NT from partner. 2C allows partner to bid hearts or NT.

DICKIE: 2C. I'm inclined to pass, but we could lose the hand if partner is stuck over West's 1NT or 2D. I can't balance intelligently over either sequence, so I'll screw up my courage and bid 2C now.

*On the down side of this choice, do you want to play 2C?*

*On close hands, you can always pass, fortunately.*

CONNELL: Pass. A tough choice between 1NT and Pass, but 1NT should be saved for hands with a stopper. I can show delayed support later. It is tempting to bid, but game is unlikely. Expecting "perfect" cards from partner often leads to grief.

*Words to live by.*

DOSTON: Pass. As I am a passed hand, partner would double with both majors or a good hand, expecting me to bid a three-card major before four-card clubs, thus saving club bids for hands where clubs is the place to play.

*A point well taken, but many hands won't suit themselves to this approach (e.g. ♠A10xxxx♥KJ10x♦Kx♣x).*

*Our most experienced member stood alone here:*

SILVER: 2S. Can't bid 1NT without a stopper. At matchpoints I would pass, but vulnerable at IMPs game is too tempting to pass up.

*This bid doesn't appear more forced than any other, but may make the investigation of other contracts less straightforward.*

*The more I look at the possibilities, the more I like the pass.*

Scoring:	Action	Votes	Score
	1NT	3	100
	2C	2	80
	P	2	70
	2S	1	70

#### E) IMPs. None vul.

♠AKJ7 ♥AK ♦62 ♣J9842

West	North	East	South
-	-	3NT*	Dbl.
4♣	5♣	Pass	?

\*Gambling

*Sooner or later pass has to be right, but surely this isn't the time. This hand is from last year's CNTC Finals.*

RIBEYRE: Pass. With slam interest, partner should double, forcing East to show his suit (*What if it's clubs? -SM*) I take this ambiguous bid as a club suit with no diamond control, and pass with fingers crossed.

SHERYER: Pass. Bidding further risks a minus. If partner has diamonds he should have bid them. I assume this is not some sort of cue bid.

CARINTHER: Pass. 5C certainly looks natural. What else can it be, looking at your hand? (*Well... -SM*)

DICKIE: Pass. 5C cannot be a cue bid, and as I have no diamond control, I can't take another call.

*These analysts make up the majority, but there were other interpretations.*

VISRAM: 6C! North is an unpassed hand and shows values. Wasted diamond values are unlikely (*how about three small? -SM*) If he bids 6H next, I'll correct to 6S.

DOSTON: 6C. Looks like partner has a club void. He didn't double 4C and won't be putting pressure on me. In case he has the red suits I'll let him choose where to play.

*Notice that both players who raised clubs were very prepared to play elsewhere. Insisting on it were:*

SILVER: 6S. No way of determining the perfect level after a preempt. I'll take our best shot for a good score. Even if we're off two diamond tricks, there's no guarantee they'll find the right lead.

CONNELL: 6S. I trust partner has both major suits and a diamond control. With clubs, he would have doubled.

*I couldn't agree more. If doubles on these auctions aren't for penalties, then we should trade in our kings and queens for lottery tickets. I don't get a vote, however.*

*When it counted, Mike Cafferata bid 5S after "almost" passing. North, with ♠Qxxxx ♥QJxx ♦KQJx ♣void, raised to six, but ran into a Ken-ny Scholes (ace of diamonds, ruff a diamond).*

Scoring:	Action	Votes	Score
	Pass	4	100
	6C	2	90
	6S	2	90
	5S	0	60

*P.S. Early reader returns show 5S leading all others by about 3-1. Well done, readers.*

#### F) Matchpoints. Both vul.

♠K62 ♥J10762 ♦K4 ♣AKJ

West	North	East	South
2♥*	Pass	2♣	Pass
Pass	Pass		

\*Both majors at least 4-4  
Your lead?

DOSTON: S2., To reduce ruffs. The one danger is that declarer will gain a tempo and go after diamonds.

SILVER: S2. The reason they are so low is they lack high cards. A trump lead will reduce their trumps tricks as well.

RIBEYRE: S2. I wish I could have doubled for penalties.

SHERYER: S2. To prevent them scrambling for tricks on a cross-ruff. The club control may be required for further trump leads.

*Garinther and Dickie led the spade six for the same reason as everyone else, but why the six, I don't know, so I'll call them equal in the scoring.*



<b>Scoring:</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Votes</b>	<b>Score</b>
	Spade	8	100
	Club	0	60
	Diamond	0	40
	Heart	0	20

### THE MAY PROBLEMS

To enter the May contest, write your answers to the May problems, together with your name and address, on a sheet of paper or postcard and send to:

Canadian Bidding Contest  
c/o Sandy McIlwain  
#6, 2160 - 39th Ave. West  
Vancouver, B.C. V6M 1T5

The reader with the best score will receive a bridge book and an invitation to the expert panel.

#### A) IMPs. N-S vul.

♠ J743 ♥ 862 ♦ 954 ♣ K108

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
1♥	Dbl.	Pass	1♠
2♦	3♦	5♦	Pass
Pass	5♥	Pass	?

#### B) Matchpoints. N-S vul.

♠ QJ86542 ♥ 10963 ♦ 7 ♣ K

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
1♥	Pass	Pass	?

#### C) Matchpoints. None vul.

♠ QJ976 ♥ A53 ♦ 64 ♣ K102

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
-	1♦	Pass	1♠
Pass	3♦	Pass	?

#### D) IMPs. N-S vul.

♠ 52 ♥ AJ10 ♦ Q962 ♣ Q754

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT
2♥	Pass	Pass	?

#### E) Matchpoints. N-S vul.

♠ AQ932 ♥ KQ86543 ♦ 10 ♣ -

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
1♦	2♣	5♦	?

#### F) IMPs. E-W vul.

♠ K108432 ♥ 8 ♦ KQJ109 ♣ A

<b>West</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>East</b>	<b>South</b>
-	1♥	Pass	1♠
Pass	3♥	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♥	Pass	4NT#
Pass	5♣*	Dbl.	?

# Roman Key Card Blackwood for Hearts  
\* 0 or 3 Key Cards.



## Announcement

**BORN:** On December 3, 1987, to Beverly Kraft and Eric Kokish: a son, Matthew Samuel Kraft-Kokish. Mother and son doing well; Father recovering.



**Kraft-Kokish**

play it there or defend for penalties.

With 9-13 HCPs responder bids 2♣. With 10-12 HCPs opener passes with a 5 card club suit or bids 2♦ or 2♥. With 16-17 HCPs he bids 2♠ or 2NT (note a 10 to 12 1 No Trump suit).

Responder bids 2NT over the 1NT opening with 14-15 HCPs and 3♣ with 16+ HCPs. With 14+ HCPs and a good 5+ card suit responder jumps to 3♦, ♥ or ♠ or 4♣.

Anyone wanting a fuller description of the Jason adaptation of 2-way no trump can get a copy by sending a stamped self addressed envelope to Marv Jason, 28 Commanche Dr., Ottawa K2E 6E9.



# 1988 CBF Finals Information

*If you qualify for the national finals in any of the big three CBF Championships, please take note of the following information:*

## CNTC

The national finals will be held in Vancouver June 4 to 8. The round-robin will last for three days, the semi-final will be on June 7 and the final match on June 8.

The event will be held on the campus of the University of British Columbia. It is recommended that all participants stay at the Conference Centre, since the nearest hotels are at the airport, a twenty minute drive. For housing reservations, call (604) 228-5441 before May 2 and identify yourself as a bridge tournament participant. There is a choice of type of accommodations:

- Single: \$26/night. Six single rooms form a “quad”, sharing washroom and lounge facilities. This is an excellent solution for six-man teams. Individual members should book separately, but specify that they want to be in a quad with their teammates.
- Studio suite: \$45/night single occupancy only.
- Bedroom suite: \$55/night single or double occupancy, with a roll-out bed.

The annual Vancouver Summer Sectional will be held over the weekend at the same location, so bring your spouse/groupie and he/she will be able to play bridge and mingle with the locals while you play in the CNTC. All sectional participants are also welcome at the Friday night reception (June 3) which will welcome the CNTC players.

Participants are reminded that this event, like all CBF Finals, will be non-smoking, but there is easy access for smokers to step outside or in the halls.

This promises to be a “fun” event with lots of opportunities to go sightseeing (a local committee will help with transportation, etc.), shopping or (if you’re so inclined) nude sunbathing at Wreck Beach.

The CNTC winners will qualify for the Bermuda Bowl trials with Bermuda and Mexico.

## AC-COPC

This event will be held in Quebec City on July 2 and 3.

For the first time, partial travel subsidies will be available for qualifiers. Details on subsidies, precise location, etc. will be published in the May issue of the Digest.

