

WINTER ISSUE



Maritime

BRIDGE LINE

*Official Newsletter and Tournament Schedules of
The Canadian Maritimes Unit 194 and Acadian Unit 230 of the A.C.B.L.*

Vol. 19, No. 1

WINTER ISSUE

FEBRUARY, 1990

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE UNIT 194

I would first like to take the opportunity to thank Karl Hicks and the entire Executive for the exemplary manner in which they have managed the affairs of Maritime Unit 194 over these past two years. Their initiatives have resulted in many improvements which will contribute significantly to the orderly running of all our events thus enhancing the enjoyment of this game we love so much.

As we enter a new decade I am concerned about the increasing lack of enthusiasm from our membership towards assisting with the work and effort necessary to keep our clubs, and the unit as a whole, healthy and running smoothly, especially at the grassroots level. Far too much of the work is left to that small core of energetic individuals prevalent in every organization willing to do whatever is necessary while the majority of us enjoy the benefits and reap the rewards of their efforts. This group inevitably tires of the unending responsibility, the thanklessness and the ensuing criticism. 'Many hands make light work' and in 1990 we should all try to participate actively in the growth and promotion of our unit, from the club level on up.

I look forward to working with the new executive. We have a busy year ahead of us. I promise to be accessible and encourage your worthwhile comments and your constructive criticisms. I wish each and every one of you a successful but more importantly an enjoyable 1990. Good luck and good bridge.

BRIAN HANSEN

OLDEST CLUB MASTER?

Bill Kell at the age of 86 has become the oldest club master in the Atlantic Provinces and perhaps anywhere. Bill started playing duplicate bridge at 84 and just recently collected his 50th masterpoint. He enjoys not only the game of bridge, but getting out and meeting people.

(1)

DON COX SECTIONAL

Where: Best Western Glengarry
150 Willow St., Truro, N.S.
Reservation: 893-4311
(mention bridge tournament)

When: April 27-29, 1990

FRIDAY, APRIL 27th

2:00 p.m.—KNOCKOUT TEAMS
—ROUND 1
TIDAL BORE PAIRS

8:00 p.m.—KNOCKOUT TEAMS
ROUND 2
MASTERS PAIRS

12:00 a.m.—SPEEDBALL
MINI-KNOCKOUTS

SATURDAY, APRIL 28th

9:00 a.m.—KNOCKOUT TEAMS
—ROUND 3

1:30 p.m.—KNOCKOUT TEAMS
ROUND 4
OPEN PAIRS QUALIFYING

7:30 p.m.—OPEN PAIRS FINAL
& CONSOLATION

11:30 p.m.—SPEEDBALL
MINI-KNOCKOUTS

SUNDAY, APRIL 29th

10:00 a.m.—SWISS TEAMS QUALIFYING

3:00 p.m.—SWISS TEAMS
FINAL & CONSOLATION
PRIZES TO ALL WINNERS
OF ALL EVENTS

Tournament Chairperson:
Lorelei Langille—893-9227

Directors:
KARL HICKS
GORDON MASER

Partnership Desk:
Pat Scammell—893-7571

Entry Fees:
\$6.00 per session

FREDERICTON SPRING SECTIONAL

Keddy's Motor Inn

March 23rd 25th

- SCHEDULE -

FRIDAY, MARCH 23rd

2:00 p.m.—KNOCKOUT TEAMS
ROUND 1
ELM CITY PAIRS

8:00 p.m.—KNOCKOUT TEAMS
ROUND 2
MASTER PAIRS

12:00 a.m.—KNOCKOUT TEAMS
ROUND 3
(Round 4 KO if necessary
TBA)

SATURDAY, MARCH 24th

11:30 a.m.—UNIT 230 ANNUAL MEETING
and ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1:30 p.m.—OPEN PAIRS QUALIFYING

7:30 p.m.—OPEN PAIRS
FINAL & CONSOLATION

12:00 a.m.—SPEEDBALL SWISS

SUNDAY, MARCH 25th

10:00 a.m.—SWISS TEAMS, 1st Session

T.B.A. —SWISS TEAMS, 2nd session

Chairperson: Duff Harper (506)-458-1617)

Partnerships: Clare MacEwen
(506)-472-8908)

Director: Karl Hicks

Fees: \$5.00 per session

ADDRESS CHANGES

Unit 194 Send to:

EDGAR BLINN
P. O. Box 1198
Lunenburg, N. S. B0J 200

Unit 230 Send to:

JUDY HARE
7 Parkfield Lane
Rothesay, N. B. E2E 3R3

HESITATIONS

Karl Hicks—Dominion

There are many hesitation situations which occur in bridge. These range from a totally unnecessary hesitation with a singleton to a hesitation based upon a real or imagined problem in bidding a hand. There is absolutely no excuse for hesitating with a singleton. The only possible reason is to intentionally mislead the declarer or defenders into making an incorrect assumption and misplaying or misdefending the hand. This is not allowed and will result in at best an adjusted score in favor of the non-offending side and at worst appearing before an ethics committee and facing disciplinary action.

This type of hesitation is not the subject of this discussion. My intention in this article is to discuss those hesitations which honestly occur as a result of thinking about a problem and which culminate with a pass or a double.

In the first instance, your partner has seen you hesitate and then pass. The difference between doing that and passing in tempo is that your partner is now aware that you had some type of imagined information to choose an action among various alternatives that he would not have seriously considered had you passed smoothly. In the second instance, in a competitive auction, you have taken some time to think about your call (referred to as a hesitation, a tank, a huddle or a twitch) and then doubled. Now when the bidding comes around to partner, he knows that you were not sure whether to double or to bid on. This is known as the NO RISK double. If partner has no defensive strength then he will bid on and if he has a sure trick or two then he will pass and collect the penalty. It is very effective but it is not permitted.

