



ISSN 0317-9281

* * * * * *

+ + +



Ron Bass

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

Published quarterly.

Jill Savage



Issue XL Vol. 14 No. 2

Deadline for next issue is June 10, 1983

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION

EXECUTIVE

President Vice President Executive Secretary Treasurer/Director		Richard Anderson Karen Allison Irene Warner, 66 Parklea Dr., Toronto, Ont. M4G 2J6 Aaron Goodman, 326–1396 Ste. Catherine West, Montreal, P.Q. H3G 1P9		
ZONE	EXPIRES	DIRECTOR		
1	85	Victor Goldberg, 701-5885 Spring Garden Road, Halifax N.S., B3H 1Y3		
2	85	Michael Kenny, 304-6607 Cote St. Luc Road, Montreal P.Q. H4V 1G9		
3	84	Karen Allison, 73 McCaul St. #234, Toronto, Ont. M5T 2X2		
4	84	Helen Shields, 1103-405 Waverley St., Thunder Bay, Ont. P7B 1B8		
5	83	Richard Anderson, 30 Clement Crescent, Regina, Sask. S4N 4T4		
6	83	Doug Andrews, 1841 E. 38th Avenue, Vancouver, B.C. V5P 1G6		

NON-VOTING BOARD MEMBERS

Douglas Drew, 155 Cambridge Ave., Toronto, Ont. M4K 2L7 George Retek, 1650 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West, Suite 202, Montreal, P.Q. H3H 2P3

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION CHARITABLE FUND

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



JOINT EDITORS Ron Bass & Jill Savage, 87 Grandin Village, St. Albert, Alberta T8N 1R9

canadian bridge digest

66cbd2

Editor's Notebook

1982

Richmond Trophy Winner Mark Molson of Montreal Does It Again

Mark Molson

It's a pleasure to congratulate Mark on winning the Canadian Richmond Trophy (he was also the 1980 winner). The Richmond Trophy is awarded to the Canadian bridge player who wins the most master points in the calendar year. I suspect this will not be the last time we see this name on the trophy.



689



Canadians Perform Well in Biarritz

By Doug Andrews

Biarritz, an Atlantic coastal resort in the south of France near the Spanish Border, hosted the 1982 World Championships. The day we arrived the sun was shining and the bridge players relaxed on the beach struggling to complete the new WBF convention card as they watched the surf roll in and the topless tanners. Food was being carted in by the caseload for the opening reception which turned out to be a lavish feast of meats, cheeses, fruits, seafood, pickles and desserts washed down with generous quantities of free liquor and wine. It certainly appeared that it would be a glorious sixteen days.

Although the sky was cloudless the first day there were black clouds on the way. By the time of the opening session they arrived and the rain began to fall accompanied by high winds. It was still raining and gusting when we left two weeks later.

The organization of the tournament like the weather had its high points and its disappointments. In fact the only constant throughout was the excellent hospitality provided by the French.

The WBF introduced a new convention card which provided for much fuller disclosure than any I have ever seen. It took close to 4 hours to complete but when you had finished you felt confident that your chances for partnership misunderstanding had been reduced greatly. Nonetheless one encountered pairs with only partially completed cards likely a consequence of the time required to complete a card or the requirement that it be completed in English.

Computer scoring was in effect for all championship pairs events which meant that all sessions were scored across the field. It was generally agreed that this was highly desirable. There were, however, some undesirable consequences.

With top on a board being between 200 and 400 even the poorest pair had a large score. The total scores were seldom available much before game time for the next session. As a result few pairs got around to checking their matchpoints on each board. It seems highly likely that mistakes were made that went undetected. It is recommended in future that each pair be presented with a printout of their scores and matchpoints by board before the start of the following session so that some verification can be done.

About 50 terminals were located in major hotels and casinos throughout Biarritz. One could look up one's total score for each session and have it printed, send messages to other participants, review the hand-of-the-day, etc. - a major plus. Unfortunately the lines of communication with the mainframe computer in Paris were shut down by the weather several times. At one point the roof in the computer room collapsed. Communications were down for about 12 hours while hair dryers were used to dry the rain-soaked optic fibres. Biarritz was almost remembered as the first world bridge championship to be rained out!

Another feature of the tournament which had received advance billing was that large screen full-colour vugraph with commentary would be available for each session. After the first day of play it was available indeed. Unhappily the availability of vugraph combined with security considerations was given as the reason that practically no kibitzing was permitted. There were many bored unhappy spouses who would have gladly lynched the

++++

organizers who barred kibitzing but took their frustrations out on the players or hostesses instead.

But the food was good and reasonably priced. Quite naturally it was served in leisurely fashion commencing fashionably late. However, the starting times of the bridge sessions were not arranged for fashionable dining and most evenings in a restaurant featured a confrontation between a harried hungry player and a harried hurried restauranteur.

This description is sufficient to let you see that there were many attractive and innovative features at the championship but the organization could have been improved immensely. No one other than the bored unhappy non-kibitzing spouses would have preferred to miss it.

Yes it is finally time to answer your question: how did the Canadians do? Very very commendably ...

- Dianna Gordon and George Mittelman won the Mixed Pairs Championship. Canada's first, and to date only, gold medal in world champion play. At 2 a.m. following the final session of the Mixed when the results were known a small group of Canadians stood in the rain in the barren streets of Biarritz, drinking champagne straight from the bottle, singing "O Canada" while Allan Graves shouted for George "to go for the sweep".

- Sandra and Doug Fraser also turned in a good performance in the Mixed finishing 22nd in the 450 pair field.

- We were shut out of the medals in the Open Pairs and the Ladies Pairs. Only the top 40 pairs in each event qualified for the final sessions. Eric Kokish and Peter Nagy were the only Canadian pair to reach the finals but they could not overtake the front running American pairs.

Several of our pairs failed narrowly to qualify finishing in the top 50. Gupta-Viswanathan and Murray-Kehela were 46th and 47th respectively in the Open Pairs while Ruth Gold-Gloria Silverman, our lone entry in the Ladies Pairs, were also 46th.

- Although we were also shut out of the medals in the three-session Consolation Pairs it looked like we might win another gold. Joe Silver-Mark Molson had a huge second session to lead the field entering the final third. Unfortunately things went as badly for them in the last session as they had gone well in the penultimate session. The top Canadians were Gupta-Viswanathan (with Andrews as substitute) finishing 14th in the 205 pair field. Eccles-Schwartz were the next Canadians finishing 19th.

- In the Rosenbloom Team, Canada's team of Allan Graves-George Mittelman-Eric Kokish-Peter Nagy-Eric Murray-Sami Kehela, with Doug Andrews as non-playing captain, won the bronze medal. This team was seeded into the rest of the world bracket (the other two brackets being North America and Europe). Playing well throughout the qualifying it reached the finals of the bracket where it was matched against a little known Spanish team. The match was very low scoring, each team missing some opportunities for pickups, and the Canadians came out on the short end. A disappointed team entered the miniknockout repechage which was played throughout the night between the next two main sessions and was quickly relegated to the Swiss.