## CWTC

The national finals for the Canadian Women’s Team Championship (formerly known as Canadian Ladies’ Team Championship) will be held July 9 - 13 in London, Ont., at the Park Lane Hotel. Rooms will be \$56/night for twin occupancy. For reservations, call toll-free (800) 267-8378.

## Nationwide Rookie-Master Game on April 5

The annual Canada-wide Rookie-Master Game will be held at bridge clubs across Canada on Tuesday, April 5. As usual, computer hands will be used and hand analysis sheets will be available after the game. One member of each partnership must have less

than five masterpoints.

Bridge clubs which would like to host this game should contact the national coordinator, Mrs. Janice Anderson, at 107 Scrivener Cres., Regina, Sask. S4N 4V6, tel. (306) 757-6211.

# Silver For The Defense

Montreal's Joe Silver is one of the country's most distinguished and colourful bridge personalities. He has won several North American championships, including the Vanderbilt, and in partnership with Toronto's Irving Litvack, is a former winner of the Cavendish Pairs. By profession, Silver is an attorney, which explains perhaps why, when we asked him to give us some material, we received a bunch of hands involved with defense.

Defense is the toughest part of the game, and also the most fascinating. It is especially important in rubber bridge, because 90% of all players are poor card holders, and consequently are defending more often than declaring. The following hands all came up at high stake rubber bridge games at Montreal's famous Linton Bridge Club:



Dealer: East  
Vul.: Neither  
(E-W have a 60 partial)

♠ A7  
♥ Q64  
♦ J972  
♣ Q983

♠ J96543  
♥ 1085  
♦ A  
♣ AJ5

♠ 8  
♥ AJ92  
♦ KQ105  
♣ K1064

♠ KQ102  
♥ K73  
♦ 8643  
♣ 72

West	North	East	South
Silver		Mancuso	
—	—	1♦	1♠
Dbl.	Pass	Pass	Pass

The bidding was short and sweet. Silver led the ace of diamonds and switched to the ♥10 which was ducked to declarer's king. The ace and king of trumps were played, Mancuso discarding a heart on the second round. The rest of the play now centered

around one question only: Would declarer score his 10 of spades? He played a small diamond from hand and Silver, desperate to reduce his trump holding, ruffed. He played the 8 of hearts to partner's 9, and when she continued with the king of diamonds, Silver ruffed again! He exited with his last heart; Renee Mancuso (a Canadian Women's

champion) now played her diamond queen and Silver discarded his club jack. Then came the 13th heart which declarer refused to ruff, discarding a club. In order to avoid an endplay, Silver threw his ace of clubs, so partner won trick 11 with her club king and Silver was left with his J9 of trumps over declarer's Q10. In order to get the maximum 500 penalty, not only did Silver have to trump two of partner's winners, he also had to discard an ace!

On the next hand, Silver's partner was another Canadian champion, Mark Stein:

Dealer: East  
Vul.: Neither  
(N-S have a 20 partial)

♠ A105  
♥ 43  
♦ QJ96  
♣ K654

♠ Q9873  
♥ J10  
♦ A42  
♣ J92

♠ J2  
♥ K98752  
♦ K107  
♣ Q7

♠ K64  
♥ AQ6  
♦ 853  
♣ A1083

West	North	East	South
<i>Silver</i>		<i>Stein</i>	
—	—	Pass	1♣
Pass	1♦	2♥	Pass
Pass	3♣	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

West	North	East	South
<i>Silver</i>		<i>Menachi</i>	
—	—	Pass	Pass
Pass	1♣	3♦	3♠
Pass	4♣	Pass	Pass
Pass			

Because of his 20 partial, South greedily stretched to a thin game which would have made against most defenders. Silver led the heart jack and continued with the 10 when declarer ducked the opening lead. South took his queen on the second round and led a diamond to dummy's queen and Stein's king. Back came another heart, establishing the suit. On this trick, Silver, sensing that partner had no entry for his good hearts, pitched his ace of diamonds, quite casually. At least he claims it was casually. Since Stein was good enough to hold the guarded 10 of diamonds, declarer had to go down one.

Of course, bridge is not just a game of aces and kings, it pays (at rubber bridge, quite literally) to watch the spot cards as the following hand will show. Once again, Silver was partnered by a Canadian champion, this time one of the Linton's owners, Ghassan Menachi. Menachi is a rubber bridge specialist who won the CNTC in 1985, which is remarkable since it was the very first bridge tournament he ever entered!

Dealer: East  
Vul.: North-South

	♠ AKJ5	
	♥ Q43	
	♦ 987	
	♣ A32	
♠ 9432		♠ —
♥ 109876		♥ AJ5
♦ AK		♦ QJ10654
♣ J9		♣ 10765
	♠ Q10876	
	♥ K2	
	♦ 32	
	♣ KQ84	

Not an easy hand to go down in, but look what happened: Silver led his top diamonds and switched to the ♥10 which was allowed to run the declarer's king. A spade was led to the king, Ghassan pitching a diamond. The ♥Q was led and won by the ace. On the next diamond, declarer ruffed with the 10 while Silver ditched a heart. Then declarer crossed to ♠A and completed the dummy reversal by ruffing the last heart with his ♠Q. Then he led the ♠7 which Silver cunningly covered with the 9, and dummy's ace won, leaving:

	♠ J5	
	♥ —	
	♦ —	
	♣ 32	
♠ 43		♠ —
♥ 9		♥ —
♦ —		♦ 6
♣ J		♣ 1076
	♠ 8	
	♥ —	
	♦ —	
	♣ KQ8	

Of course, all declarer had to do was cash the J5 of spades and claim. But that ♠5 looked awfully small; so he came to his ♠8 and tried to cash his KQ of clubs. Down one.

The final exhibit was less successful for the defense. However, keep in mind that for once Silver was not playing with, but against a Canadian champion. (Needless to say, it rankles Silver that after nine years of trying, he has yet to win his country's championship.)



Dealer: West  
 Vul.: North-South

♠ A104  
 ♥ AKQ4  
 ♦ A  
 ♣ AKQJ10

♠ K85  
 ♥ 5  
 ♦ K98543  
 ♣ 873

♠ QJ73  
 ♥ J987  
 ♦ 62  
 ♣ 942

♠ 962  
 ♥ 10632  
 ♦ QJ107  
 ♣ 62

West	North	East	South
		<i>Silver</i>	<i>Menachi</i>
3♦	4♦	Pass	4♥
Pass	5♦	Pass	5♥
Pass	6♦	Pass	6♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass

Not a bad dummy, but East-West held enough to show a profit on this hand. West got off to the excellent spade lead, taken by dummy's ace. Two high trumps followed, West pitching a small diamond on the second one. After much thought, Menachi played the ♦A and four rounds of clubs, discarding a spade on the third round. What would you do as East on the fourth round of clubs? Stop reading and decide! Silver trumped with the ♥J, while declarer shed his last spade. Menachi ruffed the spade return in his hand, led the ♦Q, let it ride and scored 1630. Did you find the correct defense? As Silver was the first to point out, he should have discarded a diamond on the fourth club and even Menachi couldn't have made the hand. So Silver kissed goodbye to some \$200. But every cloud has a Silver lining: it was only Canadian money.

---

Gordon *continued from p. 5*

well, but we also wish you any luck you will need.

Dianna: Thank you. We'll need a little luck, but if we play well, we will create some of our own luck. I've come to believe that.

Digest: Thank you, Dianna.

Reus *continued from p. 5*

of mine ever since I started playing bridge. It would be a great thrill to win for Canada.

Our daughter, Lindsay, touched a deck of cards the other day and said, "I'm going to play in diamonds." She's two.

Digest: We'll wait for her! Thank you, Sharyn.




---

Thorpe *continued from p. 4*

we are there.

We hope to get help from fine players such as George Mittelman and John Carruthers, who are fine theorists with experience against such unusual bids. We hope that Canada's 1987 Bermuda Bowl team will return from Jamaica with further suggestions about what is being played currently. We hope they will bring back copies of the women's systems used in the Venice Cup event.

I enjoy playing with Gloria because she never gives up and she loves playing. She is always up to play. She has a very even temperament; she recovers quickly from a bad result whether it is my fault, her fault, or our fault. It doesn't carry over to any of the next hands.

I can't think of anything that I would rather have happen than to stand there listening to the Canadian anthem being played! If it happens, there will be a flood of tears.

Digest: Thank you, Katie.




---

Silverman *continued from p. 4*

friends and like each other. That makes it very easy to discuss things away from the table. Katie is very even-tempered and even-keeled. She is a supportive partner. If I have a bad result, she does not look to make me feel any worse than I already do. She is very empathetic. It is a pleasure to play with her.