Both of these situations convey some type of information to partner and will result in the director being called to your table. (I'll mention the director and ruling later).

Now does this mean that you can never hesitate regardless of how difficult your hand is to bid? Does the director being called to the table infer that you and your partner are doing something unethical? Are your opponents looking for the edge or being mean? The answer to all of these questions is NO!

First of all, if your opponent clearly hesitates during the auction and follows this with a pass or a double, you should either call the director forthwith or inform your opponents that you reserve the right to call the director later if you feel that the auction requires it.

You are definitely permitted to hesitate during an auction and many hands require pause for thought. The only problems which may arise for you after a hesitation occur if you follow your thought with a pass or a double. Does this mean that you cannot pass or double after a hesitation. Certainly not! However, once you hesitate and then pass or double, you place an onus on your partner. Your partner is now required to make a call which in the judgement of the director (or subsequently an appeals committee) feel that seventy-five per cent of bridge players of equal ability would have made if the hesitation had not occurred.

So you have hesitated and then passed or doubled and the opponents call the director. The director simply advises your partner that they must be careful to take a normal action with their hand (a 75% call.) Note that if you had not hesitated before passing or doubling, your partner is free to take whatever action they see fit.

Sometimes the opponents do not call the director until your partner has bid. In this situation, the director first confirms that indeed a break in tempo (a hesitation) occurred and then advises the plaintiff to call him back if they feel that your partner did not make a normal bid. This does not mean that your opponents are accusing you and your partner of being unethical. In fact, many bad feelings can be avoided by calling the director immediately after the hesitation action or by advising your opponents that you reserve the right to call the director later in the hand. Both of these actions are designed to remind the partner of the hesitator that they must bend over backward to make a normal call. In a game that is as technical and as highly competitive as bridge, it is extremely difficult not to take advantage of any information which becomes available during the auction (whether consciously or unconsciously).

It is important that players who compete at the tournament level regardless of their playing ability are aware of the information above. I have had many people ask me about hesitations and several ask me to address the question in the Maritime Bridge Line. While there are other hesitation situations which arise in bridge, the two discussed in this article continue to be the most common and misunderstood at our tournaments and at many of our club games.

SPRINGHILL TROPHY

Congratulations to Bill Campbell 1989 winner of the Springhill Trophy. Bill, playing for the most part with Mary Cotter, consistently placed in pairs and team events throughout the year. He participated on the teams that won the Truro Spring Knockouts and the Can-At Swiss in Saint John. I have had the pleasure of playing with Bill in a couple of sectionals in Maine and the Calcutta in Halifax and whatever the outcome, it was never dull. Bill is a tough competitor, his friendly and polite manner make him an opponent who is enjoyable to play against even if you are being taken to the cleaners. As a true scientist of the game you can always find advice on bridge structure and his love of a "melodic auction" oft times transcends the desire for good results.

Bill has given his name to a series of opening leads and the expression "That was a Campbell lead" can be heard quite often in the New Brunswick bridge community.

You will have to wait for publication of the book on which he is presently working for full details.

Well done Bill !!

MIKE HARTOP

MCLEOD TROPHY

The winner of the 1989 McLeod Trophy is Carol Fagan. An import from Newfoundland, Carol lives up to the Newfie reputation for congeniality and an excellent sense of humor as well as proving her bridge playing abilities. These qualities have made her a popular choice for a partner.

Carol was a member of the women's team that won the Maritime finals entitling them to represent us at the Canadian Women's Team Championship in Calgary last Spring. Her teammates were Mary Jane MacKay, Myrtle Moulton and Elsie Adams.

Carol had a successful year playing with many partners. The highlight of her year was "going over the top" and becoming a life master during the Can-At tournament last summer in Saint John.

Carol won two main events and was runner-up in three knockouts. She is also known as "Queen of the midnight-mini knockouts," winning two back to back in Amherst. Carol and her teammates topped a few of the big guns and become known as giant killers on the tournament

trail this season. She certainly qualifies to have her name added to the list of winners on the McLeod Trophy. Congratulations Carol and good luck in 1990.

BERYL CALLAGHAN

LAGAN TROPHY

Gary Brown won the Lagan for the third year in a row. No one has ever done that. The highlight of his year was winning . . . 6 knockouts, 3 Swiss and 2 Open Pairs, with 9 different partners.

He attended all 9 tournaments last year and loves nothing more than a weekend of hanging out with Bridge players. He claims to know 75% of the tournament players on a first name basis and very much enjoys the social aspects of the game.

Gary's goal for 1990 include establishing a regular partnership and learning the intricacies of Rubber Bridge, a game he contributes more than his fair share to.

W.C.

CALLAGHAN TROPHY

Sandy Fox has won the Callaghan Trophy for the fifth time in a row. She has broken an all-time record in the Maritimes. No one has ever won any trophy five years in a row. Her victories in '89 include knock-outs and Swiss in Truro last Spring as well as knock-outs in Amherst. She has numerous seconds in other tournaments.

Sandy is a very fine bridge player. In the world of bridge where most of us have become, consciously or sub-consciously egotistical, gloating know-all, perfect bridge players, Sandy is an exception. She has humility, decency and class. She deserves a lot more credit and praise for her bridge than what we critics normally give her.

On many occasions, I have seen her making a lot of good plays as a declarer and as a defender. Sometimes she goes by logic, technique and sometimes, she goes by intuition and feeling. She works very hard to improve her bridge. She reads a lot and tries to understand the logical basis of plays and bids. She takes more blame for her mistakes than she really deserves. She is extremely tolerant of partner's mistakes and is genuinely pleasant to opponents at the bridge table. Sandy, you are a true winner, a true champion and you will remain so, whether you win this trophy again or not.