Once in the Swiss, with third place the best that could be achieved, the team regained its composure and played well enough to lead the Swiss after each match until the conclusion of the penultimate match when it dropped into second behind an Italian team featuring many-time world champion Garozzo. Since we had already played to a tie against Garozzo in this session we had to beat a U.S. team with several world champions and hope that Garozzo's match against the Swedes ended favorably for us. The team played tremendously well and beat the Americans convincingly while the Italian team lost to the Swedes, Canada had finished third in the Rosenbloom Teams, George Mittelman had a bronze to



go with l would th time afte	his gold medal hink bridge wa er all.	-perhap is a worth	s his mother h-while past	Dlr: Vul:	South Both		
- The Fr Jacob-C commer very stro	asers playing Gord McOrn Idable finish. Ing 129 team	on a tear iond ha placing Rosenblo	n with Dan d another 36th in the oom Cup.		K 9 A Q 6 2 8 6 4	3 2 10 8	
Finally a played b	a few of the ma by Canadians.	ny intere	sting hands	J 10 6 5	007		
Dianna deal and	and Georgesc got some luc	rambled k in the j	well on this play.	5 A 10 9 5			K J 4 3 2 K Q J 7
Dlr: Vul:	S N-S			A Q 7 5			K J 10 2
					A (9.7	Q 8 7 4	
	A 9 6 Q 10	43 43			8 4 9 3	3	
	K 8 K Q			Gordon	North	Mittelman	South
J 2 7 Q J 10 9 6 4	9764		K Q 10 5 A 8 6 5 2 A 3 8 7	1D 3D 4C 5D	- 1 H Pass Pass Pass	2H 3H 4S 6D	Pass Pass Pass Dbl All Pass
	8 7 K J 9 5 2 A J 1	0532		South's d retreat to were no slam. Di	louble of 5D indic wasted sp anna ru	4S followed h ated to Georg bade values so ffed the space	by Dianna's gethat there he bid the de opening
West	Mittelman -	East -	Gordon Pass	a heart.	North ro	se win the ac	e and led a
Pass	IS	Pass	INT	two hear	on by th is high c	e J. Dianna rossing to di	now rulled
3D	Pass	Pass	Dbl	club and	diamone	to make the	e slam on a
Pass	3H	Dbl	35	dummy r	eversal.		
Pass	Pass	Dbl	Pass				
Pass	3NI Daga	Dbl Dbl	4C				
rass	F 855	וטים	All Pass	K Q 9 8	x x	A x	хх
				A Q J x	х	Κx	хх
East led	the heart 7 and	d it looke	d like a 500	A x		ХХ	х
set was i	in the making	Fast-W	est taking 1	-		хх	



is in the making. East-West taking 1 set w heart, 2 diamonds, and 2 heart ruffs. But when East won the heart A, Dianna played the King and after much thought East shifted to a club allowing North-South to score +710.

Good bidding and good play led to a good score on this deal.

Litvack Hughes IS 2S 3H 4S 5D 5H 6C 7H Pass

Irving Litvack and Roy Hughes bid this combined holding of 23 high card points effectively to reach a grand slam in the Open Pairs.

Aggressive bidding considering that they play a strong club system.

Gloria Silverman made an excellent decision to sacrifice, holding 2 aces after partner, Ruth Gold, had opened the bidding, in this deal from the Ladies Pairs.

Vul: Dlr:	N-S W	
	Q 9 8 7 3 J 7 6 4 8 6 K 8	
10 6 2 10 A J 7 A 7 6 4 3 2		K J 5 4 9 5 K Q 9 5 2 Q 5
	A A K Q 8 3 2 10 4 3 J 10 9	

Silverman	North	Gold	South
-	-	1D	1H
2C	3H (preemp)Pass	4H
4N	Pass	5C	Pass
Pass	Dbl	All Pass	

After a diamond lead Gloria went one down for an excellent result. Many North-South pairs bid and made game, some doubled.

Con Carter-Gord Maser played the first 4 sessions of the Open Pairs anonymously. The computer printout listed 360 pairs but didn't show their names. The President of the French Bridge League used such words as "impossible, incroyable" when confronted with this anomaly. After the fourth session when their names finally appeared on the printout they had survived the cut to be among the nine Canadian pairs to reach the semi-finals. Con and I have been debating whether it is better to declare or defend the following hand.

West	East
A	986
AJ32	K Q 7 4
K 1073	J 8 6 2
K Q 5 2	87

Against 4 hearts by East, South leads a spade. The question is can East make the hand against repeated spade taps? Both minor suit aces are onside and the Q of diamonds is doubleton offside. Con and Mike Passell both made 5 by leading a diamond **away from the K** during the play of the hand and getting North to duck his doubleton Q. Con's line; win the spade A, cross to the heart K, club to the K, small diamond to the J and A. When the K of diamonds dropped the Q Con made 5.

There were many other fascinating hands but space does not permit me to recount them. Congratulations to all Canadian participants. It was a great performance in the World Championships for Canada!



Hear it from

Editor's Note: By profession John is a systems analyst and technical writer and just a few of his accomplishments follow:

- * winner of numerous regionals
- runner-up in the 1976 Olympiad Team Trials
- * represented Canada in the 1978 Olympiad Team Trials
- * first winner of the Richmond Trophy
- * high finishes in CNTC, Vanderbilt, Men's Board-A-Match Teams, Life Master Pairs, Blue Ribbon Pairs
- * bridge writer and humorist extraordinaire
- * winner 1983 CNTC???



John assures us he is the one on the right.

Up For The Count

By John Carruthers, Toronto

How many times have you ducked what turned out to be the setting trick late in the hand? Or, conversely, risen with an honour to take declarer off an awkward guess? And when you analyzed the situation later, what conclusion did you reach? Probably it was something like, "I forgot to count declarer's hand," "I didn't realize declarer had the king", or something similar. What your analysis has revealed is that you didn't count. It doesn't matter what the reason is -poor concentration, fatigue, laziness, whatever. The fact is that counting is what separates the expert from everyone else there, the secret is out. Big deal, did I hear you say, I can count; some secret. But stop a moment to consider - do you count every single hand you play or defend? Do you count distribution and high card points and tricks (winners and losers) on every hand? Be truthful now. If you do, you are already an expert, or well on the way to becoming one. If not, well, there's still hope. You can learn, but you must practice. Sometimes, though, even the experts forget to count. The following hand illustrates how this can happen, and the pitfalls that ensue when it does.

