## Unit 430 Bridge Magazine

## Don't Lose a Trump

## by McBruce

You're playing an eight-board team match and after two results that might win a few IMPs for you, you reach a slam that mightor might not-be bid at the other table. LHO leads the missing ace and to go plus you need to bring this trump suit in for no losers:

Dummy: J8543
Declarer: AK92
There are no clues in the uncontested auction, but LHO asks several questions about the auction before leading a different suit at trick two, landing you in the dummy. Time to pull trumpswhat is your plan?
(answer within the article starting on page 6)

It's Your Bid Problems
The It's Your Bid bidding system is on the back of this detachable strip. You could win free plays for matching the consensus answers. Good luck! Deadline: August 11.
Full Name:
Pseudonym:
(ONLY if you want to comment anonymously) Flight: A
$\qquad$

| Question 1 <br> Matchpoints Both vul | \& 762 <br> - AT6 <br> - KQ64 <br> * AK7 |
| :---: | :---: |
| WEST NORTH | EAST SOUTH |
|  | 1 NT |
| Pass 20** | Pass 20 |
| Pass 3NT | Pass ??? |


| Question 2 <br> + 58762 <br> © Q7 <br> Again Matchpoints <br> $\diamond$ JT5 <br> N -S vul <br> +KQ9 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| West NORTH <br> Pass 14 <br>  (2NT $=$ both | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EAST SOUTE } \\ & 2 \text { NT }^{*} ? ? ? \\ & \text { minors) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Question 3 <br> Still Matchpoints $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ vul | 4 <br> 『 Q6 <br> - KT854 <br> - K9843 |
| EST NORTH | EAST SOUTH |
| 28 Pass | Pass 1 NT <br> Pass $? ? ?$ |


| Question 4 | \& KQJT865 |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | J85 |
| More Matchpoints | ○ K7 |
| Both vul | $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ |


| WEST | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | Pass | 18 | $? ? ?$ |


| Question 5 <br> Knockouts Both vul | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ¢ QJ65 } \\ & \text { © Q3 } \\ & \text { \& K8542 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| WEST NORTH | EAST SOUTH |
| 1* Pass | 18 Pass |
| 20 Pass | 2. Pass |
| 3. Pass | 4NT Pass |
| 5* Pass | 69 End |
| What is your | apening lead? |

The＂It＇s Your Bid＂System（originally from the International Bidder＇s Club，a for－ mer monthly on－line bidding contest．）Prob－ lems may include other conventions ex－ plained within the question text．
－Natural，five－card majors．Limit raises．
－Over 1 in a major， 2 NT is game－forcing and shows 4 －card support．
－Splinter bids：all double－jump shifts，by responder as well by opener．
－ $2 / 1$ promises a rebid；not game forcing．
－Strong jump shifts．
－After a reverse，responder＇s 2 NT or fourth suit is negative．
－Opening $2 \star, 2 \triangleleft, 2 \diamond: 6$－card suit，5－11． $2 \mathrm{NT}=$ forcing，game try．
－Opening $1 \mathrm{NT}=15-17,2 \mathrm{NT}=20-22$ ， $3 \mathrm{NT}=$ gambling．Over NT openings or overcalls：Stayman，Jacoby transfers， Texas，Gerber．Lebensohl after 2 －level overcalls（fast 3 NT denies a stopper）．
－Opening $2 \star$ artificial，strong． $20=$ waiting bid．Natural responses．
－Over opponent＇s take－out double，new suit is forcing at one level， $2 \mathrm{NT}=$ limit raise，jump shift is pre－emptive．
Roman Keycard Blackwood（0314）， 5 NT asks specific kings．
－Support doubles and redoubles．
－New Minor Forcing，4th Suit Forcing
－Over overcalls cuebid is limit raise＋，or any game－force．Jump cue：mixed raise．
－Negative，competitive and responsive doubles through $4 \diamond$ ，higher than that： value－showing．
－Weak jump overcalls．
－Direct jump cue－bid asks stopper．
－Common sense．
To enter：clip this portion of the cover and e－mail to ooga＠shaw．ca，or phone in answers only to 604／438－9735．Name and fight is mandatory．

Send us your problems for future issues！

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
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 print version with a debut issue Ben Takemori will handle the
等萛
 Now I need two weeks at least．


 Bump streaर pue sreas rayु A funny thing happened to me
on the way to my last Match－

## President's Message

## by Peter Morse

The Canadian Bridge Federation (CBF) wants (and needs) your membership. Many ACBL members resident in Canada are not aware of the CBF and all the good things that it does. Nor are they aware how easily one can become a member (more on this later). But first, let me tell you about all the things which the CBF does. Additional information on CBF activities may be found on the CBF website, at www.cbf.ca.

The CBF publishes and mails the magazine Bridge Canada three times a year to all CBF members. This magazine contains a mix of Canadian bridge news, upcoming events, reports on recent competitions and educational articles.

The CBF also runs events throughout the year including the Canadian National Team Championship (CNTC-A and CNTC-B), the Canadian Women's Team Championship (CWTC), the Canadian Open Pairs Championship (COPC) and the Canadian Senior Team Championship (CSTC). The national finals of these events are contested at Bridge Week which is usually held in May or June, but this year was held in Mississauga, ON in February because of the timing of the 2006 World Championships. Bridge Week was held in Penticton in 2003, and is scheduled to be held there again in 2008. National Final participants in the CNTC and CWTC are determined by Zone finals (British Columbia is Zone 6 in the CBF structure). Club qualifying games determine eligibility to participate in the COPC National Final.

The CBF also sponsors the Helen Shields and Erin Berry RookieMaster games, which annually draw a combined 600 tables in 20 25 sites across Canada. In addition, the CBF hosts a Sectional Tournament at Clubs ( STaC ) which compares the scores of all participants across the country playing at a particular time, to develop a larger game, and therefore greater masterpoint awards for those having the highest scores. In recent years, the STAC has attracted in the vicinity of 2,500 tables each year over the week-long tournament. Finally, the CBF also sponsors a week long Regional, held last year in Calgary and this year in Mississauga (at the same time as the second half of Bridge Week). This CBF Regional will be held in Victoria in March, 2008.

The CBF also runs a Junior Development Fund which not only selects, trains and supports junior teams to represent Canada in international competitions, such as the World Youth Team Championship (Canada placed third in 2005, and will compete later this year in Bangkok, Thailand), the World Schools Championships and the World University Cup (being held this October in Tianjin, China), but also plans to support grassroots events that will help bring more young players into bridge.

Financial support is provided by the CBF for teams that represent Canada in international competition, such as the 2006 World Championships to be held in Verona, Italy in June. This year eight BC players will be going to either the World Championships in Verona, or to the Youth Team Championships in Bangkok.

## Inside This Issue

## Summer 2006

Articles Section
Joerg Schneider: Give Me A Hand
6 McBruce: Self-Incrimination
14 It's Your Bid results
15 Brad Bart: Surprisingly Makable
18 Bruce McIntyre on Computers
19 Peter Morse: Hawaii
20. The Unit Grinch's latest rants.

50 Advice to the new Editor
Club News Yellow Pages
25 VBC Summer IMP League
26 Weekly Duplicate Game List
27 Special Events at Clubs
? Club Ads (scattered throughout)

## Results and Info Section

29 A Social Night of Bridge
30 Trophy Race Standings
31 IMP League Playoffs (so far)
32 Monthly Unit Games Report
33 Get Ready for the Unit 430 Sectional Tournament at Clubs! UPRS April 30 Standings
36 Ace of Clubs/Mini-McKenney

North American Pairs Info
The Usual Stuff
2 Opening Lead
3 President's Message
50 Unit Board Members List (and how to get your name on the list)
51 Tournaments \& Dates, Unit 430 Calendar, Contributors
52 Victoria Day Sectional Infomercial

NEXT ISSUE:
Summer 2006 Matchpointer (Ben Takemori's debut issue!)

Deadline for submissions:
Friday, August 11, 2006.
Dates covered:
August 25 - October 31, 2006.

Away from the bridge tables, the CBF acts as a liaison with the ACBL and the World Bridge Federation to ensure that Canadian concerns are raised with these organizations. The CBF also sponsors the CBF Charitable Foundation which supports charitable activities that are intended to benefit Canadians. Funds are distributed each year in each CBF Zone and last year totaled $\$ 15,500$, including contributions to the Greater Vancouver Food Bank, Canuck Place Children's Hospice and the Mustard Seed Food Bank in Victoria.

How do you join the CBF or renew your membership? Let me count the ways. The easiest method is to join/renew when you renew your ACBL membership. On the membership form which you receive in the mail (or on the ACBL website if you choose to renew there) there is a place to mark whether you want to join/renew your CBF membership at the same time. Many people miss it, simply searching for the lowest cost option. Effective July 1, 2006, the cost to join the CBF will be $\$ 12$ per year, a small cost to help ensure that bridge in Canada continues to be promoted and advanced by a Canadian National Bridge Organization.

If you are not currently an ACBL member or are a Life Master who chooses not to pay the annual service fee, you can still join the CBF and support Canadian bridge activities. Simply send a cheque (payable to the CBF) for the desired membership period, along with your name and ACBL number, to Ms. Jan Anderson, CBF Executive Assistant, 2719 East Jolly Place, Regina SK S4V 0X8.

The ACBL has advised that, effective July 1, 2006, the additional playing fee at Sectionals for nonmembers and non-service fee paying Life Masters will increase to $\$ 1.00$ per session (up from $\$ 0.50$ per session). At Regionals, the additional playing fee will be $\$ 2.00$ per session, up from $\$ 1.00$ per session. In addition, the way in which this is presented will change so that the posted fee will now be the non-member fee, with a discount indicated for ACBL members. For a player playing several Sectionals and the occasional Regional in a calendar year, the alternative of renewing your ACBL membership may be more financially attractive. And you will also receive the informationladen ACBL Bulletin each month.

Five players from Unit 430 will be representing Canada at two separate international tournaments later this year. Bryan Maksymetz and Dan Jacob were part of the winning team in the 2006 Canadian National Team Championships (CNTC) and Rhonda Foster and Marcia Christie were members of the winning team in the 2006 Canadian Women's Team Championships (CWTC). Both these pairs (and their teammates) will represent Canada at the World Championships in Verona, Italy in June, 2006.

In addition, Samantha Nystrom has been selected to the team representing Canada at the World Youth Team Championships, to be held in Bangkok, Thailand in July-August, 2006.

Congratulations to each of them on this significant accomplishment! Please take the time to wish them well as they head off to do battle on the world bridge stage.
-Peter Morse

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit 430 relies on income from Entertainment books to help fund local bridge players of all levels competing in the national finals of ACBL and CBF multi-level events. Last year's sales raised several hundred dollars for these subsidy funds. Iennifer Ballantyne has been organizing this uniQue, win-win fundraiser for more than two decades, and because we are no longer the only group selling these books, we've sold fewer in recent years. 2006 books will be available this Fall and are usable until the end of next year. We ask local players to please make a small effort to help local bridge by purchasing their book(s) from Unit 430. Books can be purchased at any Unit 430 Sectional Partnership Desk or pre-ordered from our booksellers: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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| In |  |  |
| ev |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Give Me A Hand

## by Joerg Schneider

## PICTURES FROM PENTICTON 2005

## A: High-level decisions

Tuesday Afternoon, Board 20. You hold:
—KQJ873 © A8542 ○A \& 9
14 on your right, double by you, pass on your left, $3 \varnothing(!)$ by partner, later explained as "go to four if you have extras."

Did I have extras?!
4NT led to a RKC mixup and we got only to 68 . 7 V and 7NT were both cold.

A bad score? Not at all! A large number of pairs recorded $+710(!!)$ and where the small slam was bid, many sacrificed in 7 s or $7 \diamond$, down "only" four for minus 1100 , an improvement over minus 1460 , but worse than the most common score: minus 710. There were scores of 1100 and 1400 to East-West which I cannot explain. The full deal:

| Board Dir: West 20 Vul: Both |
| :---: |
| WEST |
|  |



We sat East-West on this one.


3\&, of course, was just what East wanted to hear. South agonized over $6 \bigcirc$ but down three was only
slightly better than average for our side.
Interestingly, Deep Finesse, the computer analysis on hand records that tells you what you can make, shows 5 as the East-West limit, because the diamonds do not come in for five tricks and you cannot ruff out the ace of spades, or concede a spade trick for discards. So those pushing on to $6 \mathbf{2}$, doubled or otherwise, received a cruel blow from Destiny. Whether South should sit for the double or pull, looking at the A ${ }^{*}$, is hard to judge.

## B: How to get fixed in two easy lessons!

Wednesday Evening, Doug Cowan and I were 'not in the running' for top prize, but any optimistic assessments were squelched on these two consective boards near the end:


On Board 17, East opened INT and West, on the strength of her good (?!) five-card club suit bid 2NT and was raised to game. Of course, the club finesse is on, the diamond finesse is on and the $\mathrm{K} \varnothing$ is right: declarer made four. Watching all this transpire was as painful as having to listen to their post-mortem!


On Board 18 East-West again got to 3NT: 14, 20; $3 \diamond, 3 N T$. Now, honestly, would you have found the lead of the AV? On the lead of the more normal JV, declarer had her nine tricks on top and eventually scored her J\$. Who says crime does not pay?