RASHID KHAN

1989 TROPHY STANDINGS

LAGAN

1. Gary F. Brown.....	147.52
2. Ken L. Eisner.....	123.44
3. Leo Weniger.....	94.06
4. Patrick D. Waddy.....	85.01
5. John Joe Currie.....	79.87
6. Ralph Fisher.....	77.57
7. Carol P. Fagan.....	73.77
8. Gerald Soucy.....	64.58
9. Louise Fisher.....	60.74
10. Ron T. Mak.....	60.31
11. Earle A. Fergusson.....	55.81
12. Bryan Rapson.....	53.76
13. Brendan J. Dempsey.....	51.69
14. Brian Busby.....	47.55
15. Myrtle Moulton.....	46.29
16. Jim A. Kirby.....	45.36
17. Glenda Hansen.....	42.08
18. Brian D. Hansen.....	41.90
19. Bernadette Busby.....	40.65
20. Edgar N. Blinn.....	39.72

SPRINGHILL

1. Bill Campbell, Jr.....	76.58
2. Mike Hartop.....	56.31
3. Norm O'Brien.....	48.55
4. Gerald LaFlamme.....	42.75
5. Gordon Chippin.....	40.87
6. James D. Harper.....	32.78
7. Jack L. O'Brien.....	28.67
8. Dale Murray.....	28.63
9. Rashid R. Khan.....	28.20
10. Bob W. Draper.....	25.78
11. Bernie Boyle.....	21.97
12. Mark Golding.....	20.59
13. S. Lyle Wiggins.....	20.21
14. Wayne M. Hare.....	19.16
15. Don A. Chisholm.....	18.11
16. Frank Elliott.....	17.13
17. Robert W. Brown.....	15.77
18. Mr. M. Moses.....	15.49
19. Bob Melles.....	14.28
20. Peter Hare.....	14.05

McLEOD

1. Carol P. Fagan.....	73.77
2. Louise Fisher.....	60.74
3. Myrtle Moulton.....	46.29
4. Glenda Hansen.....	42.08
5. Bernadette Busby.....	40.65
6. Elsie W. Adams.....	36.52
7. Carolyn MacDonald.....	23.80
8. Beryl Callaghan.....	22.14
9. Mary A. Stevenson.....	21.86
10. Lorelei J. Langille.....	21.16
11. Zelda J. Zelikovitz.....	15.54
12. Mary B. MacDougall.....	15.41
13. Mary Jane MacKay.....	14.07
14. Babe Batten.....	13.82
15. Carol J. Grover.....	13.60
16. Barbara Miller.....	13.53
17. Adela I. Christie.....	12.54
18. Margaret Conrad.....	12.47
19. Myrna L. Murphy.....	12.35
20. Beatrice Nowlan.....	12.24

CALLAGHAN

1. Sandra Fox.....	74.13
2. Mary Cotter.....	71.45
3. Ann Hartop.....	58.22
4. Alice A. Manzer.....	43.39
5. Louise Jones.....	27.25
6. Sandra Draper.....	25.82
7. Linda Cobham.....	24.75
8. Barbara MacKay.....	24.75
9. Evelyn Richards.....	21.30
10. L. Ann Posch.....	17.89
11. Loretta Murphy.....	16.05
12. Marie Carragher.....	15.54
13. Beatrice O'Brien.....	15.16
14. Kathleen Murphy.....	14.38
15. June Hare.....	14.05
16. Shirley Matchett.....	11.97
17. Jean MacPhail.....	11.46
18. Helen Lawrence.....	11.00
19. Evelyn Tower.....	11.00
20. Sarah Quinlan.....	10.61

ANNOUNCEMENT !!

The Truro Duplicate Bridge Club has relocated from Prince Street to 21 Palmer. Phone 895-3396.

They meet once a week on Thursday evening.

RON MAK AND K.K. TAN WIN FLIGHT "A" PAIRS

Ron Mak and K.K. Tan won the North American Open Pairs Zone Finals in Amherst December 9, 10/89. The win entitles them to represent the Atlantic provinces at the North American Championships in Forth Worth, Texas in March. Here is Ron with two hands that didn't help them win the event . . .

♠ K Q x x
♥ A K
♦ A J x x x
♣ Q x

♠ 10 x x x ♠ J 9 x
♥ J x ♥ 10 x x x
♦ Q 10 8 x ♦ K
♣ 10 x x ♣ J x x x x

♠ A x
♥ Q x x x x
♦ 9 x x
♣ A K x

E	S	W	N
R.M.	M.J. MacKay	K.K.T.	Tom MacKay
P	1♥	P	2♦
P	2NT	P	6NT
P	P	P	

Lead: Low ♣

Mary Jane won ♣Q, unblock ♥ AK, came to ♣K, ♥Q, give up a heart and eventually squeeze KK in spades and diamonds to make 6NT -990 and we got a zero!

ANALYSIS: Spade lead poses biggest problem, as squeeze can be neutralized when ♦K exit after ♥10 will kill the entry for eventual squeeze.

Another line that will succeed is to come to hand to lead a low ♦, threatening west to split K-Q if he has them, and cater to other possibilities at the same time:

1. K10, Q10 doubleton's with west, whereby declarer can pick up whole suit for 1 loser.

2. K10xx, Q10xx with west and as west follows low, also duck in dummy to effectively set up eventual squeeze with the ♦J finesse.

Neat hand and I believe the last line gives the best percentage to make 6NT, after a spade lead, and of course reserving ♥ 3-3 as last resort.

♠ A Q J 10 x
♥ —
♦ 10 x x x
♣ A x x x

♠ x x x ♠ K x x x
♥ Q 10 x x x x ♥ J x x
♦ Q J ♦ K x x x x
♣ K 10 ♣ x

♠ x
♥ A K 10 x
♦ A x
♣ Q J x x x x

S	W	N	E
P. Banerjee	R.M.	Duff	K.K.T.
1♣	1♥	1♠	2♥
3♣	P	3♥	P
3NT	P	6♣	P
P	P		

Lead: ♦Q

Prodeep won ♦A, spade to A, ♠Q back for a ruffing finesse, pitching low ♦ as K.K. ducked, now ♣A and give up ♣K, making 6♣, -920 another zero for us! He could have made 7 to rub it in!