North	South
A	KQJ7
J 6 2	ΑQ
K 1043	AJ7
A K J 9 6	Q 8 4 3

=the experts=

Suppose you open the South hand with a strong club, North makes a natural positive response in clubs, and after half a dozen cue bids each, a contract of 7 clubs is arrived at. The opening lead is the 10 of spades. How would you play? Decide before reading on. You can count 12 top tricks, and have potential finesses in hearts and diamonds for the 13th, or you can attempt to drop the diamond queen, and failing that, finesse the heart queen. That seems to be promising, so suppose you proceed along those lines. Thus, you win the ace of spades, and queen, West pitching the



3 and 4 of hearts on the 2nd and 3rd rounds. Next you cash the king and ace of diamonds - both follow and the queen does not fall. (You would have bet on that, right?) Now comes the king, queen, and jack of spades, both opponents following as you pitch a diamond and 2 hearts from the dummy. There's no point to throwing both diamonds from the dummy since the 10 may exert some pressure on the owner of the queen. We are down to:

-	-
J	A Q
10	J
J 9	8

In the diagrammed position, you lead the 8 of clubs to the dummy and cash your last club, hoping to extract as much information as possible. West pitches the 5 and 8 of hearts, and East the 6 of diamonds and 7 of hearts. You throw off the superfluous diamond jack. Now you lead the heart jack, East plays the 10, and you play the ...? Shall I set the stage for you? It's the semi-final of a World Championship and 29 Imp's rides on your decision, so take your time. (It's +12 Imp's if you "guess correctly, -17 if you go wrong.) Have you been counting? I hope so, because if you have, you should go right. Let's reconstruct the opponents' hands.

Both followed to 4 spades and 2 diamonds, West discarded 4 hearts and East 1, East discarded 1 diamond, and West started with 1 club, East with 3. East has followed to the heart at trick 12, so that leaves only 3 cards unaccounted for: the diamond queen and king and another heart. For you to make the hand, East's remaining card must be a heart, since if he holds the diamond queen, West has the guarded king of hearts remaining. So, if you assign the diamond queen to West, his original hand was:

Having come so far, it is evident that, since West held 5 hearts originally to East's 3, the odds are 5 to 3 he was dealt the heart king. So, you should play for the squeeze to have worked, and reject the finesse. The squeeze is more elegant anyway. The full hand:

	A J 6 2 K 10 4 3 A K J 9 6	
10 9 8 5 K 8 5 4 3 Q 9 8 I0		6 4 3 2 10 9 7 6 5 2 7 5 2
	K Q J 7 A Q A J 7 Q 8 4 3	

This hand occurred in the 1978 Rosenbloom Cup Semi-final matches between Poland and France, and Brazil and the U.S. (the hands were pre-duplicated for both matches) France arrived in 6NT, making in top tricks, and the other 3 teams bid to 7 clubs. Their bidding was superior to their play, however, as all 3 declarers failed. In Poland v. France, Frenkiel for Poland reasoned that if he led the heart jack from the dummy early on, East would cover if he had the king, so he duly led the jack, rising with the ace when no king appeared. He then misguessed the diamond queen, going down 2 and losing 17 Imps in the process. In Brazil v, the U.S., the Brazilian declarer cashed the diamond king and ace, then pitched dummy's remaining diamonds on high spades and finessed the heart. One down. Russell for the U.S. came closest to the winning line, actually arriving at our 2 card ending. But he finessed the heart queen, going down 2 and losing 3 Imp's

The difficulty with counting is that you must count everything since you often do not know until the crucial moment arrives what it is you should have counted, and by then it may be too late. Consequently, you cannot afford not to count everything: shape, high cards, and tricks. On the next hand, there is nothing as serious as the * * * * * * *

Rosenbloom Cup at stake, only a Regional Swiss Teams event.

Dummy	You
KQJ9	764
Q 10 8 2	K J 9 7
3	Q 1064
K Q 8 6	7 2

The opponents bid as follows:

North	South
1C	ID 🔥
1H	28
3S	3NT

A = 4th Suit Forcing. IS would have been natural and forcing.

Partner leads the club 4 (4th best leads) and your 7 beats dummy's 6 but, alas, declarer wins the 9. Declarer plays a spade to the king, a club to the ace, and a spade to the queen. Partner follows with, in order, the spade 5, the club 5, and the spade 8. Then comes the club king and you decide, right or wrong, to postpone a red suit discard and throw your spade. Declarer follows suit with the 3, partner with the jack. On the club queen you decide to part with a diamond since if declarer's diamonds are as good as AKJ, he has 9 tricks anyway. And maybe he'll do something silly if you discard one in front of his suit. Declarer sluffs the diamond 5 and partner follows with the club 10

Declarer now leads a heart to the ace and a heart to the queen, partner showing an even number with the 5 and 6. What do you do now? This time there's only 12 Imp's and 50 gold points at issue. From the play to date, it is obvious that declarer has either

(1) 3 2	(2) 10 3 2
A 4 3	or A 4 3
????5	???5
A 9 3	A 9 3

So you cash the heart jack, marking time, and declarer follows with the 4 spot, and partner the spade 10. It's hand number (1). What now?

As is so often the case in these situations, partner has not made the most effective lead for your side, but neither has declarer played the hand to best advantage. However, you mustn't let that deflect you from your purpose. Have you been counting with me? Then you know that partner has the spade ace (declarer's play is pretty peculiar otherwise) and either the ace or king of diamonds, or declarer has at least 9 tricks. Furthermore, declarer must have the jack and the 9 of diamonds, or he has no play regardless of which diamond you return (you're not about to lead a heart). So the only crucial cases for the defense are where declarer has either:

remaining. If he has (1) it doesn't matter which card you play, you are assured of two diamonds and the ace of spades **as long as partner ducks** declarer's diamond. Try it. If declarer has (2) however, it is imperative that you lead the diamond queen now. Try as he might, declarer can win no more than the diamond ace. On the other hand, if you lead the 6 or 10, declarer can win 2 diamond tricks by just covering your card.

If you found the play of the diamond queen, great play. When declarer has hand (1) your partner now also has an opportunity to shine when declarer covers with the king - he must duck the ace! In a way, this situation (1) would be more difficult for West at matchpoints. Should he win the ace, playing you for QJ10, or should he duck, ensuring defeat whenever possible? All things considered, he should probably duck, since you need exactly QJ10 to take all the remaining tricks, but that's another story. It also brings up the point that partnerships should discuss what their honour leads mean in these endgame situations. In one way, I'd like to be able to report that the play of the diamond queen and the subsequent duck of the ace were found at the table, but since I was declarer I'm just as happy they weren't!

We'll take a little of the pressure off for the final hand. It's from a Sectional Swiss

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Teams match. The auction was short and sweet - 1NT (15-17) by South, 3NT by North. Partner leads the diamond king into this layout:

Dummy	You
A Q 3	1086
1097	Q 6 2
Q 10 2	75
QJ75	K 10986

Partner follows up with the diamond ace and the diamond 8, you play your diamonds in whatever order is dictated by system, and declarer follows with the 4 and 9.