## Self-Incrimination

## by McBruce

Online bridge discussion groups were unusually lively last summer. The reasons: new information about a famous historic cheating scandal; and, quickly following that news, a completely new cheating scandal at a major tournament, and the fallout. Before we get to the gory but entertaining details (and the relevance of the cover hand), a short essay on cheating at bridge is an important way to begin:

As club/tournament bridge players, we share a confidence in
one another not to cheat. Any pair wanting to use illegal methods to gain an advantage can do so and probably can get away with it, if their method is not so obvious. If you want to sniff, or point your pencils, or tap your partner's foot under the table (to name a few of the methods alleged in several infamous cheating scandals) to pass illegal information at the club level, you will probably get away with it-for a short time.

But eventually, better players will notice that your unusual leads too often strike gold, and your crazy bids find the right cards in dummy more often than chance would dictate. If your reputation in the expert community is tainted
with suspicion, you will not be accepted into that expert community just because of some good results. They'll be watching, and some day, you will be caught without a good answer for an unusual bid or play, and your run of victories may end in a suspension.

Bridge authorities are more afraid of false allegations of cheating than cheating itself, and there are sound reasons for this. If a pair cheats habitually, or even occasionally, they will eventually incriminate themselves by unusual actions. But if suspicious players publicly claim foul every time an opponent drops an offside honour or bids a $5 \%$ slam that makes, we'll no longer have a game so much as

## Online Bridge Cheating

## How bad is it? Can it be controlled?

People are discovering bridge online in huge numbers. Most online bridge sites now have some form of tournament play, for fun or even for cash prizes. Several sites feature ACBL tournaments where masterpoints can be won, although there are limits as to how many online points you can use to increase your ACBL rank.

The poker world has a term, "brick and mortar," which refers to a real casino as opposed to an online poker game. In a real "brick and mortar" casino, economics force the betting limits to a certain level to cover the upkeep of the property and the salaries of the employees. In an online poker game, you can play Texas Hold'Em for absurdly low stakes, because the overhead is lower without the brick and mortar. Most sites allow players to compete for play chips for as long as they want, and it is good economics even if only $1 \%$ ever graduate to the tables where real money can be won or lost.

Similarly, in the online bridge world, you can play an ACBL tournament for a dollar. You will have hand records every time you play-in fact, complete results of every board at every table are available. Most online games have all participants playing the same boards at the same time with instant scoring, so you can tell how you are doing during the event. And you need not leave your home or even have a partner to play! There are online partnership desks and individual tournaments. Bridge Base Online is free to join and runs dozens of tournaments a day,
from free tournaments directed by volunteers (like me occasionally), to inexpensive ACBL tournaments, about a dozen a day, and even cash prize tournaments.

Should clubs be worried? No. There are huge drawbacks to online play. The biggest of these is cheating.

Two people playing online need not develop a set of signals to alert each other about what to do. Partners can be on the telephone, or an online messaging service, revealing their hands to one another. A player can log on to a site under two names and play as one and kibitz all four hands as another. It happens, and at any moment, your good score is at risk of hitting one of these superwired pairs. Even in an individual a player might watch himself and the other three hands using two connections.

Although widely accepted that blatant cheating does happen, the organizers require a mountain of evidence before they will expel players (who could return under a different name anyhow). One lucky slam, two perfect leads, a few bids that worked out well: not enough. The organizers will file it but won't do much about it except thank you for reporting. They have all but acknowledged that the most blatant forms of online cheating cannot be stopped. They have other problems to solve first.

Any site that has members from all over the world faces a serious problem in that what is considered standard in one place may not be considered standard in another. A higher level of disclosure is required when one plays against international opponents, and this brings into the picture another problem: language differences. Far more time is spent on the online
the Jerry Springer Show with cards. (Sadly, this is pretty much the current state of online bridge, where nobody can see their opponents, and illegal communication is widely suspected. See the accompanying article for a look at nefariousness in the online world.)

For that reason, the ACBL and other jurisdictions world-wide always stipulate that serious concerns about cheating may never be aired publicly. Doing so will always get you a suspension: even if the cheating is completely obvious. Some Directors avoid penalizing behavioral issues, but they all take the C-word very seriously, because we've all seen the Jerry Springer Show and we don't want to play
bridge there.
If you see something that seems to be cheating, the way to report it is to talk to a Director-privately. The Director will decide the best course of action, based on the details. You may be asked to fill out a report form on the incident which-by itself or with others regarding the same suspect playermight be used to establish a pattern in a future hearing. The Director may talk to the players involvedinexperienced players sometimes are unaware that they are committing serious infractions that might be mistaken for cheating. The Director may even convene a meeting of the Tournament Conduct and Ethics Committee to hear the case.

Or, the Director might not agree with your conclusion: perhaps there was a fair reason for the bid or play that you missed. You can always insist on filing a Player Memo so your complaint can at least be recorded, but that will likely be the end of it. If this happens, please respect the Director's opinion-don't spitefully spread disparaging comments about another player though the bridge grapevine. If you do this, you deserve to be Jerry Springer's next guest.

Having given that important lecture, we can proceed to the bridge news which had the discus-
(continued on page 8)
bridge forums discussing whether a bid explained in mistyped symbols is an adequate explanation or not, than whether a pair was on the telephone as they played.

Online players don't seem to have the stomach online for a full session; even if they did, many cannot stay connected for that long. Most tournaments online are 8-12 boards only; some are as short as four boards. Many players shoot for the big scores because somebody will surely get them. Redoubles are common. Winning scores of $75 \%$ or more are frequent over eight boards or less.

Another problem: in an atmosphere where players habitually shoot for tops in shorter tournaments, those who fail often simply quit in midstream, especially when the cost for doing so is nothing, or maybe a dollar. Accusations are met with claims that the Internet was at fault.

So-do you still want to play online? At least at a club you know you will get a decent number of boards, you won't have players quit who are doing poorly, you won't have to face players who play whatever is standard in Kyrgyzstan and cannot explain in English what their bids mean, and your opponents will be as in the dark about the other 39 cards as you are.

Online bridge is great for casual practice. Get three friends, meet at one of the online sites, and play together all night. Figure out how to reserve the seats in case someone loses connection, and you'll have a great-if perhaps a little less social-time.

For serious competition, there are problems. Play and have fun if you like, but don't expect the online tournament to match a sectional or even a club game

## for legitimacy: at least not yet.

Because of these problems, I designed my online tournament series as SAYC-only individuals: no alerts or explanations, no set partnerships (we change partners every board), and fifteen boards, fairly long for an online tournament, to keep the shooters out. The shooters play anyway, quit often in midstream, and frequently the winner is the one who watched opponents' risky actions fail and took a good score on most of the boards. Players who find themselves playing with friends abandon the enforced SAYC system and are shocked when I adjust their score.

Still, the concept has proven popular with many who are tired of the silly things that happen in free-for-all online tournaments. Would I prefer to run a more standard format? Sure, but until the problems of online bridge are solved, it's just not worth the trouble. Players are far less reasonable, right or wrong, when the Director is a thousand miles away.

There is one site where a serious attempt is being made for an online clean competition with money prizes. A Norwegian site (www.topbridge.com) runs individual daily tournaments with an unusual format. All competitors are given the Topbridge standard convention card. As you play, you never know who the other three players are; there is no chat at all. Boards are given out at random, not in any numerical order. Results are never posted until the end of the day when the prizes are awarded.

When you sign up with Topbridge, you get fifteen boards to play on their server as a free introduction to the site. Unfortunately, to qualify for cash (continued on page 8)
sion groups buzzing in the second quarter of 2005:

Forty years ago, the British team withdrew from the World Championship in Buenos Aires, after allegations by the American team that one British pair, Terence Reese and Boris Schapiro, were holding their cards in a manner which indicated the number of hearts they held. One pair on the American team noticed the strange hand positions during an early session, went through the hand records, and eventually broke the code. Instead of making a private accusation to a Director, the American pair told first a few friends, and then their team captain, who then told the British cap-
tain, and over the next few sessions data was taken that correlated with the code well over $90 \%$ of the time (most of the hands that did not fit resulted from poor sightlines or early estimates of the meanings of the finger positions that were later refined).

The British Bridge League set up a hearing the following year and after many months of testimony found the charges "not proven." The technical evidence (the telltale unusual actions cheating pairs take that seldom fail) was found to be insufficient, and most who have studied the hand records and the bidding technology available at the time agree. The BBL, however, also chose to ignore the evidence of a few dozen photos of the players holding their cards and
indicating how many hearts they held, because one or two did not correspond. The notes taken about the finger positions corresponded even more closely to the hearts held (even those taken by impartial observers) but, for various reasons, were not entered as evidence.

The World Bridge Federation refused to accept the BBL verdict and Reese and Schapiro did not play internationally for Britain again. Reese, of course, continued to be a best-selling bridge author, and Schapiro won events in Britain into the 21st century. Reese died in 1996 and Schapiro in 2002. Books on the Buenos Aires affair and the aftermath from both sides, Reese's Story of an Accusation and Alan Truscott's The Great Bridge Scandal are now in print by Master
(Online Bridge Cheating, continued from page 7)
prizes, you need to play a set of sixteen boards in a day (you can play more than one daily set if you wish). Additional boards cost six for a US dollar. Every day, the top six players receive awards from $\$ 15$ for fourth thru sixth, up to $\$ 150$ for first. If you win, you receive winnings in more boards to play, but if you win often enough to accumulate many boards, you can convert the surplus back to cash.

It's a reasonable attempt to establish a fair competition and for the most part, it works fairly well. For less than three dollars, you can win $\$ 150$ on a very good day. Even if you don't win, you can see your results on each board and compare them with others at the Topbridge website. So far it is mostly populated with Scandanavian players and the site is busier in European prime time (morning here). Several intemational players play occasionally, including WBF World Master Tor Helness, who writes a Topbridge newsletter for the site.

One criticism of Topbridge is that a player can have two separate login names and play the same boards twice. Another allegation (without any data to support it) is that the management monitors players as they play and pairs those amassing a good score with a suicidal partner from management to ensure that favoured players win the prizes. If either were happening, someone would present evidence on one of the online forums to expose the cheaters. The data required is on the website and easily collected. No such evidence has appeared.

When dealing with miscreants, it helps to focus on the positive. Online bridge may have a higher percentage of players who are willing to break the rules to win. This is not surprising - Internet gaming is full of this attitude from a minority of players. But as best I can determine, the number of online cheaters is still quite low, far below the number of online allegations made. The few cheaters out there shouldn't detract from the many, many players who are learning bridge online and might be persuaded to join those of us who play offline. Few cheaters will make the step into the offline bridge world. New online players who enjoy the game might-if we welcome them.

A goal should be to get these new online players out to their local clubs and tournaments to see the other bridge world.

The key is education and advertising. Teachers, both online and offline, have a responsibility to teach bridge citizenship along with the rudiments of the game. Sites that offer bridge should offer offline bridge organizations the opportunity to advertise local bridge events on their site, at reasonable rates. Imagine logging in to your site and finding a box ad on the main page with the dates and location of the next local Sectional or Regional, while your partnes in Boca Raton sees an ad for a Florida tournament near to her location. It's not hard - we have the technology.

Brick and mortar bridge clubs and online clubs and local tournaments can co-exist without compet ing. It's the only way all three will survive.

## Point Press.

As you might expect, the Buenos Aires affair is a perennial subject on Internet bridge forums, almost as contentious as Restricted Choice or pseudorandom dealing programs. A new topic seems to start every time someone reads one of the books and dozens of replies appear within hours. Each side has its familiar posse of commentators and set of talking points, but seldom does any new opinion appear. After forty years, what could be new? Read this:

## CHEATING AT WORLD BRIDGE

New York Times 60s Exposé Vindicated after 40 Years from David Rex-Taylor

The 1955 world bridge champion, Englishman Terence Reese, was a genius player and author. Forty years ago news media worldwide broke the biggest bridge story of the 20th century*, alleging that he and his partner, fellow-champion Boris Schapiro, had been observed cheating in a major international event in Buenos Aires. Official hearings in the USA and UK reached opposite conclusions as to guilt. Both Reese and New York Times correspondent Alan Truscott wrote books each convincingly presenting opposing cases. Controversy has raged inconclusively since then.

Over 30 years ago, Reese privately explained to me what had really happened after I solemnly promised I would reveal nothing whatever to anyone until after both his and Boris' deaths and then only after 40 years from the time of the allegations in 1965. I have kept that promise.

Firstly, to clarify my involvement with Reese that has finally brought me to this point. After the general horror and fallout from what had happened, Reese chose not to be seen for many months, and I, like many others, was concerned. As organiser of the Richmond Bridge Congress, a popular annual event, I decided to tempt him back to competitive bridge by including a special 'Little Major' session to give players a unique opportunity to use Reese's new artificial bidding system (of which the 'establishment' utterly disapproved). After days of consideration he agreed to compete.

After months of bidding practice with my partner, 48 hours before the event Reese phoned me to confirm his attendance, adding that he was looking forward to "our playing together." I was surprised, as it had not occurred to me to ask, or that he would have even considered playing with me. I said there had been a misunderstanding, which he immediately accepted. Seeking a partner (Jeremy Flint declined as he was abroad), Reese finally persuaded a reluctant Jack Albuquerque, a London rubber bridge player, who had but a few hours to study the complexities of the Little Major from scratch! GCH Fox reported the result in The Daily Telegraph.