Digest: Thank you, Gloria.



# Inside the CBF



by Aidan Ballantyne

## Towards an Independent Canadian League?

Last April the CBF Board unanimously passed a motion requesting that the ACBL examine the possibility of restructuring bridge administration in North America. The CBF Board's underlying wish is that the ACBL commission an independent study on the benefits and costs of creating a financially independent Canadian Bridge League that would continue to be closely associated with the ACBL. The rationale for such reorganization, as outlined in previous columns, is to solve present administrative problems and provide a viable vehicle for promoting bridge in Canada. The CBF has itself struck a committee to research possible options. As a member of that committee, I recently submitted a general restructuring plan/strategy to the ACBL through Percy Bean, district 19 director and member of the ACBL Canadian affairs committee. That proposal has since been endorsed by the Vancouver unit. Although the submission does not reflect an official CBF position, it is one that may be acceptable to many western Canadian bridge players. The proposed plan requires preliminary study of the cost of putting in place a new Canadian Bridge League (CBL) as follows:

1. CBL has exclusive right to administer bridge in Canada.
2. CBL has exclusive right to levy membership fees directly from individual Canadian players.
3. ACBL would evolve into a federation of four independent leagues, each

representing an ACBL country (U.S., Canada, Mexico, and Bermuda).

4. CBL would have 6 districts, or zones, each with its own elected representative. Potentially, a separate office could be set up in each region to administer programs locally.
5. CBL objectives would be a Canadian equivalent of ACBL objectives, with emphasis on promoting bridge through competition, education, published material, and active ethics.
6. Masterpoints: the ACBL (as a North American Federation) would continue to administer a North American masterpoint plan. The CBL would pay the ACBL for that service, on behalf of Canadian players.
7. Education and marketing: the CBL would develop its own programs, in a form suitable for Canada. Potentially, the CBL would have government and corporate support in implementing these programs.
8. Tournaments: the CBL would sanction all Canadian tournaments. The role of the ACBL tournament division would have to be negotiated, given the problem of coordinating tournament scheduling near the border and the challenge of maintaining the present, high level of directing. Potentially, a director exchange program would be put into place. ACBL-wide tournaments such as the NAP would continue to be available to Canadian players.
9. Published material: CBL members would receive a CBL magazine (possibly bi-monthly) in return for CBL membership. Optionally, Canadians could continue to receive the ACBL Bulletin, by paying an amount over and above CBL membership.
10. Clubs: the CBL would sanction and regulate all Canadian clubs. Clubs would continue to benefit from the masterpoint plan.
11. Charity program: the CBL would continue to administer a Canadian charities program.



What would all this mean to the average Canadian bridge player? The status quo would be retained to the extent that Canadians and Americans would continue to play in each other's tournaments, play in North American championships, and be credited with identical masterpoints. However, Canadian bridge players would enjoy additional benefits insofar as organization would become:

- more streamlined since only one jurisdiction would operate in Canada;
- more responsive since the scale of operations would be reduced;
- more sensitive to regional differences since component districts would be reduced in size, especially in the west;
- potentially better off financially since the devalued Canadian dollar would act to attract U.S. players yet our surpluses/sanction fees would remain in Canada;
- more efficient since a Canadian organization could potentially provide improved service at a lower per capita Canadian dollar cost;
- more successful in promoting the game nationwide since a Canadian office would provide a useful contact point for media and could also more efficiently coordinate government and corporate sponsorship.

At this point the big question is the cost to individual Canadian players. In that context, the potential for government and corporate sponsorship must be accurately assessed. The CBF has already approached Sports Canada on the matter and initial response appears favourable. Ultimately, however, successful restructuring may require a well-organized lobby. As a first step, more information is needed on administrative costs, expected CBL membership fees, and potential service gains. This will allow Canadians to weigh the benefits and costs in deciding whether or not to proceed with reorganization. The CBF has already asked the ACBL to commission the necessary independent study, on behalf of its Canadian members. So far, the ACBL has

not come through, perhaps pending further input from Canadian players and units. The CBF Board hopes that Canadians will appreciate the great potential for reorganization and at least support further research into the issue. Please make your views known to the CBF Board and to the ACBL.



## JASON ADAPTATION TO 2-WAY NO TRUMP

by Marvin Jason, Ottawa

In chess the person making the opening move is considered to have a slight advantage because he sets the type of game and makes the first attacking move. In my opinion the dealer in Bridge being the first bidder using a system geared for the purpose should also have a slight advantage. This slight advantage occurs because he can bid without any prior interference. The system I have developed to enhance opener's advantage is based on aspects of Standard American Precision and Roman. With the exceptions of 1♣ and 1♥ all bids up to and including 2NT are multiple or two way.

The keystone bid in this system is the 2-way 1 No Trump. It means either 10-12 HCPs or 16-17 HCPs. 1♦ followed by a No Trump bid means 13-15 HCPs. 1♣ followed by a No Trump bid means 18-19 HCPs.

Responder passes over 1NT with 8 or less HCPs unless there is a double or he has a 5+ card suit. With a 5+ card suit other than clubs when not doubled he bids it. If doubled he bids any 5+ card suit including clubs. If doubled and no 5+ card suit he passes and partner bids his 5 card suit. If the last partner does not have a 5 card suit he redoubles and a search is made up the line for the fit. If the first partner after the double redoubles it means he would like to

*continued on p. 25*

## An Interview with Audrey Grant



**Digest:** *You were recently chosen to write the Student Textbook for the ACBL's new Club Series of introductory bridge lessons. How did this come about?*

**Audrey:** When Doug Drew was president of the ACBL, he put in place a new set of objectives emphasizing the important role of the League in both marketing and education. As part of the educational thrust, the ACBL decided to set up an accreditation program for bridge teachers and to provide them with a standard course of study.

This ensures that the ACBL has some control over the quality of its educational program. To be accredited, teachers must take a 10-hour training course in education and marketing, followed by an oral and written examination on the material covered. For many bridge teachers, whose background is in bridge but not in education, this is an eye-opening experience. Once the teachers have been trained, they can use any material they like, but the League provides a standard text for each segment of a bridge course

since many teachers are at a loss for a course of study which is based on sound educational principles.

To develop the initial program, the ACBL was not as interested in bridge expertise as in expertise in the fields of education and marketing. As a consultant with the Toronto Board of Education, I had written several courses of study for teachers (e.g. in the new math) and had given demonstration lessons in a variety of subjects. I also had considerable experience in marketing and in bridge education, since I had set up and run a couple of bridge clubs and had taught several thousand bridge students. Finally, I had already written a textbook, *The Joy of Bridge*, and an accompanying student workbook, *The Joy of Bridge Companion*, which embodied many of the educational concepts which the ACBL wanted in their program. Thus, the ACBL asked me to write the material for their introductory lesson series, called the *Club Series*.

**Digest:** *What is different about the Club Series from other bridge material on the market?*

**Audrey:** One of the features of the *Club Series* is that it was written to help teachers handle the large discrepancy in skill that may exist in a class composed of both absolute beginners and those with some experience in social bridge. It was written from both a teaching and marketing point of view.

In teaching, the idea is to let the students discover for themselves as much as possible. The key for the teacher is to know when to step in and when to keep quiet. Teachers need to move the students gently from the known to the unknown.

Appropriate marketing techniques need to be carefully integrated into the course. For example, when you have a mixture of beginners and social bridge players in the first lesson, you are walking a tightrope. If you cater too much to one group, you'll lose the

other group. Proper marketing means that you have to keep both groups interested long enough for them to get to know and like you. Students will forgive your mistakes and show much more patience once they know you and will then return faithfully week after week.

The first few exercises take both groups into consideration. The students start playing right away, whist style (no bidding). The cards are played out in duplicate fashion, which is a new challenge for the experienced social players, while the beginners are learning how to take a trick.

In one of the early exercises, the players have to predict which cards in their hand will win tricks. I tell the more experienced players that this is tough. Again, the players with prior experience remain motivated while the beginners are being introduced to the basic concepts.

In another exercise, the players are asked what they would lead from ♠KQJ1098 ♥A32 ♦A32 ♣A. Believe it or not, most social bridge players do not know about leading the "top of a sequence" although they may have heard about "fourth best". Another opportunity for them to learn something new while the beginners and discovering the advantage of leading a Spade rather than taking all their Aces first. **Digest:** *Did you determine the bidding approach used in the course?*

**Audrey:** No, the ACBL told me what they wanted. The League took a poll of players such as Bobby Wolff and Mike Lawrence and asked them what 'basic' Standard American should be for the beginning series.

For construction of the practice play hands, I relied heavily on players such as Eric Rodwell and my husband, David Lindop. For example, I asked for a dramatic hand where there is the temptation to take a finesse using dummy's ace-queen.