What do you play on the 3rd round of diamonds? Are you counting? Dummy has 11 h.c.p., you have 5, and partner has already shown 7. That leaves 17; not much left for partner after declarer is given his share. With nothing resembling an entry, why did partner not lead a low diamond? He probably has AKJxxx in diamonds, and was willing to risk leading the king on the chance of

- a) finding you with the queen.
- b) a doubleton queen with dummy or declarer.
- c) declarer with queen third, but any entry in your hand to lead the second one through.

So if partner holds the diamond jack, declarer must have every other high card point except possibly one of the major suit jacks. The spade jack is irrelevant to the hand, and if declarer holds the heart jack, he will come to 9 tricks by playing his cards in any order within reason.

To have any chance at all of holding declarer to 8 tricks or less, he must have no more than 3 spades and partner must hold the heart jack. Are you getting there? Even if that is the case, declarer can lead hearts toward his hand twice, ducking if the queen appears and playing a 3rd round of the suit if it doesn't. A classic avoidance play. Surely you're there now - throw the heart queen on the diamond queen! An avoidance avoidance, so to speak. Now declarer can never make the hand.

	A Q 3 10 9 7 Q 10 3 Q J 7 5
9742	1086
J 4 3	Q 6 2
A K J 8 6 2	75
-	K 10986
	K J 5
	A K 8 5
	94
	A 4 3 2

I am delighted to report that the jettison of the heart queen was found at the table by my teammate, George Mittelman. A fine play to earn a push. Yes, a push. At my table, west led the ace, king, and deuce of diamonds with such alacrity (East pitched a spade) that he convinced everyone at the table (even his partner!) that he held the club king as a potential entry. So I double hooked the hearts, losing to west's jack third. After finishing me off with 3 more diamonds, west took great pains to point out that the jack of hearts was the only card resembling an entry in his hand, that he never thought he'd get in again, et cetera, ad nauseum. Not for the first time, nor I suspect the last, I felt the fool.

These 3 example hands serve to illustrate the point that a constant vigil must be maintained by the bridge player who aspires to expert status. **Remember, count, count, count ... shape, points, tricks, winners, losers ...**



Canadian Bidding Contest =

February Honour Roll

Interesting patterns are emerging from reader responses to our bidding contest: solvers are catching on to the panel's bidding style; this has caused runaway inflation in our scoring system. With apologies to many disappointed solvers, we'll have to cut off the February honour roll at 540.

•		
1. Joseph Doucet	Toronto, Ont.	600
2. Dan Brown	Perth, Ont.	590
3. Byron Price	Victoria, B.C.	560
48. Bobbe McDonald	Prince Albert, Sask.	550
Mike Hartop	Maple Ridge, B.C.	550
Ross Driedgen	Toronto, Ont.	550
Michael Schleifer	Montreal, Que.	550
Jude Goodwin	Rossland, B.C.	550
912. John Thompson	Ennismore, Ont.	540
Brian Thomas	North Bay, Ont.	540
Richard Bickley	Stettler, Alta.	540
Paul Godin	Montreal Nord, Que.	540
	· · ·	

The first two finishers are past winners and therefore ineligible for further panel appearances. However, when Mr. Doucet won last year, he missed out on the book prize, as it was awarded to a co-winner. Therefore, in a simonic decision (there'a a cut below the solomonic kind), The Amazing Joseph Doucet wins the bridge book, but Mr. Price joins the panel. (Aside to Mr. Doucet: Your address, please).



by Allan Simon May Panel

We have a baker's dozen of well known experts this month. Let's meet them, in alphabetical order:

GUY BILODEAU (Neufchatel, Qué.) is one of Québec's top players. He has twice qualified for the final stage of the (CNTC) and he has at least one Regional K-O win to his name.

STEPHEN ERIC COOPER (Toronto)

was a Life Master at 19, has won 7 or 8 Regionals, placed high in the last two CNTC finals and by latest count had driven his last four steady partners into retirement, alcoholism and/or insanity.

JIM HOWARD (Saskatoon), long one of Saskatchewan's best known players – he once won all four events at a sectional! --, has gained national attention with his fine play at the last two CNTC finals, representing the district 18 (Alberta-Sask.) champions.

SHERMAN KWAN (Vancouver) played in his first CNTC final last year. His other credits include one Regional first, five Sectional triumphs, and the title of one of B.C.'s top two Precision bidders. (His partner is B.C.'s only other precisionist, Sherman tells us.)

ROBERT LEBI (Toronto), is a young veteran with 20-odd Regional victories, a strong performance at the 1978 Olympiad in New Orleans (Pairs and Teams), and above all a splendid runner-up finish at last fall's major North American event, the



* * * * * * * * * *

Reisinger Teams.

JOHN MacGREGOR (Halifax) has a legendary reputation in Nova Scotia, despite the fact that he now plays infrequently. He spends his winters in Costa Rica and his biggest bridge thrill was representing Canada at the 1974 Pairs Olympiad on the Canary Islands. There, one presumes, his knowledge of Spanish must have come in handy.

JOEL MARTINEAU (Vancouver) has won nine Regionals over the years, has established a successful partnership with Alex Orlandini (a task hitherto considered impossible) and also deserves kudos for filling out his bidding questionnaire not only in a far more literate style than most, but also in beautiful calligraphy with nary an erasure or obliteration.

LYNNE MILNER (Toronto) seemed surprised when invited to the expert panel. We have no idea why; after all, she was one of Canada's youngest Life Masters and played at the 1978 Olympiad while barely out of her teens (I'm just guessing, of course).

BRIAN PAULS (Winnipeg), the bridge columnist for the Winnipeg Free Press and for the last twenty years Mr. Bridge in Manitoba, also played at the 1978 Olympiad. He also holds the unusual distinction of having won the Life Master's Pairs consolation at the Summer Nationals, not once, but twice!

VOYTECK POMYKALSKI (Cornwall, Ont.) went from obscurity to the cover of the ACBL Bulletin as a member of the GARTAGANIS team which won the 1982 CNTC. Throughout the CNTC and the Bermuda Bowl trials, Pomykalski was a tower of strength and an inspiration to his teammates. Better memorize the name, because you'll keep hearing it.

BYRON PRICE (Victoria) is here because of his outstanding performance in the February contest. In a covering letter, he modestly denies any previous encounter with bridge fame; and sportingly he states that he does not begrudge Mr. Doucet the book prize.

DAVE STOTHART (Ottawa) was on the team that placed second at the 1981 CNTC,

in his home town. Add a dozen Regional wins and (guessing again) thirty-odd years of bridge experience and you've got one of the top experts in the country.

LOUWOODCOCK (Hamilton) is another name that needs no introduction. The winner of countless Regionals and Sectionals, he was Sami Kehela's first regular partner when the latter first arrived in Canada. He is a regular contributor to the Ontario "Kibitzer".