1 T Burger/D Rex-Taylor
2 JT Reese...!
For me it was an unwelcome Pyrrhic victory. At his suggestion, I partnered Reese in another of the congress events, and when I misdefended, he remarked, "Partner, you really
butchered that one!"
Following the congress, we stayed in touch. I published (imprint Bibliagora) titles by Victor Mollo, Rhoda Lederer, Maurice Harrison-Gray, Reese and Flint, and reprinted the rare first bridge book "Biritch," and was IBPA executive editor from 1982 to 2001, when sudden serious illness forced immediate retirement. Although I am Russian-speaking and enjoyed chatting with Mollo and Schapiro, I was never in an appropriate situation to discuss the cheating allegations with Boris. Equally, I had never planned to raise the subject with Terence, and it was several years before the alleged cheating surfaced in conversation. I had managed to insert the remark that Schapiro had said, at the time, words to the effect of, "That wicked man made me do it." A long, uneasy, painful silence followed. Then, following my agreement with his strict confidentiality and 40 -year embargo insistence, he said, "Hardly fair comment by Boris, wickedness didn't come into it."

Now taking notes, I was further startled by his measured insistence that I was to understand that the versions of events in his and Alan Truscott's books were "by no means mutually exclusive, but rather jointly conclusive," adding that, "motives aside, both were, for practical purposes, collectively exhaustive." He went on to confide that in the sixties he had been planning to write a highly-researched, in-depth book on cheating at cards and other indoor games and activities, commenting that he despised cheats, that success and winning solely on merit was cardinal, and that cheats in any activity should be pilloried and their methods exposed. He had discussed the material with Boris but had planned sole authorship. He felt that the book would have done very well, and was to have been first published in the United States, possibly with the title, "Grand Theft - Cheating." I recently learned that in the 50 s , Reese made two BBC radio broadcasts on cheating. He persuaded a reluctant Boris Schapiro that, as world champions, it would be quite unthinkable that they would cheat, that no one would even be paying attention to such an idea, and that in any event, absolutely no signalled information would be used in any way whatsoever during their actual play.

Consequently, as this was merely a purposeful security exercise, they would definitely not be cheating - it would simply be a constructive illusion, establishing a crucial point about a despicable practice. Certainly, he said, a competitive advantage could be obtained by finger-signalling heart holdings whilst holding one's cards. Their exercise had the single positive aim conclusively to establish in a 'live' situation that cheating could be practised undetected, such research establishing that urgent remedial action was needed.

A reluctant Boris finally agreed, strictly on the understanding, firstly, that the whole exercise be revealed in full detail in the book on cheating, with analyses to prove that they had both acted honourably throughout the play of the hands, as if they indeed had no prior knowledge of the heart distribution, so confirming their 'worthy innocent objective,' and secondly, that publication should be a matter of priority. Reese's
(continued on page 10)
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brainwave was atypically a disastrous miscalculation. Although judged not guilty in the UK at a hearing widely considered to be flawed by blatant cherry-picking of both evidence and witnesses, elsewhere the pair were deemed proven guilty. Security was, of course, duly increased, but Reese could not reveal the true explanation at the time as the very objective of his extraordinary operation - effectively an author's failed publicity stunt - had so spectacularly backfired in abject failure. Pleading anything but innocence was therefore not an option for either player.

Instead of the cheating book, Reese said that he and Flint would write a soft-porn novel, "Trick Thirteen," based on cheating, real-life antics off the bridge table in hotel bedrooms at international bridge tournaments.

As requested by Reese, I published the paperback edition. Sales were insignificant and as the publisher I arranged for all unsold copies of both hardcover and paperbacks to be destroyed.

So, as requested, after forty years, I have provided a mouthpiece in order for Terence Reese to explain these exceptional matters to the world from beyond the grave. He was unrepentant.


#### Abstract

* The Reese-Schapiro story is hardly the biggest bridge story of the twentieth century. The Culbert-son-Lenz match of 1931-32 occupied front pages of major newspapers for weeks, and was actually broadcast live on radio, although it might be said that it was mostly American coverage. The Bennett murder received a fair amount of coverage worldwide. Even restricted to the last half of the century, the story would only be number one because nobody outside the bridge world cares much about the headline "Italy wins the World Championship ten years running." Bad news sells more papers.


Well, that's that then-or is it?
The whole matter seems to be covered by Law 73B2 (Inappropriate Communication Between Part-ners-Prearranged Communication):

The gravest possible offense is for a partnership to exchange information through prearranged methods of communication other than those sanctioned by these Laws. A guilty partnership risks expulsion.

Needless to say, no Law says that it is all right to hold your cards with three fingers whenever you have three hearts, or with two splayed fingers whenever you hold five-even if you are writing a book about cheating with the best of intentions. If the story of David Rex-Taylor is true, Reese and Schapiro were cheating. Whether or not they gained from it is moot:
passing prearranged information is cheating.
But the story may be a hoax. Reese-Schapiro
supporters lost no time in referring to the author of the story as "David Rex-Bollocks." But why on earth, asked the other side, would a respected bridge journalist make up such a story and destroy his own long-earned reputation? And the cycle begins anew...

If you fly directly from Berlin to Madrid and continue in the same direction for about the same distance, you will find yourself about 100 miles west of the African coast of southern Morocco, over the seven islands known as Las Canarias (named after the dogs found there-Canarias from the Latin canis-dog: the native birds found there were named canaries much later). Today the Canary Islands are two largely autonomous provinces of Spain and about $4 \%$ of Spain's population lives there. The European Bridge League's Transnational Championships ("transnational" meaning teams and pairs need not represent specific nations and could include members from different ones) were held on the largest island of Tenerife at the southern resort of Arona last June.

The Open Teams event began as a two-session Swiss of 83 teams, divided into two sections, qualifying sixteen from each section to the knockout phase after six eight-board matches. In the last match of the qualifying stage, an Israeli team faced an Italian team in a match where both sides needed a good score to qualify for the knockout stage. At one table this was the third board:


> Screenmates: $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{W}$ and S-E
I. Bareket Q6542
$\bigcirc 9843$
$\diamond$ QT6

| Roll | Lanzarorti North | Bareket | Buratti |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WEST | NORTH |  | South |
| Pass | $28^{*}$ | Pass | 2NT* |
| Pass | 34* | Pass | $4 \stackrel{ }{\circ}$ |
| Pass | 4 | Pass | 54 |

$2 \diamond$ was the Multi, a convention not allowed in most ACBL events but popular and unregulated in Europe, showing either a strong balanced hand or a major-suit weak two. 20 was a relay and 2 NT confirmed the strong balanced hand. 34 showed a hand with both minors. $4 \diamond$ confirmed the fit and cuebidding followed.

Jossi Roll, on the same side of the screen as South, confirmed all of this, asking specifically about the KD, which declarer confirmed having shown in the auction, before continuing with the at trick two. Andrea Buratti now took some time to consider the layout and finally called for the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$ from dummy. Ilan Bareket played low in tempo and Buratti thought for some time. Finally he played low from his hand and claimed when the Roll followed and the jack won.
(This is the trump suit on the cover of this issue, of course. The percentages are well-known to expert players: about $53 \%$ to play the two high diamonds, about $40 \%$ or less to run the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$, depending on how well you guess later if the jack is covered. )

Bareket excused himself from the table for a few moments and returned a few minutes later to complete the final five boards. The Italian team won the match by a large margin. The Chief Tournament Director, however, called the four players and team officials to an Appeal Committee for a Disciplinary Hearing, based on what Bareket had reported.

In the spring of 2005, Massimo Lanzarotti and Andrea Buratti won the Cavendish Pairs, a prestigious cash prize money game held in Las Vegas. Both men were on the Vanderbilt winning team at the Spring 2005 NABC. You'll find their pictures on page 20 of the July 2005 ACBL Bulletin. Unfortunate timing on the ACBL's part, but not Memphis's fault. The July Bulletin was already being printed as the Committee in Tenerife began the hearing.

Bareket, on the same side of the screen as dummy, reported that after Lanzarotti placed his cards on the table, he leaned over to his left to see Bareket's cards. Bareket did not try to hide them, but was never asked to show them. With screens it is a common practice for dummy to look at his screenmate's cards to better follow the play.

Having seen Bareket's cards, Lanzarotti now took up a peculiar position, with his left arm on the table and his right arm across it with only the three middle fingers pointing down over the arm, the pinky hidden. As Buratti considered his line, Lanzarotti twice shifted his position, once with the three fingers on the forearm, and once with the three fingers on the table in front of the arm. Always three fingers, and always in clear view of declarer through the screen partition.

Three fingers.
Three trumps.
After Buratti ran the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$ and partner followed, Bareket was disturbed by the coincidence of the three fingers combined with the anti-percentage first-round finesse. After the claim, he went to report the incident to the Director. He told the Committee he was
so shaken by the incident that he played poorly afterward.

Buratti was asked now to confirm the auction and the line of play. He confirmed that he had run the J $\diamond$ successfully at trick two. When asked why he had chosen that line, he gave four reasons:
-the AP lead was curious because dummy did not cuebid in hearts.
-the series of questions by the opening leader led him to believe diamonds were 1-3.
-the first two boards were bad for his side and they needed a big win to get to the next stage

- "diamonds are always badly divided in this tournament." Buratti mentioned another board where he had found a missing $\mathrm{Q} \triangleright$ on a bad break. Roll objected that on that deal he had made enough bids that the location of the $\mathrm{Q} \diamond$ was clear-cut.

Lanzarotti, asked about the three fingers and looking at Bareket's hand, made the following explanations:
-throughout the day when dummy, he had rested his head on his arms. The Israelis could not confirm this as he had not been dummy in the match except for the one board.
-he had only $20 \%$ vision in his left eye, and he could not easily distinguish between red honours with only his left. When told that Bareket had testified that he looked into his hand, Lanzarotti denied doing so.

The captain of the team including Lanzarotti and Buratti is Maria Teresa Lavazza, a high-profile sponsor of many Italian teams at major championships. (By buying a Lavazza coffee maker you may be helping develop the next generation of great Italian players, for there are many good honest ones.) Mme. Lavazza did not attend the hearing. Instead, the team's coach, Massimo Ortensi, attended and then testified that he had told the team to try to win by a large margin, and that he had never heard allegations of this kind in all his years of working for the Italian Bridge Federation and for this particular team.

Jossi Roll was asked if he had anything to add, and he mentioned that while thinking about what to do with the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$ played from dummy, declarer also rested his head on his arms for some time. This was not contested and the Committee retired to deliberate alone.

The Committee's final report was presented, after several hours of deliberation. Many players who had heard some of the story stayed to await the decision, if only to know who they might face in the first knockout round the next day!

The Committee confirmed that they were
empowered under the Laws to disqualify a contestant for cause. They then considered some of the technical evidence. They rejected the argument about diamonds always breaking badly. They noted that bidding $6 \diamond$ was not likely to happen at all tables. They noted that the play of running the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$ first is "singularly against the odds" except for one specific circumstance: when declarer knows or infers that diamonds are $1-3$, running the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$ is a $75 \%$ play, losing only to a singleton offside queen. Finally, the committee found that Bareket smoothly ducking the J厄 was a sound play, since declarer might have held five trumps and might have been trying to induce a cover.

This ground covered, the Committee found that Buratti's reasons for the anti-percentage play were unconvincing, and combined with the evidence EastWest presented, were self-incriminating for an expert player. Buratti and Lanzarotti were disqualified from the event. The match victory point score was changed, from 25-2 for Italy, to an 18-0 walkover for the Israeli team, who qualified for the knockout stage, but lost the next day in the round of 32. Finally, the matter was referred to a credentials committee should the disqualified pair attempt to enter any other events in the tournament. They did not.

Full text of the decision:
www.eurobridge.org/bulletin/05_1_Tenerife/pdf/Bul_11.pdf
I don't know how much alcohol was consumed as the team captains awaited the decision for several hours. Newspaper reports, however, mentioned that the decision when read elicited great applause from the assembled players. Some of the Internet commentariat were not as impressed with the decision...

Arguments against the decision of the Committee were in three general forms:

1) One cannot brand a pair as cheaters based only on the evidence of an opponent, who could conceivably have been lying.
2) One cannot brand a pair as cheaters based only on one single deal. A pattern of cheating is required to prove this to a high enough standard to make such a serious accusation.
3) The Committee's findings, and the Director's decision to take it to a Disciplinary Hearing, are biased against Buratti and Lanzarotti because they have been under suspicion in the past.

The first two are easy to refute. Nobody branded them cheaters. The official report does not say they cheated. It says the defenders suggested that declarer acted upon information passed illegally
by dummy, and finds the reasons given by declarer and dummy so bizarre and unsatisfactory as to be selfincriminating for players of that level. (You or I would likely get a reluctant pass, because non-experts are not held to the same standards. OK, maybe you would have some difficulty...)

The report does not even recommend any further action after disqualifying the pair and changing the match score to a forfeit. It alerts the credentials committee to look into the matter should the offending pair wish to enter any more events at the tournament, but does not recommend any course of action.

And because the report does not judge whether or not premeditated cheating took place, the standard of proof is not 'beyond a reasonable doubt,' but simply 'a preponderance of the evidence.' Even so, I would think that the standard would be fairly high, and if, as I wrote on one of the online forums, the explanations from Buratti and Lanzarotti had not been on a par with that of America's Dumbest Criminals, they probably would have received only a reprimand.