However, if the student counts winners, there are nine tricks available in the 3NT contract without taking the finesse. The hand is constructed so that, if the finesse is taken, the opponents can find a deadly switch to defeat the contract. Such an example illustrates to the student the concept of counting

winners and "taking your tricks and running". I needed expert help in constructing such hands to ensure that the bidding makes sense and no strange plays by the students will result in the point to be missed.

**Digest:** *Does the Club Series teach four- or five-card majors?*

**Audrey:** The text is based on a five-card major style since the ACBL hopes many of the students will move on into duplicate bridge where five-card majors appear to be more popular. However, there are no advanced concepts such as forcing notrump or negative doubles. It is just an introductory eight-week course and we want to keep everything as simple as possible for the students. The course does cover overcalls and take-out doubles in addition to bidding without competition.

As I mentioned earlier, accredited teachers can use any text they feel is appropriate. Those who want to teach four-card majors can use the *Joy of Bridge* and the *Joy of Bridge Companion* which incorporate all the same basic ideas as the League text.

**Digest:** *In addition to the textbook, you wrote the Teacher's Manual for the Club Series. What does it contain?*

**Audrey:** The *Teacher's Manual* has a detailed outline of all the material that should be covered in an introductory course and gives examples of how to introduce each concept. It even includes some of the standard jokes that I tell to my students. There is also a general discussion on the principles of teaching. The manual is written in such detail that you can teach directly from it.

**Digest:** *Where can one get copies of the textbook and manual?*

**Audrey:** They are both available from the ACBL and are advertised in the Bulletin. The ACBL also plans to distribute the textbook to bookstores.

**Digest:** *How does one get to be an accredited ACBL teacher?*

**Audrey:** There are courses available at each of the North American Championships. In addition, the course can be run by local units that are interested in promoting bridge in their area.

Teachers who pass the course become

ACBL accredited teachers. The ACBL is getting a 1-800 number so that institutions and groups interested in running a set of bridge lessons can call the League and get a list of the local accredited teachers.

Each course for the bridge teachers is run by a 'teacher trainer'. I initially did all of the teacher training at various locations across North America but I recently ran a course in Memphis in which I trained 10 people to be teacher trainers. This will allow the program to expand much more rapidly.

**Digest:** *How can a unit get a training course run in their area?*

**Audrey:** The unit needs to contact Memphis and work out the details. Many ACBL units are paying in part or totally for the course to be run for teachers in the area. Usually, the unit arranges for an 'area co-ordinator' who will be responsible for rounding up the teachers and helping to arrange classes and student games once the training has taken place.

The enthusiasm shown so far has been fantastic. In a test market in Omaha, the first lesson was given free to new students and we had 97% of them come back and pay for the rest of the series. That was thrilling.

After the first series of lessons, the students are encouraged to play in recreational bridge games, organized by the League with the help of the area manager.

**Digest:** *What happens after the Club Series of lessons?*

**Audrey:** The League is planning a Diamond Series on play of the hand, a Heart Series on defense and a Spade Series on duplicate bridge, including some conventions.

In the meantime, I have just completed a book with Eric Rodwell called *Bridge Maxims* which teachers can use as the basis for a play of the hand course. It covers the play of the hand in an orderly progression, incorporating all the sound educational principles that are introduced in the Club Series.

**Digest:** *What other projects have you been involved in lately?*

**Audrey:** I have just finished putting together a 26-week television series on bridge with TV London.

It is being aired by TV Ontario starting in September on Thursday evenings at 10:30 p.m. We are also negotiating with Alberta Access to air the show and several U.S. stations are interested.

**Digest:** *What is the format of the show?*

**Audrey:** World Champion Eric Rodwell is my co-host and we discuss a couple of hands as they are being bid and played out by four players at the bridge table. Several players from London assisted us in playing out the hands. Most of the emphasis is on the play and we use graphics to help illustrate how declarer should make a plan each time. Many of the hands are based on the material from the *Bridge Maxims* book.

We follow up with a quiz and a short interview with an international star. I was lucky enough to get interviews with such players as Eddie Kantar, Alfred Sheinwold, Dorothy Truscott and Zia Mahmood.

**Digest:** *Anything else?*

**Audrey:** I have also done a video with Bobby Wolff called *Secrets of the Experts*. It's currently being advertised in the Bulletin. It's the second video I've done. My first video was at a more basic level and was based on the *Joy of Bridge*. It discusses *No Trump and Responses*. Bobby and I are planning a series of videos if this one proves successful and, so far, it has been selling well.

**Digest:** *Are all your future plans centred around bridge?*

**Audrey:** I would like to branch out into other areas in which my background in education will be useful. I plan to put together a series called something like *Audrey and the Experts* on a variety of games. I'll get together with a top expert in the game to get the expert advice I need and use my skills to turn it into a 'how to' book for beginners... a sort of Coles' Notes for adults.

I'm also busy writing a book on etiquette...how to get on with your spouse, ex-inlaws, etc...which I hope to have published in the spring.

**Digest:** *That's quite a busy slate. Thank you, Audrey, and good luck with your many endeavours.*



# All-time Top Canadian Masterpoint Holders

1. Eric R Murray, Toronto ON	8719	59. Frank Markotich, Scarborough ON	3164
2. John M Molson, Montreal PQ	7621	60. Boguslaw Lagowski, Ottawa ON	3146
3. Eric O Kokish, Westmount PQ	7239	61. Michael J Kenny, Streetsville ON	3142
4. C Bruce Elliott, Weston ON	6441	62. Aidan Ballantyne, Vancouver BC	3130
5. Sami R Kehela, Toronto ON	6166	63. Mrs Barbara J Saltsman, Montreal PQ	3129
6. Paul L Heitner, Toronto ON	6080	64. Kai K Cheng, Winnipeg MB	3121
7. Joseph Silver, Hampstead PQ	6078	65. Michael A Cummings, Willowdale ON	3098
8. Boris Baran, Montreal PQ	5899	66. Mrs Sydney Isaacs, London ON	3096
9. Doug Fraser, Mont Royal PQ	5665	67. Ellwood E Clarke, Ottawa ON	3079
10. Ted Horning, Thornhill ON	5014	68. Mrs Mary Edney, Kingston ON	3073
11. George Mittelman, Toronto ON	4937	69. Mrs Joan Lupovich, Montreal PQ	3060
12. John G Carruthers, Toronto ON	4930	70. R W Chow, Toronto ON	3044
13. Laurence Betts, Burnaby BC	4771	71. Joe H Kerger, Calgary AB	3019
14. Leo F Steil, Vancouver BC	4763	72. Dick L McKinney, Edmonton AB	3004
15. Robert Lebi, Toronto ON	4755	73. Boris D Crapko, Richmond BC	2972
16. Percy E Sheardown, Toronto ON	4308	74. Louis Woodcock, Hamilton ON	2965
17. Mrs Sandra E Fraser, Mont Royal PQ	4190	75. Ken R Warren, Pickering ON	2963
18. Subhash C Gupta, Calgary AB	4150	76. Mrs Jackie B Begin, Montreal PQ	2962
19. David Stothart, Ottawa ON	4054	77. Lauren Miller, Vancouver BC	2930
20. A Feingold, Edmonton AB	4042	78. Michael P Caferata, Scarborough ON	2906
21. Stephen C Brown, Ottawa ON	4037	79. Michael J Roche, Toronto ON	2903
22. Fred Hoffer, Cote St Luc PQ	3993	80. F Sontag, Vancouver BC	2884
23. Adrian A Hicks, Vancouver BC	3986	81. G Sekhar, Winnipeg MB	2877
24. Ron Borg, Richmond BC	3967	82. Mrs Dianna M Gordon, Toronto ON	2874
25. David Curry, Nepean ON	3908	83. James M McAvoiy, Victoria BC	2853
26. Paul Hagen, Vancouver BC	3881	84. Martin Kirr, Toronto ON	2845
27. Pierre Daigneault, Chomedey PQ	3842	85. Robert F Crosby, Edmonton AB	2834
28. Mrs Mary Paul, Toronto ON	3789	86. James B Pritchard, Edmonton AB	2828
29. F E Gauthier, Montreal PQ	3756	87. Duncan R Phillips, Toronto ON	2792
30. John R Stevens, St Cathrines ON	3716	88. Mrs Solange Bouchard, Jonquiere PQ	2740
31. David Lindop, Toronto ON	3697	89. George A Caldwell, Fredericton NB	2735
32. Ray Jotcham, Scarborough ON	3670	90. Franco Bandoni, Toronto ON	2735
33. John Guoba, Toronto ON	3668	91. Stephen H Aarons, Toronto ON	2731
34. Mrs Anna K Boivin, Montreal PQ	3652	92. Mrs Francine C Cimon, Montreal PQ	2718
35. Ed W Bridson, Toronto ON	3599	93. Bill Bowman, Ottawa ON	2717
36. Bert Wings, Elginburg ON	3592	94. Don A Brazeau, Vancouver BC	2706
37. Don S Cowan, Toronto ON	3551	95. Andre Laliberte, Neuchatel PQ	2687
38. Duncan H Smith, Saskatoon SK	3533	96. Gary B Tomczyk, Parksville BC	2670
39. Ken J Murray, Agincourt ON	3531	97. Dan R Jacob, Vancouver BC	2668
40. John T Bowman, Nepean ON	3531	98. J Gilles Boivin, Montreal PQ	2654
41. Mrs Helene Beaulieu, Sherbrooke PQ	3518	99. Victor Giaccone, Nepean ON	2642
42. Jim E Riegle, Ottawa ON	3487	100. Douglas Thomson, Winnipeg MB	2634
43. Pat Roy, Sherbrooke PQ	3424	101. Mrs Gail Jotcham, Scarborough ON	2609
44. Alan H Doane, Halifax NS	3392	102. Richard J Hart, Toronto ON	2606
45. Keith R Balcombe, Oshawa ON	3378	103. P Drew Cannell, Winnipeg MB	2575
46. Cliff V Campbell, Thunder Bay ON	3368	104. Mrs Pat Smolensky, Calgary AB	2575
47. Richard H Edney, Kingston ON	3356	105. John Gowdy, Toronto ON	2537
48. Mrs Sharyn Reus, Roxboro PQ	3351	106. A W De Groot, Winnipeg MB	2537
49. Leo Glaser, Willowdale ON	3345	107. Michel B Lorber, St Laurent PQ	2534
50. Christoph B Hough, Toronto ON	3299	108. Mark Rosenbloom, Montreal PQ	2526
51. Gordon R McOrmond, Richmond BC	3286	109. Patricia F Lopushinsky, Edmonton AB	2525
52. Mrs Helen R Roche, Calgary AB	3252	110. Peter Hollander, Pierrefonds PQ	2521
53. Jerry Aceti, Sudbury ON	3250	111. Erik Viires, Montreal PQ	2518
54. Peter E Herold, N Vancouver BC	3233	112. Brooke Nelles, London ON	2517
55. Mrs Madeline M McGill, Calgary AB	3217	113. Stephen E Cooper, Toronto ON	2511
56. John J Currie, Halifax NS	3209	114. William A Wallace, Sudbury ON	2489
57. Bob Connop, Burnaby BC	3205	115. John W Rayner, Mississauga ON	2481
58. Martin Caley, Ottawa ON	3202	116. Eric R Shepherd, Hamilton ON	2478