May Solutions:

(A)	IMPs, East-West vul., South holds:
	S:J108542 H:A643 D: - C:KJ3

West	North	n East	South
-	ID	Pass	1S
Pass	2C	Pass	?
		Panel	
Scoring;	Action	votes	Points
	2S	7	100
	3C	2	60
	2H	3	50
	Pass	1	30

We were surprised to find three of the most respected panelists espouse a two heart hid. Many contemporary partnerships (and most casual partnerships between experts, surely) play that the bid of the fourth suit forces to game. Yet these panelists were so repelled by all alternatives that they selected two hearts, confident they could field whatever partner threw at them next.

MILNER: Two hearts. The worst thing I could hear from partner is three diamonds in which case I take my lumps and pass.

If we dismiss two hearts and pass as too extreme (as I feel we should), we arrive at the tough choice between two spades and three clubs. The former is a slight underbid, but places the emphasis where it belongs, on our six-bagger. Three clubs is just right on high cards, but overstates the support. Here is a representative sampling of expert opinion:

STOTHART: Two spades: Best chance for game -- if partner can bid again, we're there!

KWAN: Two spades. Best chance for game

* * * *

+ + +

Have you two gentlemen met?

LEBI: Two spades, a mild underbid. $2\frac{1}{2}$ spades is the true value call, but ... fortunately the auction is not necessarily over.

As Peter Nagy once pointed out, a warm glow will engulf an auction whenever one partner has made a slight underbid in a critical situation -- the bit he has in reserve usually looks awfully good when he tables dummy.

The most complete analysis comes from Toronto:

COOPER: Three clubs. Pass is out since pard is still wide-ranged; two hearts is nice if played as a natural one-round force, but not as a game force. Two spades overemphasizes spades and is more attractive at matchpoints. Three clubs invites -- if pard has game aspirations, you may hear more.

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

S:A8 H:A63 D:KQ754 C:A83

West	North	East	South
-	-	30	?
Scoring;	Action	Panel votes	Points
	3NT	5	100
	3D	4	80
	Dbl.	4	70
	Pass	0	30

At the risk of antagonizing eight panelists from Victoria to Halifax, I would like to forcefully express the opinion that any bridge player with red blood in his veins (or is it arteries?) would bid three notrump, especially at matchpoints. Here are the opinions of some macho panelists:

LEBI: Three notrump. There are no other choices.

WOODCOCK: Three notrump. What else can one do?

BILODEAU: Three notrump. My kind of bid in this situation. Double is out of the question because of my spades and three diamonds is a gross underbid.

MILNER: Three notrump. Take a shot at game. I believe double would put too much pressure on you and your partner.

It is difficult to see what three diamonds will accomplish, but the bid has the advantages of being safe and proper; it will appeal to the sort of people who rush out and shovel their walk right after a snowfall.

KWAN: Three diamonds. Waiting. Cannot bid game without support from partner. Will bid four hearts over three hearts and three notrump over three spades.

MARTINEAU: Three diamonds caters to the most favourable developments. On a particularly lucky day partner will bid three hearts allowing me to cue four clubs. While over three spades I'll call three notrump.

Having never been a great fan of the socalled optional double, I'll let readers draw their own conclusions from doublers' comments:

MacGREGOR: Double. Best of a poor set of actions considering our value as too strong to pass.

PRICE: Double. If partner bids three spades, I will bid four diamonds. The vulnerable three club bid is too strong for a notrump overcall.

POMYKALSKI: Double. If I bid three diamonds I might miss easy three notrump if partner holds diamond ace and a major suit king; three notrump is a shot (which might work though); so I double, then pass any response except three spades over which I would bid four diamonds. If things go wrong, I'll ask Nick (Gartaganis) what I should have done in the first place.

A master psychologist, that Pomykalski!

(C) IMPs, North-South vul., South holds:

S:64 H:J654 D:J532 C:AK7

West	North	East	South
IS	Pass	INT	Pass
2H	3C	Pass	?



* * * *

		Panel	
Scoring;	Action	votes	Points
	4C	6	100
	Pass	6	90
	3NT	1	50
	5C	0	40

Among the numerous unit newsletters which feature bidding panels, none is better than the Unit 430 "Matchpointer", masterfully edited by Vancouver's Aidan Ballantyne. This problem is lifed from their June 1982 issue; their panel voted 14-9 in favour of Pass over three notrump, while the inevitable lunatic fringe went for actions like three hearts or three spades; oddly enough nobody considered four clubs.

Defining the problem for us:

STOTHART: Four clubs. Hey, here's the best problem in a while! All my helpers in Ottawa say "I don't care what he got in spades, why no bid the first time?"

His helpers don't english so good. Most four club (and three notrump) voters felt they knew why partner did not act at his first opportunity:

MacGREGOR: Three notrump. Partner must have a strong spade/club hand not to have acted initially. Game should be a breeze.

BILODEAU: Four clubs. Partner should have six clubs and probably four or even five good spades. We might have game in clubs (surely not notrump) and I therefore show my nice support in his suit.

COOPER: Four clubs. Apparently partner has a black two-suiter which induced him not to take action initially. It is barely possible that partner is on a prebalancing expedition. (This becomes more likely if we are not playing weak jump overcalls.) However, our clubs seem too strong, the colour is ominous, and this is not matchpoints. Pard should be quite strong. I am co-operating, not hanging. Opponents own too many fast red tricks for three notrump.

An excellent analysis of the problem. Let's focus on the 'pre-balancing' business; Cooper is suggesting that partner may hold S:Qxxx H:Kx D:x C:QJxxxx. Afraid that we might neglect to balance (or, worse, balance with three diamonds) partner is pre-balancing for us. This interpretation is even more popular since Mike Lawrence (in "The Complete Book of Overcalls") debunked the old saw "Don't overcall when strong in RHO's suit", and it appealed to the passers:

POMYKALSKI: Pass. Looks like partner has six-plus clubs and some values, but he did not bid over one spade, so he is just competing, counting on my 7-9 HCP.

PAULS: Pass. What could partner hold whereby he didn't bid on the first round and we would now make a game?

LEBI: Pass. Partner must have six or seven bad clubs, probably four spades, approximately 10-12 HCP, NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO OVERCALL IMMED-IATELY. Partner is "balancing" for you as he/she is short in hearts and knows that your heart length will prohibit you from balancing. Don't hang partner, pass.

(D) IMPs, neither vul., South holds:

S:A543 H:10 D:A97643 C:K7

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1D
Pass	15	4H	4S
Pass	5C	Pass	5D
Pass	5H	Pass	?
		Panel	
Scoring;	Action	votes	Points
	6C	6	100
	6S	2	70
	5S	4	50
	5NT	1	40

This is a familiar situation. At his every turn, circumstances have conspired to force South into making a stronger-sounding bid that he really would like. And here we are again, with a moral obligation to bid six clubs, showing second round control. At this point, four panelists threw up their hands, stepped on the brakes and said in effect: "Whoa. Enough is enough. Five spades."