Nicely played on a 75% line.

!!! FLASH BULLETIN !!!

BETSY McCORMACK of Halifax and DAVE SCAMMELL of Truro win "B" Pairs and trip to Fort Worth Texas to represent Zone 1 in North American Championships in March. Congratulations !!

1989-90 NAOP DISTRICT 1 SPLIT FINAL
December 9, 10, 1989 — Amherst DBC

1. RON MAK, K. K. TAN.....	362
2. RASHID KHAN, CAROL MANN.....	343
3. PETER MacLEAN, JIM KIRBY.....	342
4. MIKE HARTOP, ANN HARTOP.....	327
5. IAN CROWE, BRUCE ARMSTRONG.....	321
6. BOB MELLES, EVELYN RICHARDS.....	320
7. GORD CHIPPIN, ALICE MANZER.....	318
8. SCOTT MacDOUGALL, BRIAN DeLONG.....	312
9. BRIAN BUSBY, BERNADETTE BUSBY.....	305
10. LEON ZELIKOVITZ, ZELDA ZELIKOVITZ	290
11. CAROL FAGAN, ROY LANDRY.....	288
12. J. DUFF HARPER, P. BANERJEE	283
13. TOM MacKAY, MARY JANE MacKAY.....	280
14. DOUG MILLER, BARB MILLER.....	272

DOLLIVER AND INKPEN
PLACE 3rd OVERALL

In the Royal Viking Pairs game, played on September 19, 1989 across North America, Unit 194 was honoured with the winning performance by Gordon Ezekiel and Randy Bennett of St. John's, Newfoundland. But perhaps it was not noticed that we were honoured twice. While Gordon and Randy finished first overall playing East/West, the top North/South score was recorded by Robert Dolliver and Mike Inkpen, playing in an 8 table game in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. They also finished third overall.

Robert is a relative newcomer to bridge and is one of those rare players who never played rubber or 'kitchen bridge'—he started with duplicate 1½ years ago at the club in Middleton. He is 24 years old and a member of the Armed Forces, based in Greenwood, Nova Scotia. He started playing with Mike in July of 1989—this is a VERY NEW partnership—and they play Precision. At the time of their big win,

Robert was the proud owner of about ten black points.

Mike on the other hand has had a long love of bridge. He started playing as a boy of 12 or 13, and by 18 was playing duplicate. Now 36, he continues to enjoy the game and loves to analyze hands and bidding methods. Mike has never been heavily into tournament bridge though, and for both he and Rob, this was their first gold point.

Both players modestly declined to give specific highlights of their big game, attributing their success only to aggressive bidding, some good fortune and doubling their opponents whenever they got out of line. Sounds like they created most of their good fortune!

So—best of luck in the future fellows. Unit 194 is proud of you.

GLENDA HANSEN

CALCUTTA QUIZ

Don Presse, Halifax

This quiz is three more hands from the World Class Imp. Pairs tournament in Toronto last February. Don Presse and Victor Goldberg, two of the Maritimes finest placed 8th overall in a star studded event lasting three days.

1.

Vul: N-S

Dealer: South

NORTH
 ♠ J1094
 ♥ A1032
 ♦ Q6
 ♣ A105

WEST
 ♠ A2
 ♥ KQ76
 ♦ KJ107
 ♣ 743

Deutsch North	Pressé East	K. Shumen South	Goldberg West
—	—	P	1♥
P	1♠	2♣	P
3♣	P	P	P

Trick (i)—A♠, 4, 7, 5
 (ii)—2♠, 9, Q, 6
 (iii)—K♠, 8, J♦, 10
 (iv)—3♠, J♣, 7♦, J
 (v)—2♣, 3, A, 8
 (vi)—10♣, 9, 6, 4
 (vii)—5♣, 5♦, K, 7
 (viii)—Q♣, 7♥, 6♦, 3♦
 (ix)—J♥ your play?

2.

NORTH
 ♠ 96
 ♥ 1052
 ♦ A632
 ♣ Q1084

SOUTH
 ♠ AKJ103
 ♥ KQ64
 ♦ 54
 ♣ 96

Wolney North	Goldberg East	Gowrys South	Pressé West
—	—	—	P
P	1♣	1♠	2♦
P	P	2♥	P
2♠	P	P	P

Trick (i)—K♦, A, 10, 4
 (ii)—9♠, 2, 3, 4
 (iii)—6♠, 8, 10, 5
 (iv)—A♠, 7, 2♦, A
 (v)—K♥, 7, 2, A
 (vi)—8♦, 5, J, 3
 (vii)—Q♦, 6, 3♣, J♠
 (viii)—6♣, 2, 8, A
 (ix)—3♥ Your play?

3.

Vul: Both

Dealer: West

Opening Lead: 4♠

Plan the play.

NORTH
 ♠ 62
 ♥ Q954
 ♦ 6
 ♣ A10643

SOUTH
 ♠ K9753
 ♥ K62
 ♦ Q742
 ♣ 2

Hamilton North	Goldberg East	Schwartz South	Pressé West
—	—	—	P
P	1♦	P	1♥
P	1NT	P	P
dbl.	P	2♠	P
P	P		

(Solutions on page 15)



CARABELLA

—Gyl Baldursson, Iceland

With the advent of some highly artificial bidding systems in recent years, I have noticed that several lesser (even not so lesser) prophets have come forth claiming to have been the founding fathers of artificiality. Well, let me tell you about "Carabella."