117.	J J Sabino, Pickering ON	2477	182.	Stephen Willard, Edmonton AB	2077
118.	David J McLellan, Thunder Bay ON	2476	183.	Michel J Lamothe, Ottawa ON	2071
119.	Brian J Johnston, Toronto ON	2466	184.	P Treuil, Ottawa ON	2068
120.	Allen McDonald, Ottawa ON	2449	185.	Paul Godin, Montreal PQ	2067
121.	Mrs D M Cole, Brockville ON	2445	186.	Andrew Tylman, Toronto ON	2058
122.	Sheila Forbes, Toronto ON	2431	187.	Elmer C Goodman, Lethbridge AB	2054
123.	John Landeryou, Lethbridge AB	2422	188.	Irving A Litvack, Toronto ON	2040
124.	Mark Stein, Mount Royal PQ	2401	189.	Byron R Nilsson, Lethbridge AB	2034
125.	Stan Cabay, Edmonton AB	2401	190.	Mrs Mary Fines, N Vancouver BC	2034
126.	Ted Hicks, Coquitlam BC	2394	191.	D A Brock, Brampton ON	2032
127.	Jonathan J Steinberg, Toronto ON	2384	192.	John Hurdle, Richmond BC	2027
128.	James A Priebe, Mississauga ON	2383	193.	Richard G Anderson, Regina SK	2024
129.	Don Brander, N Vancouver BC	2377	194.	James A Kirby, Dartmouth NS	2021
130.	John G Stewart, Halifax NS	2375	195.	Gregory J Arbour, Vancouver BC	2018
131.	Barry C Harper, Saskatoon SK	2372	196.	Nicholas Kutlis, Toronto ON	2015
132.	Bruce D Gowdy, Toronto ON	2371	197.	Mrs Christie McKinney, Edmonton AB	2008
133.	Lloyd E Harris, Sudbury ON	2371	198.	John R McAdam, Ottawa ON	2007
134.	Michael Strebingner, N Vancouver BC	2351	199.	S Viswanathan, Calgary AB	2006
135.	Michael Schoenborn, Brantford ON	2340	200.	Malcolm T King, Toronto ON	2005
136.	Katie Thorpe, Toronto ON	2331	201.	Mrs Alice L Strebingner, Burnaby BC	2005
137.	Cam Lindsay, Surrey BC	2329	202.	John Rosenfeld, Montreal PQ	2004
138.	Andy J Altay, Downsview ON	2328	203.	Mrs Lisa Z Lister, Edmonton AB	1995
139.	Charles A Swanson, Vancouver BC	2324	204.	Arno Hobart, Peterborough ON	1995
140.	Mrs Doreen Jaskela, Peachland BC	2320	205.	Mike Chomyn, Edmonton AB	1993
141.	Bryan Rapson, Dartmouth NS	2315	206.	D W Dobson, Halifax NS	1988
142.	Doug H Rankine, Edmonton AB	2299	207.	Robert A Lewis, London ON	1984
143.	Dudley P Camacho, Scarborough ON	2294	208.	Bert Eccles, Montreal PQ	1982
144.	John M Raynault, Longueuil PQ	2280	209.	Ross M Taylor, Hamilton ON	1977
145.	Donald Da Costa, Toronto ON	2277	210.	Doug W Andrews, Weston ON	1975
146.	Ramji Tewari, Calgary AB	2269	211.	Victor Cronshaw, Scarborough ON	1971
147.	Steve Goldstein, Montreal PQ	2269	212.	Gerald A Richardson, London ON	1970
148.	Don Lindhorst, Cambridge ON	2263	213.	Mrs Elaine Duff, Willowdale ON	1967
149.	Gordon B Maser, Halifax NS	2257	214.	Fred M Lerner, Markham ON	1963
150.	Roy Dalton, Mississauga ON	2250	215.	Mrs J B Miller, St Marie ON	1959
151.	Mrs Rhonda Betts, Burnaby BC	2248	216.	Charles Jaskela, Peachland BC	1955
152.	Gabriel Julien, Jonquiere PQ	2243	217.	B Pauls, Winnipeg MB	1949
153.	Mrs Genevié Skeel, Edmonton AB	2233	218.	Alan W Chapelle, Nanaimo BC	1948
154.	Gary F Johannsson, Regina SK	2211	219.	Mrs Donna Morrison, N Burnaby BC	1948
155.	Laurie C McIntyre, Ottawa ON	2210	220.	Harry Bork, Hamilton ON	1946
156.	Mrs Evelyn R Hodge, Burnaby BC	2204	221.	G Chippin, Fredericton NB	1943
157.	Rick F Delogu, St Catharines ON	2198	222.	Gordon Chapman, Acton ON	1942
158.	R B Dwyer, Dorval PQ	2190	223.	William J Lukas, N Battleford SK	1939
159.	John Ross, Flin Flon MB	2174	224.	Allan W Smith, Peterborough ON	1935
160.	Harmon S Edgar, Milliken ON	2174	225.	Dan W Mathieson, Regina SK	1933
161.	Mrs Maria Weber, Sudbury ON	2163	226.	Michael C Instance, Ottawa ON	1925
162.	John N Lang, Calgary AB	2161	227.	John Odowd, Hamilton ON	1923
163.	J Marsch, Winnipeg MB	2157	228.	Chuck Messinger, Toronto ON	1917
164.	Robert Colton, Brantford ON	2153	229.	Donald J Gladman, Calgary AB	1915
165.	Douglas Heron, Ottawa ON	2139	230.	Mrs N Sugarman, Kingston ON	1912
166.	Gerry Callaghan, Halifax NS	2133	231.	Mark E Yudin, Montreal PQ	1910
167.	Arthur G Skeel, Edmonton AB	2130	232.	George Retek, Montreal PQ	1908
168.	Don Pfafsky, Hampstead PQ	2118	233.	Michael W Betts, Fredericton NB	1907
169.	J D Cummings, Willowdale ON	2114	234.	Art D Entremont, Winnipeg MB	1906
170.	Douglas H Clark, Kingston ON	2107	235.	Randy B Bennett, St Johns NF	1899
171.	Mrs Elvira Nagy, Westmount PQ	2107	236.	Eric Stark, Vancouver BC	1898
172.	Herbert L Stewart, Halifax NS	2106	237.	William R Sheryer, Kitchener ON	1897
173.	R Hanson, Montreal PQ	2101	238.	John J Duquette, Oshawa ON	1880
174.	Gary Whiteman, Don Mills ON	2099	239.	Mrs Rhoda Habert, Montreal PQ	1887
175.	Steven Unger, Thornhill ON	2095	240.	Tony M Marsh, Whiterock BC	1883
176.	Edward C Oreilly, Kingston ON	2083	241.	David Sokolow, Winnipeg MB	1874
177.	Nick Gartaganis, Edmonton AB	2083	242.	T R Greer, Agincourt ON	1871
178.	Mrs Mona E Scott, Saskatoon SK	2081	243.	Karl W Weber, Toronto ON	1866
179.	Paul R Thurston, St Catharines ON	2080	244.	Mrs Evelyn Heal, Moose Jaw SK	1866
180.	J Melvin Norton, Burlington ON	2079	245.	Robert P Kuz, Selkirk MB	1866
181.	Mrs Marilyn Pearce, Simcoe ON	2077	246.	Colin Revill, Burlington ON	1864