Instead, we have Lanzarotti claiming first that he didn't look at Bareket's cards, then admitting he might have been in a position to see them-but his eyesight (one wonders how he sees cards in dummy when he is declarer) made that impossible. Lanzarotti describes a restful position from which one cannot imagine how he plays cards called by declarer without breaking it, not to mention that trying this restful position with a bent finger (leaving three showing) is actually fairly painful.

We have Buratti claiming that the first two boards were bad for him when the records show that they clearly were not, that Roll's questions about high honours in side suits somehow magically revealed that he had only one trump, and that leading an ace against a slam was unusual when they had cuebid everything eise. And if that is not enough silliness for you, well, diamonds are always breaking badly at this tournament.

The Committee was not bom yesterday.
What the report does do, by way of being made public, is urge the Federazione Italiana Gioco Bridge, and other organizations that have the pair as members, to look into the matter and decide what to do.

When I wrote this last summer, the FIGB had done nothing in public, although it is common knowledge that the Federazione had kept Buratti and Lanzarotti off the Italian Bermuda Bowl team for some time because of the rumours surrounding them. Fred Gitelman posted on a Bridge Base Online forum that he hoped the matter would be resolved by making "B\&L crawl back into the hole they came from [so] none of us will ever have to play against them again."

The ACBL, however, is a different story. A quick meeting of a high-level body (whose name escapes me) decided to let Buratti and Lanzarotti know that they would not be welcome in ACBL games until a full hearing in November. Speculation was that the ACBL was preparing a case against them and that ACBL bigwigs had placed them under scrutiny for some time.

Rumours spread fast.
And because they do, we have objection number three above. Is it possible that the same charges brought against a different pair might have been handled differently? Is it possible that the Committee did not give accuser Bareket the same degree of difficulty in convincing them that they would if the accused pair had no prior reputation? Is it possible that the Committee might have believed one side more than the other because of reputations?

Yes, it is possible. But it is quite unlikely. We'll never know how much of what actually happened in the hearing is left out of the report. But there is nothing in the report about anyone's reputation, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Committee considered reputations in order to help them decide. Followers know successful bridge players by reputation and the names of the members of the Committee are less prominent in the bridge world, so it's easy to blame the Committee. But the people who work behind the scenes as organizers and Directors at major tournaments are selected because they do their jobs well. They would recognize the role of reputation and make sure it was not a factor.

Instead, consider this. If you are aware that many of your fellow players think your successes are due to 'black magic' (cheating), wouldn't you want to do whatever you could to change that reputation?

Of course you would.
And because of that, you would never look into a screenmate's hand as dummy without first asking; or, rest your head on your arms low on the table where partner can clearly see what you are doing; or, hold three (or four, or one or two) fingers out in three different ways; or, pretend to think before leading a card from dummy for a first-round finesse and then again after RHO plays in tempo; or, justify an unusual play by claiming that a particular suit always seems to break badly after you have bid a pushy slam in that suit off an ace. You would be extremely aware that doing such things would only make your reputation worse, and you would avoid them.

This pair didn't seem to care.
One entertaining post on the Internet from Isabela Amancio, a player who was in Tenerife, summed up the situation well, if perhaps lacking in corroborative
journalistic sources:
This is what I witnessed there: I was with Melih Ozdil and some other friends, sitting at a restaurant two days after the "affaire" and saw Guido Ferraro come and sit down at a table next to ours where the Israeli team which had been involved in the controversy were sitting together with some others I did not recognize, and explain in his peculiar funny English what a good deed the Israeli pair had done, that those two ladroni (his words) had finally got what they deserved after 20 years of cheating, that they had played badly up to then and must have decided to put the overdrive (his word exactly) when they felt they needed. When they came back for the scoring up after the match and he, surprised, asked them how they made the slam which had gone down at Bocchi's table, nobody could believe B\&L's reply and that he had wanted to dive in the swimming pool for the embarrassment and the stupidity of what they had done. Then he continued saying that B\&L had tried to reassure them and told them not to worry that nothing will happen, since they had won $25-2$. How wrong they were! He finished saying that as a regular Chief of Appeals Committee in Italy he had had enough of strange bids and plays of "those two." A few minutes later, the coach of the Italian team, Ortensi, also went there and apologized for what had happened saying that it was his job as coach of Lavazza to try and defend B\&L in the Appeal Committee and that Mrs Lavazza and him very, very sorry and distressed about the whole incident.

My first move upon reading this was to find out that ladroni is the Italian word for "thieves."

## EPILOGUE

From the 2005 Fall NABC Daily Bulletin:
On Nov. 18, 2005, the American Contract Bridge League Ethical Oversight Committee found Mr. Andrea Buratti and Mr. Massimo Lanzarotti guilty of violating Law 73 of the Laws of Duplicate Contract Bridge for deliberately communicating unauthorized information at the European Bridge League Championship earlier this year. As a result, the Committee expelled Mr. Buratti and Mr. Lanzarotti from the American Contract Bridge League effective immediately. Mr. Buratti and/or Mr. Lanzarotti may appeal this decision to the League's Appeals and Charges Committee within thirty (30) days.

## Source:

http://web2.acbl.org/nabcbulletins/2005fall/db6.pdf (page 6)
An Internet newsgroup contributor wrote that the New York Times reported that "almost simultaneously, the Italian Bridge Federation announced its findings, banning them for thirty months and stating that they may never again play as partners." At the NABC in Dallas the ACBL Board of Directors upheld the decision of the Ethical Oversight Committee.

## It's Your Bid

## Responses and Scores

Thanks to the posting of the problems on the Internet and a site that allows novices like me to create online polls, we had 57 responses to the It's Your Bid questions from the last issue, oh so long ago. Most were submitted way back in June or July 2005.

Of the 57 responses, 22 selfflighted themselves into Flight A, 31 in Flight B, and 4 in Flight C. 13 responses were from local players and 44 more were from players from outside Unit 430, from Australia to Argentina to Bulgaria to countries throughout the alphabet.

The scoring system for the contest weights each Flight A responses as ten points (six for nonlocals), Flight B as three (two for
non-locals), and Flight C as one (local or not). We downgraded non-locals because we have no way of telling when someone tries to enter a higher flight and the percentage of online entries in Flight A is suspiciously high.

If you hit the response with the most points, you score 100. If not, your score is based on how many points your response got compared to the best response.

Why score by popularity (weighted slightly by flighting)? Because it is objective! In other bidding contests, a judge is hired to collect the votes and decide which answers get how many points. The judge does so partly by popularity, partly by the comments, perhaps a little by the actual result at the table, and sometimes by the responses of those whose opinions he respects.

I think it's better to limit my role as judge to ensuring that the flights are correct and let the formula decide the results. Sometimes this will go against the table result, but we all know that what is right in theory may not always work in practice! Your mileage may vary.

It's Your Bid will continue this feature in the online Matchpointer (the print version may contain a report on the winners, but the length and number of comments may be edited even more than they are here). If you don't want to take scissors to the Matchpointer cover page or simply call, mail or e-mail your answers to me, you can always try the online form at www.matchpointer.com along with the latest report on the previous contest.

Let's find out who won:


How many hearts? We had votes for zero to four. As usual, we begin with the least popular responses and meander towards the consensus.
"HHIT": 28.18 is an overbid; pass gives opponents their spade fit on a silver platter.

Robert Sauvé: Pass. I have my fur hat on in July [when this response was received].

Richmond Williams: Pass. As a first seat opener I am not going to hang partner with a poor preempt.

David Breton: $3 \mathbb{\$}$. I've played long enough to recognize a trump suit when I see one.

John R. Mayne: 48 . It's 48 or $1 \nabla$; the two aces say not to preempt, but the rather poor spades argue otherwise. I feel confident $4 \nabla$ will work well most of the time.

Harold Hansen: 48 . This puts the pressure on the opponents and is a reasonable bid.
"Luis": 18. Hands with hearts are difficult to bid if you don't strike first. I have opened worse hands than this one so I don't feel I will have any problem.

Larry Meyer: 10 . According to the rule of 20, assuming at least a half HCP for each of the ten-nines, there are 9 HCP plus a length value of 11.

| Question 1 |  |  |  |  | Total | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Call | A | B | C | Votes | Points | Award |  |
| 10 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 18 | 68 | 100 |  |
| $4 \nabla$ | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 61 | 90 |  |
| $3 母$ | 3 | 10 | 1 | 14 | 42 | 62 |  |
| Pass | 2 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 26 | 38 |  |
| $2 Q$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 28 |  |

Source: Lost in antiquity, or rather in the long delay between Matchpointer issues.

Partner's hand: unknown. Not too relevant in a 'what do you bid as dealer?' problem, since partner could have virtually anything.

Leaders: Eight people are tied with 100.

| 2. (Again matchpoins, both vul.) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - - T3 $<$ QJ6542 Q7543 |  |  |  |
| West | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
| 14 | Double | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 28 | 2* | 34 |
| 34 | Double | Pass | ??? |

This might be more difficult in a bidding contest than at the table, where you don't get unconscious vibes from tempo and manner.
"Bulwark": $4 \diamond$. ZERO! defensive tricks.
David Breton: 5\$. Whichever minor suit game partner chooses is fine; let them find three tricks.

Harold Hansen: 4®. This hand is probably trickless against 3 . 48 could be a make. Opponents could bid 4s a sort of sacrifice...or make it.

Dwayne Hoffman: Pass. Ouch. This is rough. North doubled and bid freely, then smacked $3 \$ 1$ freely. I'm taking the sure profit. I pass. $4 \nabla$ is a very scary call here.

Richmond Williams: Pass. I have given partner a complete description of my poor hand and indicated no tolerance to defend spades.

Gerben Dickson: Pass. Misfit! Partner has 18+ with 5 or 6 hearts and 4 decent spades. This is a penalty double.

Robert Sauvé: Pass. Why was my previous bid 3\&? I would have preferred a diamond rebid. Now I must trust partner as the opponents are on minimal values.

Phil Clayton: 44. I disagree with $3 \$$. Would have preferred 4 $\boldsymbol{k}$, unless that can be taken as a splinter. Now, 4- sounds like a really weak 6-5.

Larry Meyer: 4@. They have a fit, so we must have one, too. Give partner the information he needs.
"Luis": 4k. Distributional hand. I think we can have a good game in this hand but I'm not sure which one is it. Over $4 \diamond$ I'm planning to bid $4 \diamond$ to give partner a choice of games. If anyone passes with this hand he is crazy.
"HHIT": 44. Should show a 6-5 or 6-6 minor suit hand without much defense.

| Question 2 |  |  | C | Total Votes | Total Points | Award |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Call | A | B |  |  |  |  |
| 46 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 14 | 67 | 100 |
| Pass | 5 | 12 | 2 | 19 | 60 | 90 |
| 48 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 14 | 52 | 78 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 31 |
| $4 \diamond$ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 21 |
| 3NT | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Source: This is from an old Matchpointer, the October 1969 issue with the very first It's Your Bid feature. three of the seven responders passed, and the other four matched the four bids at the top of the list above (Ron Borg was the lone voter for 40 in 1969, which I guess indicates that he was 36 years ahead of his time). Moderator Allan Graves admonished the panel for not considering 3NT, which "can't be misconstrued and must show a doubleton heart and spade void."

Partner's hand: not given. Jack Marsch, whose vote was to pass, speculated something "along the lines of $\$$ AJT VAKxxxx and a minor suit ace or king."

Leaders: Four people still have a perfect score...

## Surprisingly Makeable

## by Brad Bart

Here's a declaring problem from a local club game.
None vulnerable:

| West | NORTH | EAST | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 14 | Double | 24 | 28 |
| Pass | Pass | 3* | 30 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

## Dummy: Q64 © KQT63 $\diamond$ Q853 \& 3

92 led vs. 30

```
Declarer:$ KT5 ` AJ72 \diamond 72 T864
```

Thanks to partner's passed hand takeout double, you take the push to 30 . After winning the J\&, East returns the J 人 to West's ace, but miraculously, your hopes are not instantly dashed: East follows to the spade return. Your next move, ruffing a club, proves the clubs are 1-7.

Obviously, the hand is cold if hearts are 2-2, but something tells you-perhaps it was the speed of the 3* bid-that the hearts are 3-1. Can the hand be made in that case?
(answer on page 19)

| 3. (Still matchpoints, none vul.) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ K8 $\vee$ AKT8764 $\bigcirc 3$ KT8 |  |  |  |
| West | NORTH | EAST | SOUTH |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | ??? |

The consensus of the $3 \varnothing$ bidders was that $3 \varnothing$ is at least $100 \%$ forcing. Those who chose other calls tended to indicate that they weren't sure...

Dwayne Hoffman: 5NT. Ask partner to pick a slam. Partner is unlikely to be off two aces for their jump, and 5 NT if passed might be a nice spot.