I believe it all started in 1959. The mighty Italians, the formidable "Squadra azzura" had been dominating the bridge scene for some time, using two different bidding systems, the Neopolitan Club and the Roman Club. Both systems were shockingly artificial, by contemporary standards, to the point where many purists refused to treat the game as bridge. Sure, Shenken had advocated the use of "one club strong and artificial" and other avant-garde frills, but those Italians had gone completely overboard, they said. Not so, said a couple of aspiring bridge players in Reykjavik. If artificiality was the secret of getting all the way to the Bermuda Bowl, more artificiality had to be the ultimate guarantee. Thus, "Carabella" was conceived.

"Carabella?" you say. Well, it had to sound Italian. Shades of Belladonna, you see. Actually, the name was lifted from a local underwear manufacturer who went bankrupt shortly after the conception of our system. I'm sure his creations have all been worn thin by now, whereas our system lives on.

The creators, Siggi and I, had one simple goal, clearly expressed in our original manifesto: **there shall be only one natural bid in a bidding sequence, i.e. the final bid** (If you are lucky). All bids leading up to the final contracts had to be artificial or ambiguous! Sure, we played in some esoteric sub-mini-Moysian fits, but oh what fun. At the top of our convention card we listed our two mottos: (1) "There must be system to our madness", and (2) "There must be madness to our system." But before we go further, let me give you a quick review of our system:

OPENING:

- PASS: 16+; even distribution
- 1 NT: 0-9; denies a 7+- card suit
- 2 suit: 10+; void in the suit bid
- 2NT: preempt; any 7-card suit
- 3 suit: solid 7-card suit; outside control; suit bid 2 steps below the long suit
- 3NT: solid 7-card major; nothing outside
- 4 suit; transfer along same lines as opening 3; does not promise outside control or solid suit

Bidders continue to describe weakness until a notrump bid is made, after which the bidding becomes reasonably natural. Non-jump notrump bids always show weakness.

The more weakness bids you made, the higher your point count. 1 NT response to pass: 0-4. (You guessed it—we did not use the strong pass in 4th position).

After the auction, the system dictated that declarer had to say a prayer before dummy came down. Never worked, but, hey . . .

- And the principles of competitive bidding:
- double: transfer to the next suit
 - simple overcall: transfer to the next suit
 - cue bid: Michaels
 - jump overcall: preempt; transfer
 - over 1 NT: transfers
 - 1NT: equivalent to a strong takeout double
 - 2 NT: colourful 2-suiter

Ambiguous cooperative doubles and passes throughout play.

Suit preference along Lahtnival (sic.) lines, i.e. **high** suggests **lower** of remaining two, etc.

Note: Lahtnival is Lavinthal spelled backwards.

Killing leads (no further specification of who gets killed).

All kinds of flaky lead and carding agreements.

Gloating rights freely exercised.

Of course, there were all kinds of finer shades, all based on the same premise of artificiality.

The introduction of our system in local bridge circles caused quite a stir—O.K., furor. In those days there was no such thing as a convention card, and the "alert" principle hadn't yet been introduced. Actually, come to think of it, we may have been the first local pair to use alerts systematically. To the majority of players that was tantamount to cheating, of course. Anyway, in retrospect, it wasn't quite fair at the time. A number of opponents simply ignored our alerts and suffered dearly. We never used the system in serious competition during those years but our success at the club level was quite remarkable ("disgusting" to some). It wasn't until artificial systems had become more accepted that we ventured into serious competition with Carabella a few times. Never used it much, though. Frankly, we were afraid of being shunned by neurotic opponents. Had some good times with it, though. Our sequence one club, two clubs, three clubs, four clubs, five clubs, six clubs, seven clubs, SEVEN SPADES still stands out as the ultimate bidding victory. Seriously.

So, if you are tired of the old Standard American and want to try something new and become thoroughly unpopular in the process, try Carabella.

Ciao !

HALIFAX SECTIONAL RESULTS

KNOCKOUT TEAMS (16 Teams)

1. John Stewart, Eric Balkam, Leo Weniger, Gary Brown
2. Ron Mak, K.K. Tan, Ken Eisner, Patrick Waddy
- 3-4. Downey Grover, Carol Grover, Les Barkhouse, Winston Samuel, Larry Murray
- 3-4. Gerry Soucy, Joe Currie, Bryan Rapson, Elsie Adams, Virginia Giza

BANOOK LAKE PAIRS (18 Pairs)

1. Marg Grassby, Julie Beasy.....	130.5
2. Dorothy Fergusson, Mary Gray.....	127.0
3. Stewart Pye, Roy Landry.....	123.0
4. Frank Jackson, Boyd Wells.....	122.0
5. Norm O'Brien, Charles Waddell.....	121.0

MASTERS PAIRS (42 Pairs)

1. Mike Betts, Randy Bennett.....	135.0
2. Del Knox, Brian Delong.....	134.0
3. Beryl Callaghan, Evelyn Richards.....	131.5
4. Babe Batten, Bill Campbell.....	128.5
5-6. Rashid Khan, Sandra Fox.....	127.5
5-6. Duff Harper, Dale Murray.....	127.5

FRIDAY ZIP KNOCKOUTS

1. Herb Watters, Lorelei Langille, Brian Busby, Bernadette Busby
2. James Mahoney, Gordon Ezekiel, Marilyn Bennett, Randy Bennett

OPEN PAIRS (62 Pairs)

1. Bill Camp, Don Presse.....	269.5
2. Norm O'Brien, Myrtle Moulton.....	259.5
3. Gordon Chippin, Alice Manzer.....	256.2
4. Ralph Fisher, Eldon Mills.....	245.0
5. Gerald Murphy, Myrna Murphy.....	241.7
6. Frank Dunsworth, Francis Dunsworth.....	235.0

OPEN PAIRS CONSOLATION

1. Phil Emin, Bill Knoll.....	206.0
2. Laura Watson, Gary Brown.....	205.0
3. Ron Mak, Ken Eisner.....	191.5
4. Michael Ames, Hans Neuteboom.....	186.0
5. Marg Grassby, Mabel Moffatt.....	181.5
6. Bill Halliday, Karen Landry.....	176.0