WOODCOCK: Five spades. I have bid

more than enough and have already made one cue bid.

MARTINEAU: Five spades. Good problem. We perhaps already overstated our values despite our controls and definite trick-taking potential. But then partner needs only S:KQ10xx H:Axx D:Kx C:Axx to be virtually cold for seven, and can probably make six with S:KJxxx H:Axx D:xx C:Axx. But if we stop to realize that with either of these hands, partner will keep trying for seven, our obligation for now is surely to slow this headlong rush with a five-spade bid.

Six panelists, however, enjoy headlong rushes. They floored the accelerator by cue bidding again:

BILODEAU: Six clubs. I haven't shown partner any more extra values than I have. I will keep on cue bidding my controls up the line for as long as my partner keeps bidding.

HOWARD: Six clubs. If partner can show second round diamond control I will bid seven spades. Partner should have KQxxx or King sixth or seventh in spades to invite slam.

MacGREGOR: Six clubs. Although we were trapped by the four heart bid, our hand has only appreciated with every round of bidding. It seems contrary not to continue to exchange information while proceeding to a small slam.

It is easy to sympathize with panelists who decided to compromise between the exuberant six clubs and the prudent five spades. Their choice of six spades strikes me as inappropriate, however. It suggests something like S:AKxx H:x D:Axxxxx C:xx, in other words a minimum with great trumps. Still, any bid advocated by Milner and Pomykalski can't be too far off the mark:

MILNER: Six spades. I still really like my hand but I would never show any second round control on the way since it already looks like six will be on one of two hooks.

Finally, our honourary expert displayed a

refreshing willingness to experiment with the unorthodox:

PRICE: Five notrump. Six or seven spades, partner?

(E) Board-a-Match teams, North-South vul., South holds:

S:AQJ9 H:Q D:A92 C:KQJ98

West	North	East	South
-	Pass	3D	3NT
Pass	4H	Pass	Pass
Dbl.	Pass	Pass	?
		Panel	
Scoring;	Action	votes	Points
2.	Pass	7	100
	Redbl.	4	80
	4NT	1	60
	45	1	40

This hand was dealt in the Men's Teams at the 1974 Spring Nationals in Vancouver. Eddie Kantar, South, chose to redouble, obviously SOS. But North, Bob Hamman, holding S:xx H:K10xxxx D:Q C:A10xx, elected to pass four hearts redoubled and went down one while five clubs was laydown.

Agreeing with Kantar was:

POMYKALSKI: Redouble. This means pick a black suit. If partner leaves it and goes for a number we will beat them on other boards.

Most of the panel, however, did not wish for further excitement on this particular board:

HOWARD: Pass. No doubt four notrump will be right on occasion, but when in doubt I always elect to be dummy.

PAULS: Pass. What justification is there to mastermind the hand? My own holding is consistent with my bid and partner should not have been misled. Also, his trumps are over West's.

KWAN: Pass. Partner should have a minimum of seven hearts and did not want to preempt in first seat.

Finally, two panelists who do not like being dummy, even in a bidding contest:

PRICE: Four spades. Partner should

* * * * * * * * * * * *

+ + determine the final contract, four spades or five clubs. Redouble would be confirmative.

WOODCOCK: Four notrump. West did not double three notrump. Hearts are stacked but I can keep East out.

(F) IMPs, neither vul., South holds:

S:Q987 H:AQ964 D:6 C:K97

West	North	East	South
-	-	-	1 H
3H*	Dbl.	3NT	Pass
Pass	Dbl.	Pass	Pass
Redbl	Pass	Pass	Pass

* shows solid minor and asks partner to bid 3NT with a heart stopper.

Which card do you lead?

		Panel	
Scoring;	Action	votes	Points
	Club	5	100
	Ace of		
	hearts	1	90
	Spade	3	70
	Small		
	heart	4	60
	Diamon	d0	0

The scoring of this problem looks strange. We felt South had two distinct questions to ask himself: 1) Could partner have the heart king? By a vote of 9 to 4 the panel answered no, therefore the small heart leaders get only 60 points. 2) Which black suit is right? Club guessers win 5-3 (with one undecided panelist, who hopes to find inspiration in the appearance of dummy and partner's signal), so they get top score. Fair enough? Let's listen to a heart leader first:

COOPER: Heart six. The first double should say "You stole my bid" – it's some kind of heart raise. The second double is either lead-directing or a misplaced display of confidence in my "opening bid".

Cooper continues with an exhaustive analysis of lead-directing doubles (including a review of pertinent literature since 1946), confirming his conclusion that a heart is the only sensible lead. To his credit, Cooper also reveals that he recognized the deal but would not let the real-life result influence his response. Most panelists, however, felt a heart was out and tried to hit partner's entry:

STOTHART: Small spade. No consensus anywhere between Toronto and Montreal. I'd love to hear the post-game review of this one – if you guess wrong!

MARTINEAU: This could be one of the great egg-on-the-face decisions, but ... king of clubs, because of partner's second double. Partner must know she can defeat three notrump, and she certainly doesn't know that in the heart suit. I hope that in your discussion you could give the origin and result of this one.

Sure could. The hand is from the 1981 World Championship final between the United States and Pakistan. The full deal was:

North (Fazli)
S:J54
H:J32
D:J3
C:AQJ53
West (Meckstroth) East (Rodwell)

S:2	S:AK1063
H:108	H:K75
D:AKQ10852	D:974
C:642	C:108
Se	outh (Munir)
S:	Q987
Н	:AQ964
D	:6
C	:K97

Munir Atta-Ullah reasoned as follows: "Conscious that an enormous number of IM Ps hung on the lead I took time to think matters over ... the double of three hearts clearly showed some heart support and the subsequent double must guarantee at least a black ace ... I decided one lead through East would enable us to run the hearts and I concentrated on trying to work out which black ace partner held. If East held stoppers in both black suits then partner held the spade ace and declarer the club ace and spade king ... So I led a spade and Rodwell was +750. If I had led a club we would have been +2200." Other panelists who found the club lead were:

PAULS: Seven of clubs. East would not bid three notrump without stoppers in the majors.

LEBI: Seven of clubs. The second double was to warn me off the lead the first double called for. It is really a guess whether a spade or club is right. I have more help in clubs so I close my eyes and hope for the best.

WOODCOCK: Club king. Heart is OUT.

HOWARD: Club seven. Partner will have a fine hand and very likely the club suit on this auction.

August Contest

To enter the August contest, send your guesses (comments are welcome, but not required), together with your name and address to:

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

Only one set of answers per person please. (One fellow once sent 40 different sets of answers, yet failed to break 500!) The reader with the highest score will receive: a bridge book; an invitation to join the expert panel; and the admiration of everyone.