Richmond Williams: 3t. To keep the auction alive. If partner bids 3 NT we may have a play at 60 . If partner bids 4 k a club or diamond slam may be possible. If he bids $4 \diamond$ then a diamond game or slam may be better.
at's Your Bid, continued from page 15)
Larry Meyer: 44. Give pard a chance to show two-card heart support. If he has a couple of small hearts, the missing aces, and the K○, not a lot to ask considering his bidding, then $6 \gtrdot$ looks good.
"Useless": 3NT. North is very unbalanced but has around 16 HCP . South's 13 HCP is not enough for slam. Take the game and hope for overtricks.
"Dale": 4ワ. Extra values in the partnership. I have a self sufficient suit. What's the problem?
"HHIT": 4NT. A shameless attempt to scoop the points by going with what I expect will be the consensus.

David Breton: $3 \diamond$. Once I bid over $3 \diamond$, we're pot committed; a good partner won't pass.
"Luis": 30 . Forcing. This is so easy.
"Skorchev": 30 . I hope it's forcing, else I'll bid 3@ showing values and forcing.

Phil Clayton: $3 \bigcirc$. Is this really a problem? Does anyone think $3 \triangle$ isn't forcing?

John R. Mayne: $3 \varnothing$. $3 \varnothing$ is forcing, or you've got to bid 4. on hands like this, and that isn't good. I'll try to get some help from pard here.

Robert Sauvé: 30 . Absolutely forcing; if fit found, Roman Keycard next.

Gerben Dickson: $3 \varnothing$. Running from partner's jump rebid of his own suit is $100 \%$ forcing. No need to give up on slam yet.

| Question 3 |  |  |  | Total Votes | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Call | A | B | C |  |  | Award |
| 30 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 17 | 75 | 100 |
| 4NT | 5 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 48 | 64 |
| 48 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 37 | 49 |
| 3NT | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 24 |
| 4* | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 20 |
| 34 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 19 |
| 4॰ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| 5NT | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Source: A deal given by an online responder last time, Mary Carmen Babot.

Partner's hand: A5 $\vee$ Q $\diamond$ AKT9754 A73.
78 has a much better chance than $7 \diamond \ldots$
Leaders: "Luis" and Phil Clayton have a hat trick. The local leader is Stuart Carr with 244.

## 4. (More matchpoints, both vul.)

- J92 $\vee \mathrm{Q} \diamond \mathrm{AQT963}$ - J43

| West | NORTH | EAST | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 14 | ??? |

The top three responses here can be described in three adjectives: bulletproof...

Larry Meyer: 30 . Take away a round of bidding from the opponents-hope passed-hand partner doesn't raise me too vigorously if he has a diamond fit.

Phil Clayton: $3 \diamond$. Only pause for consideration is the $\$ 19 x$. But I really like the intermediates, so I preempt.
"Dale": 3仓. Ten ugly points, this is what weak overcalls are for.
...fatalist...
Gerben Dickson: Pass. Sorry, the suit is nice but not enough values.

Harold Hansen: Pass. Couldn't find a $4 \triangle$ answer here. [Harold bid $4 \triangle$ or led the $4 \varnothing$ in the other four problems!] $2 \diamond$ could go for a bundle if West has a diamond stack.

Robert Sauvé: Pass. Bad spade holding, vulnerable and passed partner. A $2 \diamond$ bid has 1100 written all over it. Pass, the most underrated bid in bridge.
"xx1943": Pass. What is the problem?
Dwayne Hoffman: Pass. Pass, pass, and PASS. Jacks are overrated. And $3 \diamond$ is just silly.
... and pragmatic:
Richmond Williams: 20 . No reason to preempt with this poor hand.
"Rabid": $2 \diamond$. Largely for the lead. If I pass it might go 1NT and partner won't find a diamond lead.

John R. Mayne: $2 \diamond .3 \diamond$ with all the side defense has low appeal, and the diamonds are good enough for $2 \diamond$. I'll wager this will win by a bundle.
"HHIT": $2 \diamond$. We pay 800 or 1100 once in a while for the benefit of keeping opponents from having nice easy auctions.

| Question 4 |  |  |  |  | Total | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Call | A | B | C | Votes | Points | Award |  |
| $2 \diamond$ | 10 | 14 | 2 | 26 | 99 | 100 |  |
| Pass | 8 | 12 | 2 | 22 | 82 | 83 |  |
| $3 \diamond$ | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 27 | 27 |  |
| Double | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 |  |
| 2NT | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |

Source: I have a strong recollection that this is from a book or article where $2 \diamond$ goes for 1100 , and the author chastises anyone who thought about overcalling, but I don't remember which it was.

Partner's hand: I'm sure those who passed can imagine the dummy the book presented, but those of us who bid $2 \diamond$ or $3 \diamond$ would argue that one can visualize many more that would be far better, and in matchpoints the reward trumps the risk.

Leaders: The leader is now "Luis" with 383. Local leader is still Stuart Carr with 344. The top seven are non-locals as we round the final turn...
"Luis": A\$. I've seen this kind of trick before. Bite me.

| Question 5 |  |  |  | Total Votes | Total Points |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lead | A | B | C |  |  | Award |
| A | 10 | 7 | 1 | 17 | 81 | 100 |
| A/K® | 6 | 14 | 0 | 21 | 66 | 81 |
| 48 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 15 | 60 | 74 |
| 74 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| 3* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| J® | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

Source: Morning KOs, Victoria Regional 2005.
As many suspected, the declarer had spade losers he was trying to hide with the fancy convention, in this case QJ doubleton. I'd plead guilty except that it was the morning knockouts and at that hour I just didn't have the balls to try it, only thinking of it afterward. (Wouldn't have won the match anyhow...)

Leaderboard: Tough set! To make the top ten list you needed to score 427:

427 Phil Clayton, Nancy Shomette
435 Robert R. Ellery
438 Gerben Dickson
444 Torsten Skibbe
448 Viktor Urban
462 Ashok
468 John R. Mayne
478 Helene Thygesen (Flight B leader)
483 Luis Argerich
The top local player was Stuart Carr, who was 12th overall with a score of 418 and won a Sectional and a Monthly Unit Game free play. Top local Flight B score was Stuart Carr; second was Zoran Peca who won a Monthly Unit Game free play. Tops in Flight C, local and overall, was Silvia Comanescu with 348 and a Monthly Unit Game free play.

Good luck on this issue's problems! The online form for this issue's contest should appear fairly soon at www.matchpointer.com.

## TSAWWASSEN BRidge Club

South Delta Rec. Centre, 1720 56th Street
Mondays at 7:15 pm Open stratified, quarterly Swiss Separate Newplicate Games
Richard Dunn: 604/940-9809
e-mail: rmdunn@dccnet.com

Results \& Information:
www. user.dccnet.com/rmdunn/

Special Games:<br>May 22: Closed for Sectional<br>May 29: Charity Swiss Teams<br>June 5: STaC Game (silver points!)<br>June 12: Closed (Penticton Regional)<br>June 26: Club Championship<br>August 7: Stratified Swiss Teams<br>Sept. 18: Club Championship

## Recent Winners:

March 20 Club Championship: Joyce \& John Ranger

April 10 Membership Game:
Wenda Hopp/Erik Andersen
BIG GAME:
Sheila Sache/Gilbert Lambert ( $68.98 \%$, March 13)

## Instant Matchpoints 2.0

## by McBruce

Over the past year, I have developed a new type of duplicate for the Wednesday night VBC crowd. The hand records are sliced into small pieces of paper with one deal on each, and the deals in a round are put into an envelope. If you have extra time at the end of the round-don't be slow!-you can check the hand records for the boards you played in that round, and the predicted matchpoint scores for your result, much like the charts in an Instant Matchpoint game. Where do these predicted scores come from? Read on.

The "Wednesday Night Quickie" is an early bird game, running from $7: 00$ to $9: 30$ and is about 20 boards in length, for a slightly reduced price. A few days before each one, I instruct the computer program JACK to create and play 30 deals 50 times each, using computer pairs playing many different convention cards. I then play the hands myself as South at a 51st table, with three JACK players, and I list the results on the reverse side of the hand records. When players finish a round, they might see this deal:

| Board Dir: North17 Vul: None |  | Dec. 6, 2005 WNQ game |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| WEST |  | EAST |
| - T93 |  | -876 |
| ¢ JT4 | SOUTH | \% K853 |
| +Q7 | $\triangle$ AQ42 | $* 964$ +653 |

And, on the reverse side, they see this:

| N-S Score E-W |  | Contract | Freq. | N-S\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 980 |  | 64= | 1 | 100 |
| 490 |  | $3 \mathrm{NT}+3$ | 9 | 90 |
| 480 |  | 4 + 2 | 4 | 77 |
| 450 |  | 54 $=$ | 1 | 60 |
| 450 |  |  | 12 | 60 |
| 420 |  | 5*+1 | 1 | 41 |
| 420 |  | 4金= | 5 | 41 |
|  | 50 | 4*-1 | 1 | 29 |
|  | 50 | 3NT-1 | 5 | 29 |
|  | 100 | 64-2 | 1 | 20 |
|  | 100 | 4V-2 | 1 | 20 |
|  | 100 | 3NT-2 | 1 | 20 |
|  | 150 | 44-3 | 1 | 8 |
|  | 150 | 3NT-3 | 8 | 8 |

You can quickly see what the most common contracts are, and what your score is likely to
be. (I chose fifty-one tables as the tournament size because in European scoring there are no halves, so top in a 51 -table game is exactly 100.) It's quite fascinating to see the variety in these charts. On some deals there will be only a very few results, maybe 3NT making $8,9,10$, and 11 tricks. On others there might be as many as 20 different scores, some obtained in several different ways. Usually there is a bulk of 15 35 tables with the same result, but often there are several common results far away from one another on the table, with even more uncommon results sandwiched in.

All of the scores obtained in the computer tables are pre-entered into ACBLScore, in two separate sections, one of 26 tables and one of 25 tables (ACBLScore has a limit of 40 tables in a section), and the real game is entered as a third section. This allows an interesting effect: by scoring across the field, but choosing not to rank across sections, you can track everyone's progress, even after only one round. If each board is played ten times in the game, the eventual top (using North American scoring) will be 60.

Of course, one cannot award masterpoints for beating a computer, and so at the end you must score the "live" section on its own. Removing the scores of the 51 computer tables usually leaves the percentages of the live players pretty close to what it was with the computer tables added.

JACK creates the 1500 results ( 50 results for 30 boards) overnight, but can be set at many different skill levels. I have found that a fairly low skill level is best. Computer players already have huge (some might say illegal) advantages over human players:
\& they never forget a card played
$\vee$ using their perfect memory of the bidding and play, they can visualize complicated end positions and place missing cards better than most human players can
$\diamond$ their bidding is based on rigid rules, so they never base their decisions on possible layouts that don't fit the auction
Because of all this, I usually set the level fairly low, and the computer tables usually are fairly close to the live table results. We don't see pairs jump from $45 \%$ to $55 \%$ when we remove the computer results from the scores. They do sometimes jump a little bit.

We now have a series of games every two months, featuring matchpoint games with occasional IMP Pairs, team games, and an individual game at the end (to break ties!). All feature hand records and instant feedback from the computer scores. The leading players in each series win a few extra masterpoints at the end. Wednesdays at 7:00: I hope you'll come out and join us!

## Hawaii

## by Peter Morse

The Hawaii Regional bridge tournament in January provides a pleasant break from the cold and rain in Vancouver (and other parts of North America). While not a large tournament, the Hawaii Regional does draw a considerable number of bridge pros, at least those fortunate enough to have a client willing to pay their way. This year the tournament was immediately after the Vancouver Regional, which resulted in some local players rushing off to an airport shortly after the last card had been played in the Sunday Swiss Teams event. For those who stayed home, I am pleased to advise that the weather in Honolulu was sunny and warm, the golf was enjoyable and the restaurants were great. But enough gloating, and on to the bridge.

This hand comes from a first round match in the mid-week

Swiss teams and involves declarer play only:

## \& 4 〇 K65 $\diamond$ AK86 * AQT93

As led vs. $4 \triangle$
\& J87 ~ AJ972 $\diamond$ Q54 * 64
The contract is $4 \nabla$, with East having overcalled in spades, supported by West along the way. The opening lead was the As, followed by a shift to the $\mathrm{T} \diamond$. Winning the diamond in hand, I ruffed a spade and, lacking hand entries, chose to play the $\mathrm{K} \varnothing$, which drew two small hearts, followed by a small heart from the board. On this trick, East showed out and I rose with the $A P$, and paused to consider alternatives.

While two trump losers remain, the contract can still be made if the K is onside. As this is essential, I next led a small club to the queen, and when it held, I now was at a crossroads. If West is 3-4-3-3, the hand is cold, as it doesn't matter which minor suit I
use to discard my last spade. On the other hand, if West is 4-4 in the majors, I need to ascertain in which minor suit he holds a doubleton. If it is clubs, I need only cash the high diamonds and discard my losing spade on the fourth diamond while West ruffs with one of his trump winners. On the other hand, if he has a doubleton diamond (the lead of the $\mathrm{T} \diamond$ suggests he might have two), I need to play A use one of the high diamonds as an entry to discard my spade on the fourth club. As it couldn't hurt to cash the A\&, I did so, and watched the king come down. But, I said to myself, West is a good enough player to play the king from a remaining holding of $\$ \mathrm{KJ}$. So, I decided to ruff a club, and watched as West overruffed and cashed a spade and his last trump for down one.