SATURDAY ZIP KNOCKOUTS

1. Gerry LaFlamme, Edgar Blinn, Bill Campbell, Mary Cotter
2. Gordon Ezekiel, James Mahoney, Randy Bennett, Marilyn Bennett

SWISS TEAMS (39 Teams)

1. Ian Crowe, Bruce Armstrong, Earl Fergusson, Russell Boyle.....	8
2-3. Eric Balkam, Sandy Fox, Sharon Balkam, Gary Brown.....	6
2-3. Bill Knoll, Russ Smith, Mary Stevenson, Carolyn MacDonald.....	6
4-6. John Beasy, Julie Beasy, Leo Weniger, Greg Gray.....	5¾
4-6. Ted Moffatt, Peter Roy, Bryson Crowell, Paul Conrad.....	5¾
4-6. K.K. Tan, Ron Mak, George Holland, Ken Eisner.....	5¾

SWISS TEAMS CONSOLATION

1. Andrew Badley, John Cook, Duff Harper, Dale Murray.....	3½
2-5. Brian Hansen, Edgar Blinn, Gerry LaFlamme.....	3
2-5. Linda Walker, Bea Brown, Joyce Michielli, Dorothy Riteman.....	3
2-5. Mike Wyman, Joy Cavazzi, Jim Gray, Hugh Shankel.....	3
2-5. Don Sanderson, Louis Roberts, Patrick LeBlanc, Bilgin Batman.....	3

OVERALL MASTERPOINT WINNERS

1. Gary Brown.....	23.60
2. Eric Balkam	21.09
3. Leo Weniger	16.22

- NOTICE -

The 1990 National Finals of the Canadian Women's Team Championships will take place in Halifax from June 30 to July 4, 1990. Twenty-two teams from across Canada will be participating, three of which will be from the Atlantic region.

No Club qualifying rounds are planned, but rather eligibility for the National Finals will be determined at a Zone 1 Final scheduled for May 11 and 12 in Amherst.

For further details, contact your local Club Manager, Barb MacKay, Unit No. 230 Co-Ordinator; or Myrtle Moulton, Zone Co-Ordinator.

NEW LIFE MASTERS

BOB DRAPER.....	Woodstock, N. B.
SANDRA DRAPER.....	Woodstock, N. B.
LESLEY ANNE POSCH.....	Sackville, N. B.
OLIVE GOODWIN.....	Halifax, N. S.
GLADYS REID.....	Charlottetown, P.E.I.

BOGART, MOZART AND SPLINTERS

Earl Fergusson—Armdale, N. S.

My favorite convention? . . . Now let me see, is that a question which has an answer? Or is it similar to . . . Do I have a favorite actor, or composer? I like Hoffman, am fond of Bach and insist upon Lebensohl. After all, how else do I distinguish between—xx, xx, KQ10xxx, xxx and Ax, xx, AKxxxx, xxx when the auction goes INT—2♠—? . . . And, if not playing lebensohl over the opponents weak twos, I face a complete guess holding — x, AKxx, Axxx, AJxx when the auction proceeds 2♠ — dbl. — P — 3♥ — P — ?

Does partner have xxx, Jxxx, xx, xxx or Qxx, Qxxx, xx, KQxx

Yes, lebensohl is on par with Hoffman, or Bach, but is there something higher? . . . Well, there's Chopin—Olivier and KCB. Perhaps Rachmaninoff—Brando and competitive doubles.

Dealing with hands such as this: Axx, Qx, K10xxx, Qxx after the auction proceeds 1♠—2♥—2♠—? becomes more than difficult, if partner straitjackets you with penalty oriented doubles. Doubles which occur when opponents bid — raise, must show general values with no clear direction.

Still, in my minds ear, I hear a voice rising above Brando's above even Bogarts, . . . a melody and a lightness of touch surpassing Chopin and Schumann. Yes, the very Mozart of conventions, the splinter bid!! . . . Compare and contrast the following hands:

A. ♠ KQxx ♥ KQx ♦ Axxx ♣ xx ♠ AJxxx ♥ Axx ♦ xx ♣ AKx	B. ♠ KJxx ♥ KQxx ♦ Axxx ♣ x ♠ AQxxxx ♥ Ax ♦ x ♣ xxx
---	--

In hand (A), with 30 HCP and a good fit, any intelligent application of Cue bidding or KCB will lead to the cold slam because the basic power is there. In hand (B), however, we have a minimum opener in HCP and a minimum game force in response, yet slam is equally cold. In order to learn how to effectively appreciate the power of hand (B), the grip on HCP must be loosened and some appreciation of winners vs. losers must be substituted for the evaluation of unbalanced hands. Bridge

is a game of fits and controls, yet if you are afraid to open 10 HCP hands such as (B) then you miss your fits. And if you do not splinter with the game force opposite, you miss your slams. Anybody can bid them when they have lots of power, . . . the key to successful bridge, is to bid them with marginal but well located power. By showing fit and shortness, splinters allow partner to evaluate how effective his cards will be in the actual play.

Holding:

♠ AKQxx	After 1♠ — 2♦
♥ KQxx	2♥ — 4♠
♦ x	?
♣ xxx	

You have no intention of continuing. Yet after 1♠—4♣, even though you have no convenient cue bid, you move towards slam. Since partners weak spades must be compensated for by the red aces. That is why a 4 club splinter is a much better bid holding Jxxx, AJx, A10xxx, x than 2 diamonds. Get the most important message across to partner — Support, Controls and Club shortness. Save the 2♦ — 4♠ sequence for Jxxx, Ax, KQJxx, xx. Here the source of tricks in diamonds is most important.