August Problems

(A) Rubber bridge, E-W vul. and a 70 partial, South holds:

S:KJ1096 H:83 D:Q95 C:KQ4

	West	North	East	South
	-	-	1S	Pass
	Pass	Dbl.	Pass	Pass
	2D	Pass	Pass	?
(B)	IMPs, i	N-S vul., S	South ho	lds:
	S:543 H	1:5 D:AK	Q109 C:K	(1063
	West	North	East	South
	-	-	۱H	?
(C)	Match	points, ne	ither vu	l., South

holds:

S:Q105 H:96 D:10542 C:J864

West	North	East	South
-	IC	Pass	Pass
Dbl.	Redbl	2S	?

(D) IMPs, neither vul., South holds:

S:J853 H:AQ6 D:Q2 C:AK74

West	North	East	South
Pass	1D	ΙH	Dbl.*
Pass	1S	Pass	2H
Pass	2S	Pass	?

* negative double

(E) Matchpoints, North-South vul., South holds:

S:Q865 H:AK92 D:4 C:AKJ7

West	North	East	South
1S	Pass	2S	?

(F) IMPs, both vul., South holds: S:AJ97 H:AJ87 D:A76 C:65

West	North	East	South		
-	-	INT*	Pass		
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass		

* 15-17 HCP

Which card do you lead?

In Memorium: J.R. Barrington

It is in sympathy that we record the passing of John Ronald Barrington, known as Barry Barrington to the bridge players. In recent years the Barringtons were members of Vancouver Unit 430. Due to failing health Barry had not played much recently, but he was well known to Bridge World readers for his continuing success in the Master Solvers Forum.

Before moving to Vancouver in the mid-seventies Barry worked for over 25 years in promoting bridge in the Montreal Unit.

Bridge players across Canada mourn the passing of J.R. Barrington who worked hard to promote bridge at the local level.





By Aaron Goodman

For the 13th consecutive year I am pleased to present a report on the financial operations of the Canadian Bridge Federation for the year 1982.

Attached are statements which show:

- (A) Receipts and Disbursements on both Membership and Olympiad Fund account (maintained separately) indicating in each case the year end cash position, and,
- (B) a detailed listing of contributions and payments made in 1982 by Units of the C.B.F. and affiliated Clubs shown separately for Membership and Olympiad Fund account.

For better evaluation comparative figures are given for 1981 and 1980.

STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS - Jan. 1/82 to December 31st/1982.

RECEIPTS

	M Ad	embership ccount	Olympiad Account	
1982 Membership dues	\$15056.65			
deposits	5067.50			
tribution to CBF	5000.00	25124.15		
Total proceeds from Canada Wide and other Olympiad Fund Games Received 50¢ per member from Units 230/194/152/192 166/228/392/391/393/573/ 575/431			10494.70	
	4944.85	15439.55		
Two thirds of ROTHMAN'S contribution to CBF Stan Tench - surplus realized from CNPC A.C.B.L remainder of surcharge			10000.00 893.23 (US) 34.00	
TOTAL RECEIPTS - 1982		25124.15	26366.78	
31/1981		30643.77	29318.68	
TOTAL available funds		\$55767.92	55685.46	

+ + +

* * * * *

DISBURSEMENTS

		DISDURSEN	ILINIS			
A.C.B.L. Fe	b. 1/82 Digest	1796.70				
A.C.B.L. Ma	av.1/82 Digest	2082.42				
ACBL AD	g 1/82 Digest	2349.04				
ACBL No	v 1/82 Digest	2403 50				
A.C.D.L. NO	W. 1/02 Digest	2405.50				
Bass/Savage		2412 (0				
4 Digests 194	42	2419.60				
		11051.26				
Less Adverti	sing	85.00	10966.26			
ACRI Feb	1/81	05.00	2769.02	13735 28		
ACBLICO.	1/01			1,7,55.20		
Expenses of	six Directors and					
Treasurer att	ending Members					
& Directo	rs meeting in					
Edmonton	-		4345.70			
Expenses of	retiring V P and					
new Execu	itive Sec'y to					
Edmonton	nive see y to		1421.01			
Editionion			1421.01			
			5767.51			
Less portion	covered by CBF					
Char, Fund	-		616.00	5151.51		
Honorarium	1982 Executive					
Sec'v (2)	Die Briedunie			1500.00		
Honorarium	to Transurar			500.00		
				500.00		
F.A. Dalaga	- expense a/c to			(00.01		
July I				688.01		
Irene Warne	er - expense a/c					
from July 1				490.92		
H. Shields - e	xpenses attending					
ACBL Meet	ing			601.13		
Expenses of	5 Directors (Tel.					
-Post. etc.)				683.72		
Hotel charge	es general ex-					
nenses cove	ring Members &					
Directors me	eting			628.02		
Directors inc	& Bank abarges			61.20	2/	1020.09
Registration	& Dalik Charges			01.39	24	+039.98
Biarritz Oly	ympiad partici-					
pation - Enti	y Fees					7812.61
Travel and p	er diem advanced					26682.50
Expenses of	D. Andrews re-					
presenting C	BF at Biarritz					2100.00
, 0			2295 00			26505 11
			2385.00			30393.11
Less entry fe	es received		1335.60		_	3720.60
Less refund	from Andrews -					
undistribute	1					32874 51
Alton experi						100 00
A C D J	sca/c					100.08
A.C.B.L.	- transfer to					00.00
Charitable F	und			_		98.00
Balance on I	hand - Dec 31 -	1982	31727 9	4 3316	0 59	22524.37
Datafiel Off	nanu - Dec. 31 -	1702	51727.7	. 5510	0.57	22227.27



÷

* * * * * * * * * * * *

	N.	EMPERSHIP				OLYMPIAD	1000	
	1980	1981	1982)	1980	1981	1982	
<u>ONE 1.</u> CADIAN UNIT #230	300 e ⁰⁰ (*79) 599.00(80) 611.00	582.00)	710.50	877.75	14.00 120.00 161.00 42.00 56.00 45.00 10.00 49.00 38.50 84.00 46.00 36.00 291.00	Campbelltown BC Newcastle DBC (2) Fredericton DBC (3) X. U. Br. Studio Kensington DBC Monston DBC Abigweit Br. Cl. Wast Primce BC Fundy D B C Nipisquit DBC Summerside DBC Sathurst DBC Unit Unit X 50¢ 1052.55
CAN. MARIT DAES #194			684.00)	308.00	738,50	126.00 357.00 49.00 342.00	Cornerbrook BC (2) Halifax Br. World (3) Trufo DBC Unit X 50¢ 874.00
2004 2. ONTEEAL WIT #151	1936.50	1819.50	2250,50)	904.75	359 . 50	48.00 24.00 108.50 112.00 94.50 47.25 73.80 98.00	Mirabel DBC Circle de ^B r. St. Lamber Bnai Brith BC Manoir DBC Circ. de Bf. Sherbrooke St. Vincent de Paul BC Verdun DBC Mon Club DBC 605.7
QUEREC UNIT ∦152	307.00	350.00	381.00)	420.00	136.50	246.00 119.00 147.00 190.50	Cl. de Br. St Georges (4 Cl. de Br Murray Bay (2) Cl de Br St Hillary (2) Unit X 50¢ 702.50
SAGUENAY UNIT #199	372.00(79) 348.00(80)	<u> </u>))	133.00	2 29 . 50	77.00 49.00	Circ. de Br. St. Ile Mont Joli DBC 126.0
								3360 7