Of course, if I had made the (continued on page 20)

## |Surprisingly Makeable

## Solution to problem on page 15

Assuming the heart singleton, East's distribution is an open book: 2-1-3-7. To reach nine tricks, there must be two diamond ruffs, but diamonds must be led twice before the ruffing can begin. This means risking a spade ruff, or, if you draw East's trump, the defence can lead hearts twice to kill your second ruff. It seems impossible! But a strange finesse of the diamond queen will save the day.

At trick five, you lead a trump to the ace, and a

$\overline{W e s t}$ can never get in twice to kill your crossruff, unless he holds both diamond honors. But in that (unlikely) case the $\mathrm{Q} \diamond$ scores a trick and you will only need one ruff. And if East gets in twice to lead clubs, then they complete a dummy reversal.

In fact, something similar happens even if the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$ and $Q \diamond$ are switched. The new version at trick five:


Finessing the diamond jack twice allows West two entries to lead trumps, but at a price: the A॰ will be exposed to a third-round ruff, setting up your jack. I wonder how weak the dummy's diamonds could possibly get, and still be able to make the hand at trick four?
more obvious play of cashing three diamonds and hoping they break evenly, I would have made the hand. No need to think about the club suit alternative, or was there? No doubt there is a 'rule of restricted choice' lesson here, but I probably missed that part of the book on declarer play.

The full deal was:


So we move on to a knockout event the next day where declarer (South) managed to get one right in a close match against two professionals and their clients.


| West | NORTH | EAST | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \%$ |
| 1 | 1NT | Pass | 20 |
| 2 | 30 | Pass | 40 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led the $\mathrm{K} \$$ and the trick was won on the board. Next declarer led a small club, putting in the jack, which lost to the queen. West returned the Q , on which East discarded a diamond while declarer ruffed. Next came the A and a small club, ruffed in dummy. West has now shown up with 10 black cards. Whether he has two trumps or one or none is unclear, but if he has none, the hand is not making, as East would have five hearts to the QT8, and declarer is down to four and still has to lose the $\mathrm{A} \diamond$ (which is Q 0 likely with West), so could get tapped again. While declarer will likely make the hand if East
holds three hearts to the queen, it is clear that if he tries to draw trumps and guesses wrongly, he will go down.

He decided to play a diamond to the king, which was taken by West with the ace. When West now chose to tap declarer once more and played the J $\stackrel{\text {, }}{ }$ East discarded the T®. Declarer ruffed, reducing his hand to three trumps. It now appeared that trumps were $4-1$ and that simply pulling trumps was not going to work even if the $\mathrm{Q}^{\ominus}$ was onside. So he decided to throw East in by forcing him to ruff a diamond. At this point East is pickled, as a trump lead makes it easy for declarer to draw the outstanding trumps and cash good diamonds. The club lead which he chose was equally ineffective, but led to a more interesting conclusion to the hand. The club was ruffed on the board, declarer discarding a diamond from hand, and the K $\bar{M}$ was cashed. The T was then led giving East two chances, Slim and None, and Slim was already at the airport. When East discarded his last club, declarer pitched his last diamond, and the forced lead of a diamond from the board finished off the trump coup.

The next hand shows that sometimes it helps to be lucky. One of Vancouver's fine players, playing in a knockout match against the legendary Mike Passell ( 56,000 masterpoints lifetime), held:

## \& QJT8 ® Q963 $\diamond$ AQ4 \& K5

White vs. red, he opened $1 \diamond$ and Passell overcalled 14. The partner of Our Featured Performer held:

$$
\star-\vee \text { A75 } \diamond \text { JT8632 } 9732
$$

Taking advantage of the favourable vulnerability and his shape, he applied some pressure to the opponents by jumping to 50 . Passell's partner, a decent player himself, held four spades and two aces and now bid 54. Our Featured Performer, looking at 4 QJT8, had no problem now finding a double. It was about this time he also found that his $4 \diamond$ was actually the 49...

## \& QJT8 \& Q9643 ©AQ K5

...which would have led to a very different auction if he had noticed it before he opened the bidding.

There wasn't a lot to the play as Mike Passell found out early that he had two trump losers, and one in each of the other suits, mumbled 800, and put his hand back in the board. At the other table, the contract was 3 down one, for a sizeable gain.

The full hand is shown at the top of page 21.


This turned out to be a significant gain, since it propelled our team to a 24 IMP halftime lead against the heavily favoured Passell team. We 'spent' nearly all of the lead during the second half, but needed a gain on the following hand in order to eke out a victory.


West led a heart, won by East (Gene Freed, no slouch himself with 27,000 masterpoints) with the ace and a heart was continued. Dummy was a bit of a disappointment for declarer who put in the jack and, full of hope for the club suit, used his only board entry by leading a spade to the queen. The lead of a small club brought forth the $\mathrm{K} \$$, normally a welcome sight,

## REAY'S Moving and Storage

Residential and business moving services
Storage - Packaging supplies - Competitive rates
John Reay, manager
1987 Triumph St., Vancouver V5L 1K6 ph. 255-1713 fax 255-1879
but not this time, as there is no way to get more than two tricks out of the club suit. Added to three spades and two hearts, this meant that two diamond tricks were necessary to make the contract.

While East might have opened without the $\mathrm{K} \diamond$, it seemed unlikely as it would give him at most 11 highcard points (West has already shown up with the $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ ), including a singleton K\&. So declarer chose to try to effect an end play, and cashed all his winners outside the diamond suit. This reduced the hands to the following, with declarer needing two more tricks, and leading from his hand.


West had to be careful to hold both clubs, or else a club discard would enable a club throw-in for declarer's ninth trick without touching the diamond suit. Declarer now led a small diamond to the 80 , and East is truly endplayed. He can cash his two heart tricks, declarer discarding clubs from his hand and dummy, but must finally lead away from the $\mathrm{K} \diamond$, giving declarer the last two tricks. Note that it does no good for West to insert the $\mathrm{J} \diamond$, as declarer holds the ace-ten behind East's king. Declarer's line fails if West holds both the jack and ten of diamonds, but that was not the case this time.

Making 3NT (for +600 ) resulted in a gain of 10 IMPs, as at the other table, Mike Passell settled in 2 NT , making 2 for +120 . This gain and the fortunate one discussed previously resulted in a 3-IMP upset, and a berth in the semi-finals of the event.

## PDI Bridge Supplies

35116 Spencer St. Abbotsford BC, V3G 2E3
Call 1-888-852-5187
Baron-Barclay distributor
Books and supplies for players, clubs, Units
Bridge accessory rentals: tables, bid-boxes, boards, etc.

## The Grinch Returns

## by McBruce

In the December 1996 Matchpointer, disguised as the Unit Grinch, I wrote a scathing article debunking some of the most popular misconceptions about tournaments and other issues. Now, in my last print issue, the Grinch is back, dealing with some of the issues of competitive bridge today. Brace yourselves...

Let's begin with passed out hands. There seems to be a conception that one has a right to bid and play every board for the money you pay. You don't.

Quite frankly, $99 \%$ of the time someone says they have a 'right' to something, they don't. Our entitle-ment-laden world seems to give rise to the idea that there are things we can claim at any time without caring about who else we inconvenience. A right is fundamental and not dependant on outside factors. That's why true rights belong only in constitutions. People who talk about their 'rights' often confuse rights with opportunities, privileges, or entitlements. You have the right to refuse to testify against yourself at a criminal trial in which you are the accused: this is a basic principle of Western jurisprudence, not something we just casually decided seemed proper. The 'right' to get only certain types of deals which entertain you (avoiding boring passouts) in exchange for your entry fee is not a right: it is an opportunity.

Recently, a player mentioned on the Internet that the Director at his club used a dealing program to ensure that the deals played at his game were all deals in which at least one player held 13 HCP or more. His justification was that his players hate passed out hands. No doubt some asserted their 'rights' and demanded such a solution. But it isn't a legal solution.

The Laws say that a deal which is passed out cannot be redealt-even if it happens in the very first round. If you ensure that there are no passed out hands, you are going to have situations where a player can make a key assumption about missing high cards because he will know that at least one player has to have a full opener. That's not bridge.

What about players who play light opening systems designed to do well in these deals where everyone has 9-11 HCP? By removing such deals, you are reducing the effectiveness of their system unfairly.

If you want, and if you have the time, let the bidding go on after the fourth pass and play the hand wherever it ends. But score it as a passout, please.

I prefer the break the occasional passout provides.
Next topic: ruling confusion. Now that I direct once a week, I see things in a different light, and one spotlight that hits my specs often
is this complaint: a ruling cannot be correct because another Director ruled differently in the same situation. It happens with contested claims, revokes, disagreements about the number of tricks won - virtually anything that a Director may be called for. "That can't be the right ruling," says the player ruled against. "The last time this happened, the Director ruled this way."

I may very well be wrong, because I have made some incorrect rulings, as we all have. But I'm not going to change the result just because someone else made a different ruling somewhere else. Situations are never exactly the same. Claiming with a trump out is a very complicated situation and no two can possibly be the same. Figuring out if the penalties for a revoke adequately restore equity to the non-offenders cannot possibly be the same for two different deals. An infraction on Wednesday may be dealt with differently than a similar infraction on Tuesday: it's the nature of the game, and it is why we call the Director.

What is the same is the method by which the Director comes to a decision: by ascertaining the facts from everyone, consulting the book and giving out a penalty if prescribed, or, if no penalty is prescribed, by making sure the non-offenders are not disadvantaged by the offense. The general rule is to "restore equity," with the non-offending side getting the benefit of the doubt in all contentious points. Few infractions carry automatic penalties; even those that do can be increased if the non-offenders are disadvantaged.

I have seen FIVE tricks transferred for a particularly devilish revoke, and to any impartial observer (including the three other players at the table), unquestionably it was the correct ruling!

But the player who held up his last trump (despite several attempts to extract it) and then ruffed declarer's side suit and cashed a string of winners said "but at my club, a revoke only costs two tricks..."

Strat rats: I covered this in 1996; it is still a sticking point today. People complain about the strat boundaries at tournaments and even stay home because they or their partner has recently gone over 500 and they now have to play in Flight B.

If you would actually consider staying home because you have to go up to the next strat, you need to think about your motivation for playing this game.

Bridge is supposed to be fun, win or lose, $65 \%$ or $35 \%$. Even at current tournament entry fees, there is no better or cheaper way to have fun playing a thinking person's game in a setting that is both formal and social. Where else can you play a competitive game against the best players in the area, sometimes even get the better of them, and then chat them up a bit, or ask for advice, before you go off to meet the next op-
ponent? If it is no fun for you unless you win masterpoints at the end, well, the Grinch thinks that you need your head examined.

We're still in the early years of stratified events, the whole concept having emerged less than twenty years ago. In 1986 an Open Pairs event at a tournament or a club game would be scored without any stratification: the only other option you had was a 0 20 novice game. But people came out, tried their best, and - once in a while - managed to win a few masterpoints by getting in the overalls or placing in a session. Now, with stratification, the game is the same for the Flight A pairs: they still have to beat everyone else to win masterpoints. For other players in the lower flights, they have a few extra chances to win masterpoints. "Once in a while" has become "twice" or "thrice."

Our well-attended sectional tournaments allow us to experiment with different types of pairs events over our yearly schedule. We have "Stratified" events where all play together, "StratiFlighted" events where the top players are placed in a separate section, and even an annual "Flighted" pairs where all three groups play separately.

Currently our strat limits are set at 500 and 1500 masterpoints for most events. We could move these up and down like skirt lengths in the fashion world, but that would be pandering to those who play only to win masterpoints. We'd rather pander to those who like to play bridge because is it fun and cool, than to the merchant masterpoint seekers.

Once you have 500 points you should be able to move up and play with the middle group. More importantly, it's not really fair that your scores are compared to the newest players out of the side 99ers game. Similarly, players who have amassed 1500 points should be able to survive at the highest level of local competition. Quite often there will be an under3000 X strat in events, so that you are shielded from the elite, but 1500 points is hard to come by without learning enough to at least compete with the best.

What continues to amaze me about these complaints (and what follows is exactly what I wrote a decade ago) is that the very players who place great value on moving up in the masterpoint lists somehow feel penalized when they reach their goal and enter Flight B: you'd never get them to admit that having reached Flight B, they hadn't earned it, but this is what their complaints about strat limits imply. You worked so hard to get to the next level but you really don't want to be here? Why the rush then?

One final rant, directed at those who grumble about surcharges. What's the deal here? Why are we so grumpy about paying an extra dollar or two to sup-
port a worthy charity, to help fund a trip to the Nationals for our local champions in pairs or teams, or to encourage ACBL membership?

Often, the problem is one of poor communication. Too often a club Director announces that next week's game will cost an extra dollar or two without adequately explaining why. It's far better to explain precisely what the money is going to be used for. We bridge players are a grumpy lot when asked to dig deeper into our pockets - unless told exactly why. The April 5 ACBL Charity Game was well-received where 1 direct, because I told everyone that the extra money was going to food banks and children of poverty, the focus of 2006 Canadian Bridge Federation charitable donations. Without the announcement, it's just a bribe: more masterpoints for extra bucks.

The North American Pairs, Canadian Open Pairs Championship and Grand National Teams club qualifying games collect an extra dollar or two from players to help fund the free trips to the Nationals (or the CBF Bridge Week finals) for the regional winners. Whether it's District 19 (Alaska, B.C. and Washington State) of the ACBL or Zone VI (B.C.) of the CBF, we consistently send more representatives to the national finals than our Unit's population would pre-dict-and not just at the highest level: we have often seen Flight B and C players attend and do well. This means that we get good value from the money we pay to play in these games. I wish we could see more local clubs support these events.