247.	Beryl Callaghan, Halifax NS	1863	312.	Alex Kornel, Toronto ON	1637
248.	M D Roussin, Ottawa ON	1861	313.	George S Oliver, Medicine Hat AB	1635
249.	Joan E Eaton, Toronto ON	1858	314.	D M Schamehorn, Orillia ON	1630
250.	M Kevin Conway, Kirkland Lk ON	1855	315.	David C Holgate, Stt St Marie ON	1628
251.	Mark Arbour, Scarborough ON	1853	316.	W G Lim, Prince Georg BC	1626
252.	Michael Dimich, Vancouver BC	1850	317.	David J Oulton, Windsor Jct NS	1624
253.	Eric L Balkam, Halifax NS	1846	318.	John A Macgregor, Halifax PQ	1622
254.	Brian Fraser, St Laurent PQ	1845	319.	Raymond Fortin, Montmagny PQ	1621
255.	Edward M Ashenhurst, Saskatoon SK	1844	320.	Bob J Todd, Winnipeg MB	1619
256.	Rick K Boldt, Saskatoon SK	1844	321.	Brij B Garg, Sudbury ON	1617
257.	Gary R Mitchell, Regina SK	1840	322.	Heather Peckelt, Nepean ON	1613
258.	Joel Marlineau, Burnaby BC	1836	323.	Victor J Goldberg, Halifax NS	1612
259.	David M Burke, London ON	1835	324.	Grant G Ardern, Scarborough ON	1610
260.	Dev D Prakhya, Saskatoon SK	1828	325.	Len Racette, Saskatoon SK	1609
261.	Mrs Terry Lesperance, London ON	1821	326.	Martin W Newland, Ottawa ON	1609
262.	John Beasy, Halifax NS	1816	327.	Peter W Bambrick, Ottawa ON	1609
263.	Alvin Baragar, Edmonton AB	1811	328.	S P Kandel, Willowdale ON	1606
264.	Jacques Ribeyre, Port Alberni BC	1804	329.	Mrs Kathy Adachi, N Delta BC	1602
265.	Mrs Sandra Borg, Richmond BC	1795	330.	Mrs Beverly G Kokish, Westmount PQ	1595
266.	David R Colbert, Weston ON	1790	331.	Mrs Myrtle Moulton, Halifax NS	1595
267.	Robin J Wigdor, Uxbridge ON	1789	332.	J T Murphy, Calgary AB	1591
268.	Bryan W Culham, Brampton ON	1778	333.	Jim C Ong, Winnipeg MB	1589
269.	John D Lloyd, Ajax ON	1777	334.	John J Morgan, Ottawa ON	1587
270.	Mrs Ethel Major, Westmount PQ	1777	335.	Veryl E Norquay, Calgary AB	1587
271.	Michael J Hargreaves, Victoria BC	1771	336.	Mrs B J Mackay, Fredericton NB	1584
272.	Mrs Jennifer Paynter, Vancouver BC	1768	337.	Mrs Gladys Derby, Montreal PQ	1581
273.	Alex Orlandini, Kelowna BC	1765	338.	Bill Pollack, Hamilton ON	1577
274.	George Holland, Dartmouth NS	1764	339.	Mrs Babe Batten, Glace Bay NS	1577
275.	Ian J Glover, Trail BC	1763	340.	M M Miller, Toronto ON	1577
276.	Edward Lichtman, Winnipeg MB	1763	341.	Gerald W McCully, Surrey BC	1574
277.	Martin G Oreilly, Vancouver BC	1748	342.	Arthur Kwei, Guelph ON	1573
278.	Mrs Jean I Turnbull, Vancouver BC	1747	343.	R Paul Prince, Edmonton AB	1573
279.	Michael A Philippas, Montreal PQ	1746	344.	Robert Hirsch, Brossard PQ	1570
280.	Jacques Laliberte, Cap Rouge PQ	1739	345.	Ralph Fisher, New Glasgow NS	1568
281.	Paul Skinner, London ON	1734	346.	Cliff G Puskas, Saskatoon SK	1564
282.	M A Wilson, Vancouver BC	1731	347.	Stan Matheson, Calgary AB	1564
283.	Mrs Ferne Wroth, Calgary AB	1728	348.	Donald Urquhart, Edmonton AB	1563
284.	Mrs Elinor S Levy, Westmount PQ	1728	349.	C Douglas Fox, Toronto ON	1563
285.	Douglas C Deschner, Red Deer AB	1724	350.	Mrs Ruth H Gold, Toronto ON	1562
286.	D Di Felice, Toronto ON	1723	351.	Mrs Jane Green, Nanaimo BC	1562
287.	Bernie A Lambert, Calgary AB	1721	352.	Mrs Ruth Instance, Ottawa ON	1561
288.	W Lebovic, Toronto ON	1718	353.	Mrs Marie Carragher, Charlottetwn PE	1557
289.	Edward Zaluski, Ottawa ON	1717	354.	Douglas A Baldwin, Surrey BC	1554
290.	Mrs Linda F Wynston, Toronto ON	1717	355.	Mrs S P Kandel, Willowdale ON	1540
291.	Bryan M Maksymetz, Sherwood Pk AB	1716	356.	Gil A Lafreniere, Regina SK	1536
292.	Earl Knipfel, Calgary AB	1716	357.	Bryson Crowell, Dartmouth NS	1532
293.	Kenneth W McGuirif, Saskatoon SK	1712	358.	Allan Mowat, Winnipeg MB	1532
294.	Douglas L Fisher, Winnipeg MB	1707	359.	C J Yaskowich, Edmonton AB	1531
295.	Mrs Margaret La Dochy, Toronto ON	1704	360.	David M Gold, Richmond BC	1531
296.	Mrs Evelyn Kirsh, Roxboro PQ	1700	361.	Wayne A Timms, Waterloo ON	1527
297.	Lee R Barton, Edmonton AB	1699	362.	Ray Chen, Toronto ON	1526
298.	Ronald T Mak, Halifax NS	1699	363.	Denis Lesage, Montreal PQ	1526
299.	A Koffler, Dol Des Ormx PQ	1696	364.	Mrs Eileen M Macdiarmid, Sarnia ON	1525
300.	J Cunningham, North York ON	1695	365.	Mrs Susan Sanders, Stt St Marie ON	1525
301.	Haig G Tchamitch, Thornhill ON	1690	366.	Mrs Berit V Sunninge, Kelowna BC	1518
302.	Douglas W Scott, Saskatoon SK	1689	367.	G Sereny, Toronto ON	1518
303.	Ken Penton, Calgary AB	1687	368.	Eric P Marchand, Montreal PQ	1517
304.	Gerald Charney, Toronto ON	1684	369.	Mrs Hazel C Stowards, Prnce George BC	1516
305.	Mrs Abigail L Heitner, Bramalea ON	1683	370.	W A Blake, Pembroke ON	1512
306.	Michael J Tyrrell, Saskatoon SK	1680	371.	L Magnan, Montreal PQ	1510
307.	Mrs Marjorie E Smith, Nanaimo BC	1673	372.	Howard Jacobs, Willowdale ON	1509
308.	Mrs Gladys O Campbell, Saskatoon SK	1657	373.	Edward F Maguire, Ottawa ON	1507
309.	K S Dawe, Renfrew ON	1655	374.	Michael Rahtjen, Winnipeg MB	1506
310.	Art D Dahl, Regina SK	1648	375.	Sadru K Visram, Toronto ON	1502
311.	Robert C Macduff, Maple Ridge BC	1645	376.	Kenneth B Marden, Oshawa ON	1501