I could give an almost endless testimonial to the effectiveness of splinters in bidding good thin slams as well as avoiding bad fat slams.

However, more to the point is a general principle as to when splinters apply. Every serious partnership needs substantial discussion of rules and exceptions. A good starting point is to consider all jump bids after a suit has been bid — raised as a splinter.* Also, any jump in a situation where a non-jump would be both natural and forcing, agrees the previous suit and shows shortness.

- 1♠ - 2♥
- 4♣ — shows shortness and hearts
- 1 NT - 2♥**
- 2♠ - 4♦ — splinter in spades
- 1♠ - 2♠
- ***4♣ — splinter in spades
- *apologies to asking bidders.
- **transfer
- ***if not using short suit game tries

Asking bids are great when the occasion arises (infrequently), but splinter bids, although less exact* as to the actual holding outside of the splinter suit, bring partners values into clear focus. As all values outside the splinter suit are upgraded while

secondary values in the splinter suit are disregarded. This brings to mind a similar situation I often see mishandled by two-way Stayman players:

*asking bidder is usually solid outside of the asked suit.

Holding: ♠ AJxxx
♥ x
♦ KJxxx
♣ Ax

Some players bid 2♦ over 1NT and follow 2NT by opener with a 3♣ bid to get partners pattern. Far better to bid 3♠, then 4♦, so partner will appreciate intermediate values in those suits, but only prime values in your short suits. Getting his shape does not tell you where his values are. In a similar vein, hand (A) is a clear opener whereas hand (B) is garbage with secondary values in short suits.

A. ♠ KQxxx
♥ Ax
♦ Q10xxx
♣ —

B. ♠ Axxxx
♥ KJ
♦ K
♣ Jxxxx

Are you sick of splinters yet? O.K. I'll give you a break. Let's look at mini-splinters. If you play 2 over 1 as a game force, why should you be the only pair to miss this slam?

Opener: ♠ AKxxx Partner: ♠ Qxxx
♥ xxxx ♥ x
♦ AKx ♦ QJxx
♣ x ♣ Axxx

3♥ is not needed as strong over 1♠, and I suspect you'll find it more useful as a mini-splinter, (or possibly fit showing), than you will as pre-emptive. Give it a try. Remember when you buy a house, location is the most important thing. Hand evaluation is much the same. Meanwhile, I'm happy on my desert island with Bogart, Mozart and splinters, (Mini & Maxi).

EXPERTS BIDDING QUIZ

See what you would bid with each of the following hands. (You are South). On hand C, include your opening lead. Check with the experts on page 14 to see how they bid it.

(A) Imps. Vul: Both
♠ KJ543 ♥ QJ942 ♦ 3 ♣ K5
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
Pass Pass Pass ?

1♠ dbl.
(B) Imps: Vul: Nobody
♠ AK1083 ♥ KJ ♦ A764 ♣ Q10
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
Pass 1♣ 4♥ ?

(C) Imps. Vul: E-W
♠ Q103 ♥ E-KJ ♦ J832 ♣ J953
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
Pass Pass 7NT ?

(D) Imps. Vul: Nobody
♠ J976 ♥ 10 ♦ A876 ♣ Q1054
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
Pass 1♥ Pass ?

2♥ Pass Pass

(E) Imps. Vul: Both
♠ AKQJ87542 ♥ — ♦ A532 ♣ —
WEST NORTH EAST SOUTH
5 ♦ 6 ♣ 6 ♥ ?

UNIT RECORDER

Have you ever felt uncomfortable because of rude or unethical behaviour by fellow players?

Have you felt uneasy because some strange bid or play by your opponents had resulted in a bad board for you?

Have you ever felt that your opponents were taking advantage of some means of communication other than bidding or carding?

In all of these cases you can, and probably should call the Director. However, calling the Director in uncomfortable situations or on mere suspicions, often makes the situation even more uncomfortable, and anyway, these guys always know more than we do! Who wants to look stupid?

These situations happen all the time. They leave us unhappy, unsatisfied and often cheated. They may even convince us that the game just isn't worth the aggravation.

Our unit has appointed me Unit recorder. My duties include:

1. Receiving complaints and/or inquiries from players, usually concerning questions of conduct or ethics.
2. Responding to such complaints or inquiries in an appropriate and timely manner.
3. Maintaining records or incidents where applicable.

The subjects most often encountered by recorders involve:

1. Unbecoming Conduct (rudeness or profanity)
2. Suspected Psyches
3. Wild, collusive, or destructive bidding

Recorders have absolutely no independent disciplinary authority. So, if you feel that the system has somehow let you down, please don't hesitate to contact me so that I can record your complaint.

If I am unavailable, our directors will provide you with our "player memo" form so that you can describe your complaint or incident.

These memos will be kept in strictest confidence.

BILL KNOLL
Unit 194 Recorder

EXPERTS PANEL

Hand A:

BRYSON CROWELL—3 Hearts. Slightly aggressive but should play well from my side.

EARL FERGUSON—3 Hearts. While I hate to stop short of game, I must give partner a little room. My spade honours are badly placed and RHO stands to be short in spades.

BRIAN ALEXANDER—2 Spades. With game being a virtual certainty (famous last words) we have to determine where. My bid should allow us to begin to investigate these possibilities.

MIKE BETTS—4 Hearts. There are too many hands that will produce game, where partner might pass 3 hearts.

RASHID KHAN—3 Hearts. My choice is a slightly conservative one. Partner should always push for a vulnerable game at Imps. if there is a chance for it.

ERIC BALKAM—3 Hearts. spade values are questionable and this hand does not rate to play well as East is short in spades. If we miss game, partner will not be interested in my expert analysis.

Hand B:

ALEXANDER—Double. At this level, a double shows high cards. A slam may be possible, but I don't want to start guessing. We should extract a nice penalty.