As for the surcharge on Life Masters who choose not to pay their service fee (the surcharge is going up on July 1), I recognize that there are a handful of local LMs who were "promised" ACBL life membership by getting their gold card decades ago, when this was a difficult task. (I put "promised" in quotes because in years of online debates on this topic, nobody has found any written proof of such a promise, although it is common knowledge that there was such a policy.) Had the policy remained, the ACBL would now be broke - or, the masterpoint inflation of recent years would not have been allowed to occur, and ACBL membership would likely have declined severely.

The current state of affairs is not a serious hardship on those players who earned their gold card the hard way: they can pay a dollar extra here and there to play in toumaments, or pay their LM service fee if this is more economical. Anyone who earned their gold card in the days when getting to Life Master was a major accomplishment, is a player we'd welcome unquestionably at our tournaments.

But what's done is done, and was done long ago, in Memphis: the local Unit had-and has-no control over the policy. I understand the frustration, but directing it locally is no viable solution.

North Shore Bridge Club
at Lymmmour House - 1621 Lillocet Rd
Mondays at 10:00am (including Holidays)
Director: Stephen Beaton 604-984-0453 Partnerships: Aase Haines 604-986-3196

May 22: Victoria Day Club Championship June 5: STaC game
July 17: North American Pairs Club Qualifying Game August 7: August Holiday Pairs
September 4: NSBC's 2nd Anniversary Holiday Club Championship Pairs

2006 Masterpoint Leader (to Apr 24): Mary Fines April 17 Charity Club Champions: Janis \& Nick Parker

Regular games during Penticton Regional Enjoy our free buffet at every game: cold cuts, cheeses, fruit \& veggies, baked goods and more.

## North Shore, Hollyburn, and North Shore Winter Club Bridge Clubs online:

 www.bridgeclubnews.ca
## Hollyburn Bridge Club

Hollyburn Country Club, 950 Cross Creek, West Vancouver
"Bridge with a view" Stephen Beaton 604/984-0453
Mondays at 7:30 pm, open to all! Thursdays at 9:30 am, by invitation only

Closed May 22 and June 12
May 29: Charity Club Championship June 5: STaC Game
July 31: ACBL-wide Inter-Club Championship Game
April 3 Club Champions: Natalie Warnes \& Joan Harvey

## North Shore Winter Club Bridge

1325 E. Keith Road, North Vancouver Tuesdays at 7:30 pm
Stephen Beaton 604/984-0453
Bemice Mulock 604/987-8289
June 6: STaC Game
June 20: ACBL-wide Inter-Club Championship Game August 8: North American Pairs Club Qualifying Game August 22: ACBL-wide Inter-Club Championship Game

April 4 Experts of the Month: Mike Paine/Malcolm Tindale

## Chilliwack Duplicate Bridge Club Jim Groves 604/847-0107 e-mail: j_groves@shaw.ca <br> The Forresters Hall, 7194 Vedder Road (Vedder and Alder. just south of the freeway) <br> Mondays, 7:00 pm

Monthly stratified game: Last Monday each month
STaC June 5 Membership Game August 28
Club Championship May 8, July 10
Chilliwack's newest ACBL Life Master:
Anne Knowlan (Congratulations!)
Chilliwack DBC Web Site:
http://members.shaw.ca/j_groves/

## Mission Duplicate Bridge Club

Murray \& Felice Clements 604/826-3557 e-mail: clements02@shaw.ca Sandcastle Preschool, 33345 2nd Ave. Thursdays, 7:00 pm Open

STaC June 8
Club Championship May 25, August 24
January 26 Club Championship: Cindy Kershaw/Brian Lee
BIG Game (Feb 9, 72.62\%):
Roselle MacRae/Jim Sache
Mission DBC Web Site:
http://members.shaw.ca/missionduplicatebridgeclub/

## Arbutus Village Bridge Club

Arbutus Village Recreation Centre - 2B-4255 Arbutus Street, Vancouver OPEN TO ALL PLAYERS coffee, tea, cookies Thursdays at 7:30 pm sharp Jean Tarry 604/733-2807 STaC June 8 (silver points!)

## E.C. Bridge Club

at the Vancouver Bridge Centre, 2776 E. Broadway
Eugene Chan $778 / 837.2228$
Thursdars at 7:30 pm all games stratified

## Summer IMP League '06

## Sunday nights, early finish

Unit 430's sanction to run the IMP League is an ongoing sanction to run continuous extended team events. The Vancouver Bridge Centre will once again be borrowing the Unit's sanction to run its Summer IMP League on Sunday evenings beginning May 28. The VBC will reimburse the Unit for the sanction fee and players will enjoy the extra masterpoints awarded for a Unit-rated event.

Organizers recognize that players do tend to take time off in the summer to leave town. Teams will be allowed more liberal use of substitutes, although only the six players playing most often will earn masterpoints for a team.

The format will be a round robin team game over eight or nine nights. Every night a team will play a few more boards in an ongoing match against every other team. For example, if there are eight teams, there will be seven rounds of three deals, each team's East-West pair facing all opposing North-South pairs for three boards each. The first four weeks will be one 12 -board match against every other team, and the second four weeks will be another 12 -board match. No playoffs: the winner in each strat will be determined based on victory points.

## Vancouver Bridge Centre

2776 East Broadway, Vancouver, ph. 604/255-2564 Club Schedule
Monday $\quad 7: 15 \mathrm{pm} \quad 0-1000 \mathrm{MP}$ (with pre-game lesson)
Tuesday 10:30 am Open Daytime Stratified
7:30 pm (Burnaby DBC Open Game)
Wednesday 10:30 am 0-1250 MP \& \$3 optional lunch
7:00 pm "Wednesday Night Quickie" done by $9: 30 \mathrm{pm}$, varying format
Thursday 7:30 pm (E.C. Bridge Club Open Game) 7:30 pm 0-50 Newcomers Game
Friday 10:30 am Open Stratified \& $\$ 3$ optional lunch
7:30 pm Open Game (Opt. Lucky \# Jackpot)
Saturday afternoon Occasional Special Events 7:30 pm Monthly Unit Game
Sunday 1:00 pm Open Aftemoon Stratified 7:00 pm Summer IMP League (begins May 28)

## Cheek out VBC Game Results Online at

 www.cs.sfu.ca/~bbart/personal/van-bc/stats/ (pick up our event schedule on your next visit)At the same time, the scores obtained will be compared with the whole field as though it were an IMP Pairs game so that we can determine the MVP (most valuable pair every night. This will be just for fun and there will be nothing but pride on the line!

All deals will be preduplicated with hand records. The event will be stratified based on the masterpoint average of the top four players on each team, so that the three strats will have about the same number of teams. Gametime is 7:00 and players will usually be done by $9: 30$ so they can get some sleep for the work week ahead. The projected dates are: May 28; June 4,11 and 25 ; July 9 and 30 ; August 6 (if necessary), 13 and 20. These dates carefully avoid Penticton, the Summer NABC, and the Puget Sound Regional, but regular games will be run on the Sunday nights not mentioned above, and it is hoped that this will become a regular game in the fall. Bruce McIntyre will be the Summer IMP League Director.

A signup sheet will soon appear at the VBC for full teams, pairs and singles looking for others to form a team, and players who would like to fill in where needed. (Reminder: only four may play on any one night, but a team can have as many as six players.)

The emphasis will be on fun bridge, and may be a way to keep your Winter IMP League team sharp during the annual hiatus before the 'big league' begins again in the fall. See you May 28 !

## SELECTED SPECIAL EVENTS

Masterpoint June 5-11 STaC week (extra game 1:00 Sat aftn.
hunters

Superstars! Saturday, June 3
North Amer- June, iean Pairs July. August
VBC Summer starts
IMP League May 28
Lesson Series ongoing
Check the club for details on our lesson programs for players of all levels


Dress warm! VBC air-conditioning cools down the summer!

#  

## Unit 430 Weekly Duplicate Game List

Most recent update: April 26, 2006. Not including invitation-only clubs.

| Day | Time | Club | Director | Club Contact/Phone Number | Game Detalls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mon | 10:00 | VCR | G. Lambert | Gilbert Lambert 524-6617 | Open stratified, holiday party games |
|  | 10:00 | N-S | S. Beaton | Stephen Beaton 984-0453 | Open stratified |
|  | 10:45 | WIL | E. Dietrich | Dianne Wilson 521-0458 | Open stratified |
|  | 7:00 | CWK | J. Groves | Jim Groves 604/847-0107 | Open (last Monday stratified) |
|  | 7:00 | SQU | E. Tenta | Kathleen Roberts 604/898-3896 | Open stratified (closed July 3-September 4) |
|  | 7:15 | TSW | R. Dunn | Richard Dunn 940-9809 | Open stratified, occasional team games |
|  | 7:15 | SRY | A. Browning | Arlene Browning 870-9300 | Open (first and third Monday stratified) |
|  | 7:15 | VBC | B. Bart | Club telephone 255-2564 | Stratified 0-1000 MP, Mini-lesson |
|  | 7:30 | HBN | S. Beaton | Stephen Beaton 984-0453 | Open stratified |
| Tue | 10:30 | VBC | C. Miller | Club telephone 255-2564 | Open Day-time Stratified: optional \$2 lunch |
|  | 11:00 | S-W | F. Schultz | Finn Schultz 534-5025 | Open stratified |
|  | 7:30 | NSW | S. Beaton | Stephen Beaton 984-0453 | Open stratified |
|  | 7:30 | WIL | E. Dietrich | Dianne Wilson 521-0458 | Open stratified |
|  | 7:30 | BBY | G. Lambert | Gilbert Lambert 524-6617 | Open stratified (location: VBC) |
| Wed | 10:00 | VCR | G. Lambert | Gilbert Lambert 524-6617 | Open stratified |
|  | 10:30 | HAS | E. Dietrich | Ernie Dietrich 936-2298 | Open stratified |
|  | 10:30 | VBC | C. Miller | Club telephone 255-2564 | Stratified 0-1250 MP, \$3 lunch (optional) |
|  | 7:00 | VBC | B. McIntyre | Club telephone 255-2564 | Varying format, 18-21 boards, 9:30pm finish |
|  | 7:15 | WRK | A. Browning | Arlene Browning 870-9300 | Open (second and last Wednesday stratified) |
|  | 7:15 | VCR | G. Lambert | Gilbert Lambert 524-6617 | Open stratified. monthly team games |
|  | 7:30 | C.R | A. Yallouz | Albert Yallouz 321-1891 | Open stratified |
| Thu | 11:00 | JCC | C. Delisle | Connie Delisle 263-9196 | Open stratified |
|  | 7:00 | VBC | J. Pocock | Club telephone 255-2564 | Novice/Beginner: 0-50 MP, mini-lesson |
|  | 7:00 | MIS | M. Clements | Murray \& Felice Clements 604/826-3557 | Open, occasional stratified games |
|  | 7:15 | NWR | G. Lambert | Gilbert Lambert 524-6617 | Open stratified, occasional team games |
|  | 7:30 | ARB | A. Nagy | Jean Terry 733-2807 | Now open to all |
|  | 7:30 | E.C | E. Chan | Club telephone 255-2564 | Open Stratified |
| Fri | 10:30 | VBC | S. Nystrom | Club telephone 255-2564 | Open stratified Optional \$ 3 Soup \& Bun |
|  | 1:00 | $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{S}$ | L. Hurren | Lorraine Hurren 898-2702 | Open stratified (closed July-August) |
|  | 7:30 | S-D | G. Lambert | Gilbert Lambert 524-6617 | Open stratified, occasional team games |
|  | 7:30 | VBC | S. Nystrom | Club telephone 255-2564 | Optional Lucky Number Jackpot Open |
| Sat | 1:00 | VBC | S. Nystrom | occasional special games | June 3 (World Wide Pairs), June 10 (STaC) |
|  | 7:30 | VBC | R. Dunn | Monthly Unit Game (see page 32) | Monthly (dates, page 32)-Open stratified. |
| Sun | 1:00 | RMD | E. Dietrich | Ernie Dietrich 936-2298 | Open stratified (occasional hand records) |
|  | 1:00 | VBC | C. Miller | Club telephone 255-2564 | Open Stratified |
|  | 7:30 | VBC | B. McIntyre | Club telephone 255-2564 | Summer IMP League - begins May 28 |