377.	Allan G Terplawy, Calgary AB	1500	442.	Morley D English, Ottawa ON	1383
378.	Jordan M Cohen, Concord ON	1499	443.	James H Cole, Brockville ON	1382
379.	M A Smith, Vancouver BC	1489	444.	Dennis P Dohl, Vancouver BC	1379
380.	Roy D Hughes, Willowdale ON	1487	445.	M Johnson, Vancouver BC	1376
381.	Voyteck L Pomykalski, Cornwall ON	1486	446.	William F Knoll Sr, New Glasgow NS	1376
382.	Clifford K Hargrove, Ottawa ON	1483	447.	Bruce J Wahl, Jonquiere PQ	1375
383.	Willfred B Sarner, Toronto ON	1483	448.	Mrs Virginia McGonigal, Vancouver BC	1375
384.	Wayne M Perrin, Ottawa ON	1482	449.	Mrs Frances Breakwell, Etobicoke ON	1371
385.	Mrs Sheila K Dickie, Richmond BC	1482	450.	F Smith, Stt St Marie ON	1371
386.	Ken Gee, Regina SK	1481	451.	Brian Alexander, Fredericton NB	1368
387.	Charles S Liegerot, Calgary AB	1476	452.	Allan K Simon, Calgary AB	1368
388.	Rita Poder, Hamilton ON	1476	453.	Eric Ditchfield, Oakville ON	1366
389.	Elmer F Christopherson, Vancouver BC	1475	454.	Mrs Patricia McAdam, Ottawa ON	1366
390.	Wilf May, Surrey BC	1474	455.	Mrs Sophie M Moffatt, Sudbury ON	1365
391.	Douglas T Hawkes, Victoria BC	1473	456.	Gerry R Marshall, Calgary AB	1361
392.	Mrs E Lee, Vancouver BC	1470	457.	Mrs June B Hicks, Vancouver BC	1360
393.	Ron J Smith, Victoria BC	1466	458.	Jean Bernier, Neufchatel PQ	1360
394.	Dave G Willis, Orleans ON	1466	459.	Mrs Margaret J Simmons, Toronto ON	1358
395.	Bert Habert, Montreal PQ	1462	460.	T Scott Symonds, Halifax NS	1358
396.	Monte Kay, Cambridge ON	1460	461.	Mrs Joyce Phillips, Toronto ON	1357
397.	Geraldine Sugarman, Saskatoon SK	1459	462.	Peter Cooper, Vancouver BC	1356
398.	Mrs Anne Nagy, Richmond BC	1458	463.	Mrs Mildred Dalgleish, Saskatoon SK	1353
399.	M H Campbell, Qualicum Bch BC	1456	464.	Paul R Graves, Toronto ON	1348
400.	Mrs D E Michaelis, Milk River AB	1454	465.	Greg Carroll, Toronto ON	1342
401.	Mrs Leah McDonald, Quesnel BC	1447	466.	David M Kirsh, Roxboro PQ	1341
402.	John R Arblaster, Thunder Bay ON	1446	467.	Charles Milne, Toronto ON	1339
403.	John I Laskin, Toronto ON	1446	468.	S Lewis, Dartmouth NS	1338
404.	John Measures, Ottawa ON	1443	469.	Stephen A Mackay, Unionville ON	1337
405.	Mrs Bjorg Jurkovich, Milk River AB	1441	470.	Mrs Gilda Caplan, Toronto ON	1334
406.	Mrs Doris McGuirl, Saskatoon SK	1439	471.	Larry R Duffy, Markham ON	1331
407.	Lawrence U McCluskey, Pembroke ON	1439	472.	Glynlord Hatfield, Brmngtn Psge NS	1331
408.	Donald M Fraser, No Burnaby BC	1436	473.	W Campbell Jr, Fredericton NB	1328
409.	Phiip J Silverstein, Cote St Luc PQ	1436	474.	L D Hansen, Thunder Bay ON	1327
410.	Mrs Irene Hodgson, Toronto ON	1435	475.	John E Whitehouse, Etobicoke ON	1327
411.	N W Miigram, Toronto ON	1434	476.	Larry Cara, Toronto ON	1326
412.	Henry Smilie, Vancouver BC	1434	477.	Mrs O Stevenson, Ottawa ON	1324
413.	Mrs P Tanton, Hampstead PQ	1433	478.	Alfred W Bishop, Toronto ON	1324
414.	Richard G Grant, Comox BC	1432	479.	Robert D Partridge, Delta ON	1322
415.	David House, Vancouver BC	1431	480.	Kenneth W Paine, Saskatoon SK	1321
416.	Ron Gardiner, Edmonton AB	1431	481.	Jean L Provost, St Thms Daqn PQ	1320
417.	Doran A Flock, Calgary AB	1426	482.	George R Schick, Ladysmith BC	1320
418.	Mrs Joan A Schneider, Regina SK	1423	483.	Mrs Maureen A Culp, Whithby ON	1319
419.	Mrs Lee Atkinson, Montreal PQ	1421	484.	Ron A Bishop, Willowdale ON	1317
420.	Maurice Larochelle, Ste Foy PQ	1419	485.	Mrs Raye Dolgoy, Edmonton AB	1317
421.	John S Hazell, Angus ON	1415	486.	Mrs Marge Neate, N Vancouver BC	1315
422.	Mrs Sandra Terrade, Nepean ON	1413	487.	D Shepherd, Simcoe ON	1315
423.	Ron Marks, Ottawa ON	1413	488.	Mrs Ruth Urquhart, Etobicoke ON	1314
424.	Kamel Fergani, Montreal PQ	1412	489.	Mrs Joyce D Lemoine, Ottawa ON	1314
425.	Pearle E Bally, Dunrobin ON	1411	490.	Mark B Liberman, Don Mills ON	1314
426.	Malcolm Ewashkiw, Belleville ON	1411	491.	Mrs Nancy Koffler, Dol Des Ormx PQ	1313
427.	Mrs Marj K Andrukow, Calgary AB	1409	492.	Vince Oddy, Scarborough ON	1311
428.	Ron E Bass, Red Deer AB	1407	493.	Mrs K Van Lieshout, Vancouver BC	1310
429.	Peter F Cronin, Toronto ON	1405	494.	Mrs Patricia Y Tasker Brown, Victoria BC	1309
430.	James D Harper, Fredericton NB	1404	495.	Mrs Bessie G Burns, Mississauga ON	1307
431.	Peter R Basarsky, Moose Jaw SK	1404	496.	Michel Letourneau, Chicoutimi PQ	1306
432.	Christine G Hutton, Toronto ON	1403	497.	Mrs Peggy McGregor, Saskatoon SK	1302
433.	Mrs Ina Andersen, Richmond BC	1400	498.	Gordon E Horne, New Wstmslr BC	1301
434.	F Gagnon, VI D La Baie PQ	1399	499.	John A Bryden, Vancouver BC	1298
435.	Donald L Presse, Halifax NS	1396	500.	J Castonguay, La Salle PQ	1297
436.	H Gordon Hoare, Victoria BC	1393	501.	Derek B Ward, N Vancouver BC	1296
437.	Mrs M Thomas, Edmton AB	1389	502.	R Provencher, Carp ON	1294
438.	Alex F Kisin, Toronto ON	1389	503.	Martial C Chagnon, Longueuil PQ	1288
439.	D R McCorkell, Nepean ON	1388	504.	Gary M Hodgson, Toronto ON	1287
440.	John Valliant, Ottawa ON	1388	505.	Mrs Lucille A Barton, Edmonton AB	1286
441.	David L Kent, Ottawa ON	1386	506.	Mrs Sharron E Balkam, Halifax NS	1286