KHAN—4 NT. Since I'm not allowed to use negative doubles at this level, 4 NT is Key Card for clubs or straight Blackwood. Small slam in NT has excellent prospects.

BETTS—Double. Could easily make a slam, but which one. Partner can always bid on with the right hand.

CROWELL—4 S. Slam could be on but doesn't look like suits will be breaking well.

FERGUSON—Double. Can't be too sure of slam. Double shows values which are transferable and will give sound recompense for any game. If partner bids on, so will I.

BALKAM—5 S. This bid will invite slam in a strain partner is quite likely to fit. Other bids do not keep options open. Besides if it's wrong, I'll show this hand to John Beasy; he'll appreciate the artistry.

Hand C:

BALKAM—Double. The heart king. Whatever suit East thinks is going to run, I have a surprise for him. A Heart lead is the only safe lead and will lead to a number, if partner has Q10xx... in hearts.

ALEXANDER—Double. I lead the spade 10. RHO believes he has a long running suit. This precludes me leading a minor. Therefore, I lead from my longer major, more specifically the ten, starting the unblocking process.

CROWELL—Double. The heart Jack. End played at trick one. Declarer probably has a long suit he thinks will run. Surprise!!

FERGUSON—Double. The Heart King. Show you are in the game. Opener obviously has a suit he considers solid. Hearts is the one suit on which he cannot be counting.

BETTS—Double. The Heart King. If 7NT shows anything but a solid suit(s) I'm in the wrong game. The only suit declarer cannot have is hearts. Sounds like at least +800.

KHAN—Double. The Heart Jack: Declarer has either a ten card spade suit headed by AKJ or a nine card minor headed by AKQ10.

Hand D:

KHAN—Double. Assuming a good partner and sound opposition. If the auction proceeds to four hearts, (one level at a time) where I have nothing more to say, I would be sick and conclude that everyone else at the table is crazy. Keep me away from them.

CROWELL—2 Spades. Would like to double but would feel sick if partner passed. So I give a push with two spades.

BETTS—Double. Virtually automatic. Partner has 11-15 with hearts. We should have a fit and better defense against 3 hearts. Partner will almost never pass.

BALKAM—Double. Regardless of vulnerability, hand is mandatory reopener in my opinion.

ALEXANDER—Double. Partner may be hovering in the weeds. If not, we should have a fit somewhere, or, we may push the opponents up a level.

FERGUSON—Double. Automatic at any form of scoring. Partner will allow for a light shapely reopener and raise them to a level which may be more of a problem. Only against pooches would I be concerned about balancing them into game.

Hand E:

- FERGUSON**—Double. Our only possible Pluses occur defending 6 hearts or playing 7 clubs, since partners hand rates to be worthless to me in spades.
- BALKAM**—Double. Unless partner has the miracle spade fit, my diamonds are losers. My instincts tell me nobody can make anything, and I listen to my instincts. Really!
- ALEXANDER**—7 clubs. If partner can bid 6 vulnerable clubs, I should be able to raise him to seven. If I were playing spades how would I get to partners hand? If we can't make seven, then who knows, maybe the opponent will sack!!
- KHAN**—6 Spades. I am not going to waste my time or energy trying to visualize the bizarre hands others could hold. We all paid our money and now its my turn to bid. I bet the bidding does not stop here.
- BETTS**—6 Spades. My two headed lion has bid on both sides. The real question is what to do over 7 hearts.
- CROWELL**—6 Spades. Who knows? I always bid my nine card suits at least once.

CALCUTTA QUIZ SOLUTIONS (NORTH)

1. You are looking at:

DUMMY
 ♠ —
 ♦ A1032
 ♥ Q
 ♣ —

WEST
 ♠ —
 ♥ KQ7
 ♦ K10
 ♣ —

The Jack of hearts has been led by South: You of course have been watching the discards and know declarer started with 2 hearts and three diamonds. You of course duck and declarer must lose a heart and a diamond trick.

2. The following cards remain:

NORTH
 ♠ —
 ♥ 105
 ♦ Q104
SOUTH
 ♠ K
 ♥ Q64
 ♦ —
 ♣ 9

East who won the 8♣ with his ace, returned the 3 of hearts. East was obviously end played, having no diamonds, he was forced to establish dummy's clubs or lead a heart.

However, South, a member of the 1984 Polish Team Champions smelled a skunk and rose with the Q♥. The actual layout:

NORTH
 ♠ 96
 ♥ 1032
 ♦ A632
 ♣ Q1084

WEST
 ♠ 754
 ♥ J7
 ♦ KQJ97
 ♣ K72

EAST
 ♠ Q82
 ♥ A983
 ♦ 108
 ♣ AJ53

SOUTH
 ♠ AKJ103
 ♥ KQ64
 ♦ 54
 ♣ 96

Victor Goldberg had false carded by winning the A♣, hoping to give the appearance of being end played. If Gowry ducks the heart to my jack, I can force declarer with a diamond and later win the K♣ and cash a diamond for the setting trick. Declarer has two heart tricks but cannot take them as the suit is blocked.

3. The complete layout:

NORTH
 ♠ A62
 ♥ Q954
 ♦ 6
 ♣ A10653

WEST
 ♠ 84
 ♥ A1087
 ♦ AJ8
 ♣ J875

EAST
 ♠ QJ10
 ♥ J3
 ♦ K10953
 ♣ KQ9

SOUTH
 ♠ K9753
 ♥ K62
 ♦ Q742
 ♣ 2

To make this hand you must attempt to ruff 3 clubs in your hand, a diamond in dummy, while scoring your A, K of trumps and a heart trick.

There is only one line of play that allows you to do all this: Win the K♠, lead a club to the A and ruff a club, a heart to the Queen, club ruff, give up a diamond, win the return in dummy with the A♠, ruff a club and ruff a diamond. The defence can have the rest. Richard Schwartz played the hand precisely this way.