P

CANADIAN BRIDGE FEDERATION

66cbd21

66cbd22

	1980	1981	1982		1980	1981	1982		
Brought forward	2915.50	3727.50	3897.50)	2476•25	2341.75	3360.75		3360.75
EASTER!! ONTARIO #192	1199.00	1517,50	1124.00)	884.00	715.5 ⁰).08.50 63.00 154.00 133.00 84.00 562.00	Kingston DBC Sault Falls DBC Gloucester DBC Capital DBC Brockwille DBC Unit X 50¢	1104.50
ZONE 3. OWTARIO	4784.00	4910 . 00	4711.00)	3066.00	48.50.00	175.00 66.50 26.00 380.50 63.00 180.25 413.00 91.00 228.50 28.50 28.00 84.00 70.00 77.00 84.00 55.00.00 177.83 21.00 2355.50	Grant Lindop BC Burlington St. Belleville Ajax DBC T. Horning BC (Guelph DBC Niagara Falls B Kate Buckmans B Mississauga DBC Varkland Wood B Oakville DBC Embers DBC Goderich BC Georgetown BC Elmbank DBC Maple City BC White Oaks Unit (Eater Tou Trials Surplus West Germany Unit X 50¢	(2) 4) C (3) C (2) rn) 5149.08
TRENT VALLEY UNIT #246	55555	500.00('8 482.00	0) 500.00		364,28	154.00	70.00 30.00 52.59 35.00 84.00	Barrie DBC Trenton DBC Aurora DBC Belleville DBC Crillia DBC	271.50
Carried forward	8828.50	11137.00	10232.50		6790.53	8041.25	9885.33		9885.83

f

ŀ

-

--

÷

÷

÷

+

ŀ

+

+

÷

ŧ

L

+

Þ

Þ

÷

-

÷

÷

	1080	MEMBERSHIP 1981	1982)	1980	OLYMPIAD. 1981	1982	
Brought forward	8898,50	11137.00	10232.50)	6790.53	8041.25	9885 . 93	
ZONE 4. MANITOBA UNIT #181	491.00	464.00	8 29 65 8)	96.50	42.00	168.00	Kirkfield-Westwd (2) 168.00
T‼UNDER BAY UNIT #228	230.00	228.00	216.65)	311.50	350.50	63.00 203.00 84.00 22.00 60.00 108.35	Geraldton DBC Th. Bay Unit BC (2) Northwestorn Ont. Master Non M. Parry Sound BC UNIT X 50¢ 540.35
QUONTA UNIT #238	405.00	3 74 •00	392.00)	414.00	441.00	36.00 80.50 77.00 98.00 35.00	Porcupine DBC Parry Sound DBC Coppereliff DBC North Bay DBC Nickel City BC 326.50
SOO INTERNATIONAL #212	80.00	140.00	846 a a)	***	******	30.00 113.87	Elliot Lake BC Soo St Marie BC 143.67
NOFTE. MANITOBA UNIT #245	844663	建合学主由	112.50)	## # ##	计合同系统	56.00	Flin Flon BC 56.00
ZONE 5. TETHBRINGE UMIT #392	156.00	148.00	131.00)	64 57 5	操作计算	65.50	UNIT X 50¢ 65.50
NCRTH. ALBERTA #391	674.00	664.00	630.00)	469.50	588.00	297.50 10.00 98.00 49.00 315.00	Klondike DBC (3) Campbell - Edmonton Unit Red Deor DBC UNIT X 50¢ 769.50
NEDICINE HAT #393	58.00	53.00	54.00)		35.00	36.00 28.00 27.00	Brigge Unltd. Brocks DBC UNIT X 50¢ 91.00
CALGARY UND T #300	710.00	720.00	595 . 00)	364.00	210.00	147.00 70.00 13.00 157.50 133.00 42.00 297.50	Central Alta BC (2) Canmere BC Red Deer BC Unit (2) Martinique BC Banff DBC
Carried forward	11702.50	13928.00	12363.65)	8446.03	9707.75	12906.55	12906.55

÷

* * * *

	1980	MEMPERSHIP 1981	1982)	1980	OLYMFIAD 1981	1982	
Brought forward	11702.50	13928.00	12363.65)	8446.03	9707.75	12906.55	12906.55
ZCNE 5 - Cont'd NERTH SASKATCHEWAN #575	483 . 00	468.00	473 . 00)	255.50	465,50	119.00 63.00 63.00 236.50	Loydminster DBC (3) Nipawin BC (2) Prince Albert BC UNIT X 50¢ 481.50
SOUT! SASKATCHEWAN UNIT	#573 450.00	497.00	4 95.00)	402.50	695. 50	221.00 56.00 84.00 112.00	Moose Jaw RC (3) Broadview DRC Swift Current (2) Regina DBC 473.00
ZONE 6. EAST KOOTENAY #574	8-8 ** ** **	要要能要必	拉卡林尔 尔)	115.00	21.00	(247•50 ≉*∺92*) Unit X 50¢ Cr. 1981
OKANAGAN UNIT #571	387.00	384.00	352.00)	343.00	*******	91.00 56.00 70.00	Summerland DBC Kamloops DBC Salmon Arm BC 217.00
VANCOUVER UNIT #430	1385.00	1182.00	1065.00)	383.25	558 . 50	329.00 105.00 56.00 189.00 133.00	Haidi DBC (3) Port Coquitlam BC Pemberton DBC Burnahy DBC Cloverdale 812.00
QUESNEL UNIT #456	******	100.00	(180)****)	224.00	203.00	112.50 45.00 63.00 49.00	Spruce Capital BC Williams Lake BC (2) Fort St. John BC Prince Rupert BC 269.50
VICTOPIA UNIT #431	328.00	333.00	308.00)	80.50	84.00	154.00	UNIT X 50¢ 154.00
PARKSTILLE UNIT #429	250.00	250.00	8-18-18 8-18 -18)	88.00	241.50	126.00	UNI T 126.00
)				
TOTAL	14985.50	17242.00	15056.65)	10338.28	11986.75	15439.55	15439.55

+

+ +

-+

+ +

* * * *