507.	Mrs Helen E Armit, London ON	1285	572.	Rene Perron, Montreal PQ	1219
508.	George E Joneson, Powell River BC	1284	573.	B Christoffersson, Coquitlam BC	1217
509.	George W Geyer, Toronto ON	1282	574.	Robert K Teshima, Edmonton AB	1216
510.	Cedric W Macdiarmid, Sarnia ON	1279	575.	Mrs Janet Cox, Ottawa ON	1215
511.	Mrs Kay Allen, Toronto ON	1278	576.	V Levy, Westmount PQ	1214
512.	H Alex Sutton, Islington ON	1276	577.	Mrs Patricia Glen, N Vancouver BC	1214
513.	R Brown, Dartmouth NS	1275	578.	B H Symons, Edmonton AB	1213
514.	Richard Lesage, La Prairie PQ	1274	579.	A Schwarz, Montreal PQ	1213
515.	S Levine, New Westmnsr BC	1273	580.	Mrs Claire Gellman, Willowdale ON	1212
516.	Michael J Martino, Oakville ON	1272	581.	Mrs Anita Marquart, Winnipeg MB	1211
517.	Neil D Kimelman, Winnipeg MB	1271	582.	Lauriat Gervais, Jonquiere PQ	1210
518.	Robert J Brambrick, Ottawa ON	1271	583.	K Van Renesse, W Vancouver BC	1208
519.	Mrs Margaret J Whitehouse, Etobicoke ON	1270	584.	Mrs Doris Rossen, Winnipeg MB	1207
520.	David G Bryce, Toronto ON	1269	585.	Mrs Anita Hargrove, Nepean ON	1205
521.	Mrs Patricia Harris, Tantallon NS	1268	586.	Gary M Harper, Burnaby BC	1205
522.	Connie Delisle, Vancouver BC	1267	587.	Mrs Gladys L Minor, Calgary AB	1205
523.	W Zumstein, Lethbridge AB	1266	588.	Aaron Goodman, Montreal PQ	1203
524.	Jean Lamontagne, Charlesbourg PQ	1266	589.	William J Crissey, London ON	1202
525.	David H Turner, Pickering ON	1265	590.	Mrs F Helen C Krajna, Toronto ON	1202
526.	Daniel Doston, St Leonard PQ	1265	591.	John I Singer, Sudbury ON	1199
527.	Mrs Anne E Dunn, Moose Jaw SK	1264	592.	William C Kozak, Thunder Bay ON	1198
528.	Laurier Girard, Ville Baie PQ	1264	593.	Jill Savage, Red Deer AB	1197
529.	Douglas A Schmeiser, Saskatoon SK	1264	594.	Don Domansky, Thunder Bay ON	1196
530.	Wayne D Fedynak, Edmonton AB	1262	595.	Mrs Gloria J Hummel, Milk River AB	1196
531.	David J Waterman, Vancouver BC	1261	596.	Mrs Pamela Dahl, Regina SK	1193
532.	Gordon Campbell, Calgary AB	1261	597.	Michael J Gamble, Ottawa ON	1192
533.	Heleen M Mitchell, Edmonton AB	1261	598.	Peter D McLaren, Ft Quappelle SK	1192
534.	S Kirsh, Weston ON	1259	599.	Norbert A Bedoucha, Ottawa ON	1192
535.	C O'Reilly, Dundas ON	1259	600.	William Boston, Sit St Marie ON	1190
536.	Mrs Beverley McKellar, Kingston ON	1255	601.	Jim McCully Jr, N Vancouver BC	1190
537.	Mrs Sophie Ziger, Montreal PQ	1253	602.	Jean Yves Gauthier, Charlesbourg PQ	1189
538.	Mrs Constance McAvoy, Victoria BC	1252	603.	Mrs Ida M Goodlad, Richmond BC	1188
539.	Mrs Stella K Alliston, W Vancouver BC	1252	604.	Wendy L Geyer, Toronto ON	1186
540.	John D Vikstrom, Nanaimo BC	1251	605.	Conn H Sutherland, Mississauga ON	1183
541.	Harvey L Piercy, Vancouver BC	1246	606.	Mrs Molly M Turnbull, Ple Claire PQ	1182
542.	Mrs Margaret C Lawless, Calgary AB	1245	607.	H Rubin, N Vancouver BC	1180
543.	Mrs Marcia L Caplan, Ottawa ON	1244	608.	Mrs E M Horning, Willowdale ON	1180
544.	Juliette Fajgelzon, St Laurent PQ	1243	609.	John L Matynia, Ottawa ON	1179
545.	Mrs Leona Rose Smithen, Winnipeg MB	1242	610.	F Williamson, Ottawa ON	1179
546.	R Scull, Don Mills ON	1241	611.	Mrs Ruth F Neustadt, Calgary AB	1178
547.	Dave Kilworth, Edmonton AB	1240	612.	Nick Jurkovich, Milk River AB	1177
548.	Stuart Oulton, Fredericton NB	1239	613.	Simon Marinker, Sit St Marie ON	1175
549.	Richard R Christie, Surrey BC	1237	614.	Herb B Cronin, Saskatoon SK	1175
550.	Bruce R Broadfoot, Prnce George BC	1237	615.	Edgar Blinn, Lunenburg NS	1175
551.	S J Howard, Saskatoon SK	1236	616.	Mrs Faith M Pritchard, Edmonton AB	1173
552.	E G Adams, Vancouver BC	1236	617.	Mrs Molly Silverstein, Downsview ON	1173
553.	Norman L O'Brien, Moncton NB	1236	618.	Robert Hambly, Charlottetwn PE	1171
554.	Judith A McGillis, Edmonton AB	1236	619.	Nairn Ferguson, Ottawa ON	1171
555.	Jim W Norman, Saskatoon SK	1234	620.	Mrs Therese B Gauthier, Charlesbourg PQ	1171
556.	Brian J Carpenter, Calgary AB	1234	621.	David Greenough, Ottawa ON	1170
557.	Mrs Leslie R Gold, Richmond BC	1233	622.	Mrs Helene F Fournier, Chicoutimi PQ	1170
558.	Alfred Couture, Ottawa ON	1232	623.	William T Camp, Halifax NS	1170
559.	D Mallinson, Brantford ON	1231	624.	Mrs Mary D Manley, Sydney NS	1169
560.	William Hepperle, Kelowna BC	1231	625.	Elmer F Fisher, Medicine Hat AB	1169
561.	George Berton, Scarborough ON	1229	626.	Mrs Carolyn Macdonald, Truro NS	1166
562.	Jim E Lopushinsky, Edmonton AB	1228	627.	Mrs Phyllis Barrington, Vancouver BC	1166
563.	Harry Abel, Toronto ON	1227	628.	Mrs Bina Adams, Clarkson ON	1165
564.	Tim Edwards-Davies, Gloucester ON	1225	629.	Joseph O Doucet, Toronto ON	1165
565.	Richard S Spackman, Lethbridge AB	1224	630.	Bill Solomon, Willowdale ON	1163
566.	William R Koski, Beeton ON	1224	631.	Donald J Lesperance, Woodstock ON	1162
567.	N S Sutherland, St Albert AB	1221	632.	Mrs Karen Kilworth, Edmonton AB	1161
568.	Roland E Nelson, Oakville ON	1220	633.	Mrs Elayne Kays, Fredericton NB	1161
569.	Douglas A Drew, Toronto ON	1220	634.	Mrs Gloria Silverman, Toronto ON	1161
570.	Kenneth R Venning, Mississauga ON	1220	635.	J N Goldie, Victoria BC	1160
571.	Mrs Emily I Bower, Regina SK	1220	636.	Peter Jones, Edmonton AB	1159

# CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION

## Executive

**President & Director** Aidan Ballantyne  
3549 E. 22nd Avenue  
Vancouver, B.C. V5M 2Z5

**Vice-President & Director** David Lindop  
247 Wanless Avenue  
Toronto, Ont. M4N 1W5

**Treasurer & Director** Richard Anderson  
107 Scrivener Crescent  
Regina, Sask. S4N 4V6

**ZONE**                      **EXPIRES**  
1                              88

2                              89

3                              90

4                              88

5                              89

6                              90

**DIRECTORS**  
George Colter  
P.O. Box 2100  
Fredericton, N.B. E3B 4Y6

Douglas Fraser  
1380 Kenilworth Road  
Mount Royal, Que. H3R 2R9

David Lindop  
247 Wanless Avenue  
Toronto, Ont. M4N 1W5

Douglas J. Cannell  
404 Hosmer Blvd.  
Winnipeg, Man. R3P 0H7

Richard Anderson  
107 Scrivener Crescent  
Regina, Sask. S4N 4V6

Aidan Ballantyne,  
3549 E. 22nd Avenue  
Vancouver, B.C. V5M 2Z5

---

**Charitable Fund Chairman** Moise M. Deschamps  
2400 Carling Avenue, Apt. 209  
Ottawa, Ont. K2B 7H2

**Digest Editor** Allan Simon  
1339 Hamilton St. N.W.  
Calgary, Alta. T2N 3W8

**WBF and international events** Dr. Alvin Baragar  
6608 84th Street  
Edmonton, Alta. T6E 2W9

**Executive Secretary** Barbara Tench  
200 Clemow Ave.  
Ottawa, Ont. K1S 2B4

**Ex-officio Director** Douglas Drew  
349 St. Clair Avenue West  
Toronto, Ont. M5P 1N3

**Alternate,  
International Events** George Retek  
202 - 1650 de Maisonneuve Blvd. W.  
Montreal, Que. H3H 2P3