Please check the listings on the next page for special events and club closures before attending club games.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\triangle 13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Special Events at Clubs |  |  |  | Date | Time | Club | What's Happening |
|  |  |  |  | 22 M |  | N-S | Victoria Day Holiday |
| May 1-August 31, 2006. |  |  |  |  | 0:00 | VCR | Club Championship Game |
| Date $T$ | Time | Club | What's Happening | 22 M | 7:30 | HB | No game this |
|  | 15 | SRY | Bi-monthly Stratified Game | 24 May | 7:00 | VBC | Bi-monthly Wednesday Tean |
|  | 00 |  | Start of Series 3 in "Wednesday | 25 May | 7:15 | NBC | Ascension Day Swiss Teams Summer IMP League begins |
|  |  |  | Night Quickie" Series |  | 7:00 |  | Summer IMP League b |
| 6 May | 30 | VBC | May Monthly Unit Game (see |  |  |  | required) |
|  | 7:30 | BBY | ACBL Charity Game | 29 Ma | 7:15 | CWK | Monthly Stratified Game |
| 10 May10 May | 7:00 | VBC | Monthly IMP Pairs | 29 May | 7:30 | HBN | Club Championship Gam |
|  | 7:15 | WRK | Bi-monthly Stratified Game | 30 May | 7:15 | TBY | Charity Swiss Teams Monthly Swiss Teams |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10 \text { May } \\ & 15 \text { May } \\ & 19 \text { May } \end{aligned}$ | 7:15 | SRY | Bi-monthly Stratified Game | 31 May | - | VBC | Monthy Swiss Teams Monthly IMP Pairs Ca |
|  | 7:00 |  | 430 Social Night of Bridge | 31 May | 7:15 | VCR | Monthly Swiss Teams |
| $\square$ |  |  | ent players who bring a new | 31 May | 7:15 | WRK | Bi-monthly Stratified |
|  |  |  |  | 3 June | 1:00 | VBC | orld-Wide Pairs (Satur |
| 19-22 May |  |  |  | 3 June | 7:30 | VB |  |
|  |  |  | pans |  |  |  | ams (see page 32 for details) |
|  |  |  | ay Sectional at | 4 June | 7:00 | VBC |  |
|  |  |  | ity Centre in Burnaby |  |  |  | (continued on page |


| Club Abbreviations, Ad Locations in this Issue, Web Page Addresses |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abbr. | Club Name | Page | Web Page Address (or Game Results Page) |
| ARB | Arbutus Village Bridge Club | 24 | (none) |
| BBY | Burnaby Duplicate Bridge Club | 28 | ww. $\mathrm{newwestbridge.ca}$ |
| C. R | Central Richmond Bridge Club | 29 | some results at ww.bridgeclubnews.ca/ |
| CWK | Chillwack Duplicate Bridge Club | 24 | www.members.shaw.ca/j_groves/ |
| E.C | E.C. Bridge Club | 24 | www.cs.sfu.ca/~bbart/personal/van-bc/stats/ |
| HAS | Hastings Bridge Club | 29 | (none) |
| HBN | Holiyburn Bridge Club | 24 | www.bridgeclubnews.ca/ |
| H-S | Howe Sound Bridge Club | 48 | (none) |
| JCC | Jewish Comm. Ctr. Dup. Bridge Ciub | 29 | (none) |
| MIS | Mission Duplicate Bridge Club | 24 | www.members.shaw.ca/missionduplicatebridgeclub/ |
| NWR | New-West Bridge Club | 28 | www.newwestbridge.ca |
| $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ | North Shore Bridge Club | 24 | www.bridgeclubnews.ca/ |
| NSW | North Shore Winter Club | 24 | www.bridgeclubnews.ca/ |
| RMD | East Richmond Bridge Club | 29 | some results at ww.bridgec/ubnews.ca/ |
| S-W | South-West Duplicate Bridge Club | 29 | (none) |
| SRY | South Surrey Bridge Club | 29 | (none) |
| SQU | Squamish Duplicate Bridge Club | 48 | (none) |
| TSW | Tsawwassen Bridge Club | 17 | www.user.dcenet.com/rmdunn/ |
| VBC | Vancouver Bridge Centre (City) | 25 | www.cs.sfu.ca/~bbart/personal/van-bc/stats/ |
| VCR | Vancouver Bridge Club (West Vcr.) | 39 | www.vancouverbridgeclub.ca/ |
| WIL | Wilingadon Bridge Club | 29 | (none) |
| WRK | White Rock Bridge Club | 29 | (none) |

Special Events at Clubs, continued from page 27
Date Time Club What's Happening

| 5-11 June | Unit 430 District-wide STaC (Sectional <br> Tournament at Clubs. Silver points at <br> your local club game! All Unit 430 <br> clubs will be participating in the STaC |
| :--- | :--- |
| (What's a STaC? See page 33.) |  |

Date Time Club What's Happening

| 9 July | 7:00 | VBC | Summer IMP League Night \#4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 July | 10:00 | VCR | Club Championship Game |
| 12 July | 7:15 | WRK | Bi-monthly Stratified G |
| 16 July | 7:00 | VBC | Summer IMP League off week (a regular game will be run) |
| 17 July | 0:00 | N-S | North American Pairs Qualifying Game (all flights) |
| 17 July | 7:15 | SRY | Bi-monthly Stratified Game |
| 19 July | 7:00 | VBC | Monthly Team Game |
| 23 July | 7:00 | VBC | Summer IMP League off week (a regular game will be run) |
| 26 July | 7:00 | VCR | Monthly Swiss Teams |
| 31 July | 0:00 | N-S | ACBL-wide Inter-Club Championship Game |
| 5 Aug | 7:30 | VBC | August Monthly Unit Game (see page 32 For MUG details) |
| 7 Aug | 10:00 | VCR | BC Day Charity Holiday Pairs |
| 7 Aug | 0:00 | N-S | August Holiday Pairs |
| 7 Aug | 7:15 | TSW | Swiss Teams |
| 8 Aug | 7:30 | NSW | North American Pairs Qualifying Game (all flights) |
| 22 Aug | 7:30 | NSW | ACBL-wide Inter-Club Championship Game |
| 28 Aug | 7:00 | CWK | Membership Game |
| 31 Aug | 7:00 | M | Club Championship G |

## ADVANCE NOTICE

Date Time Club What's Happening
4 Sept 10:00 N-S Second Anniversary Holiday Pairs and Club Championship Game
9 Sept 7:30 VBC September Monthly Unit Game (see page 32 For MUG details)
15-17 Sept Evergreen Sectional at Queensborough Community Centre (most clubs closed)
(Please confirm with clubs for additions and changes.)

## SUBURBIA CLUBS Gilbert Lambert 604/524-6617 suburbiabridgeclub@shaw.ca

NEW! Website for the Burnaby and New Westminster clubs: www. newwe stbridge.ca Results, schedules, and articles for Intermediate Players (your partner?) and more Experienced Players (you!)

Burnaby Bridge Club<br>Vancouver Bridge Centre 2776 East Broadway<br>Tuesdays, 7:30 pm, open stratified<br>Swiss Teams, last Tuesday of each month<br>May 9: Charity Game<br>June 6: STaC Silver Point Game<br>June 13: Closed for Penticton Regional

## East Richmond Bridge Club

7891 Cambie (at River Road), Richmond (Richmond Rod \& Gun Club) Ernie Dietrich 604/936-2298

Sundays at $1: 00 \mathrm{pm}$
All games stratified, hand records for special games

## Hastings Bridge Club

1950 Windermere St. (at 4th Ave), Vancouver
Ernie Dietrich 604/936-2298
Wednesdays at 10:30 am, open stratified (lunch included)

Central Richmond Bridge Club
7891 Cambie Road, Richmond (Rod \& Gun Club) coffee \& goodies computer scoring Albert Yallouz 604/321-1891 Wednesdays at 7:30 pm sharp All games stratified

Jewish Community Centre Bridge Club 950 W. 41st Ave., Vancouver Thursdays at 11 am All players welcome! Connie Delisle 604/263-9196, or 604/671-3884 (cell)

Partnerships: Marge Groberman 604/266-7722
South Surrey Bridge Club
Victory Memorial Park
14831 28th Ave., Surrey
Director: Arlene Browning 1-604/870-9300 Partnerships: Dot Carnegie 604/535-8286

## Mondays at 7:15 pm

First and Third Monday of each month Stratified Computer Scoring Partners Guaranteed

> Willingdon Bridge Club
> Willingdon Heights Community Ctr., 1491 Carteton Ave., Burnaby
> Dianne Wilson 604/52 I-0458 hm., 604/294-7935 wk.
> Ernie Dietrich, director 604/936-2298
> Grace Wakabayashi, partnerships, 604/298-9377
> Mondays at 10:45 Tuesdays at 7:30
> Check for holiday club closures

South-West Duplicate Bridge Club
White Rock Elks Club, 1469 George Street
Finn Schultz, 604/534-5025 Tuesdays at 11:00 am

## White Rock Bridge Club

Sunnyside Community Centre, 1854 154th St. ,White Rock
Arlene Browning 1-604/870-9300
Partnerships: Dot Carnegie 604/535-8286
Wednesdays at 7:15 pm
Stratified games 2nd \& last Wednesday of each month

ALERT: Tournament players! Help us promote bridge to new people! Bring a new player to the Social Event (see below for details) and you will receive a free play coupon for the Friday evening session at the Victoria Day Sectional. (Remember that the Social Event begins a half hour earlier than the tournament session.) There is no charge for the new players at the Social Event.

## A Social Evening of Bridge

 Friday, May 19th, 7:00 pm Bonsor Recreation Centre, 6550 Bonsor Avenue.
## A pleasant introduction to the world of duplicate bridge!

Participants can attend with or without a partner. Please register by phoning the Vancouver Bridge Hotline: 604/931-6729 Leave a message including your name and number.
(More details on the reverse side. Clip this ad and give it to someone you know who may be interested.)

## 2005 Final Sectional Trophy Race Standings

Phil Wood Trophy

1. Dan Jacob. ..... 84.04
2. Kathy Adachi ..... 77.33
3. Ben Takemori ..... 77.06
4. Mike Takemori ..... 75.26
5. Aidan Ballantyne ..... 73.17
6. Les Fouks ..... 67.51
7. Katrin Litwin ..... 66.04
8. Michael Yuen ..... 56.93
9. Trudy Hurdle ..... 52.30
10. John Hurdle ..... 52.30
11. Larry Hicks ..... 48.85
12. Brad Bart ..... 45.98
13. June Pocock ..... 45.36
14. William Ge ..... 42.42
15. Nick Stock ..... 39.95
16. Tao Feng ..... 35.04
17. Doug Fraser ..... 34.53
18. Sandra Fraser ..... 34.53
19. Jack Lee, ..... 34.46
20. David Breton ..... 32.66
21. Ron Borg ..... 31.41
22. Cam Doner ..... 30.98
23. John Lien ..... 30.40
24. Sima Sadri ..... 29.99
25. Kam Tang ..... 29.61
26. Andrew Lee ..... 29.05
27. Ken Ramsay ..... 28.67
28. Liz Stoneman ..... 27.79
29. Colleen Walker ..... 27.43
30. Olga Guitelmakher ..... 27.31
4,615.57 masterpoints (all silver)were won by 623 players (a further88 played but did not win any) atthe Unit 430's four open Sectional
Tournaments of 2005.
Edie Bonnell Trophy
31. Kathy Adachi ..... 77.33
32. Katrin Litwin ..... 66.04
33. Trudy Hurdle ..... 52.30
34. June Pocock ..... 45.36
35. Sandra Fraser ..... 34.53
36. Sima Sadri ..... 29.99
37. Liz Stoneman ..... 27.79
38. Colleen Walker ..... 27.43
39. Olga Guitelmakher ..... 27.31
40. Vicki Moffatt ..... 26.97
41. Mary Fines ..... 26.54
42. Samantha Nystrom ..... 26.30
43. Sandra Robson ..... 25.01
44. Christa Mead ..... 22.09
45. Kathy Bye ..... 21.92
Phil Wood Under 200 Trophy
46. Tao Feng ..... 35.04
47. Ken Ramsay ..... 28.67
48. Colleen Walker ..... 27.43
49. Olga Guitelmakher ..... 27.31
50. Baixiang Liu ..... 23.82
51. Kai Zhou ..... 23.72
52. Eric Pan ..... 18.10
53. John Chen ..... 18.08
54. Hsiang Li ..... 15.40
55. Jadwiga Polujan ..... 13.47
56. Zoran Peca ..... 12.75
57. Tony Shyu ..... 11.94
58. Samuel Krikler ..... 11.81
59. Samuel Lai ..... 11.44
60. Alex Chuang ..... 10.43
61. David Huang ..... 10.43(to be eligible you needed to be apaid ACBL member with less than200 masterpoints on Jan. 1, 2005)
Leo Steil Trophy1. Kathy Adachi77.33
62. Les Fouks ..... 67.51
63. Michael Yuen ..... 56.93
64. John Hurdle ..... 52.30
65. Doug Fraser ..... 34.53
66. Sandra Fraser ..... 34.53
67. Ron Borg ..... 31.41
68. Sima Sadri ..... 29.99
69. Mary Fines ..... 26.54
70. Peter Morse ..... 26.01
71. Sandra Robson ..... 25.01
72. Danny Lee ..... 24.01
73. Kenny Chan ..... 23.85
74. Christa Mead ..... 22.09
75. Kathy Bye. ..... 21.92
(to be eligible you needed to be an
ACBL member born before 1950)
Trophy Sectional Top Ten
76. Sheila Sache ..... 22.66
77. Peter Morse ..... 22.46
78. Craig Zastera ..... 21.29
79. Stanford Christie ..... 21.29
80. Ben Takemori ..... 20.40
81. Aidan Ballantyne ..... 17.71
82. Katrin Litwin ..... 17.71
83. Peter Herold ..... 16.56
84. Ken Scholes ..... 16.56
85. Gus Axen ..... 15.62958.25 masterpoints (all silver)were won by 306 players (a further51 played but did not win any) atthe 2006 Trophy Sectional.(Top tens at other 2005 Sectionalsnot covered last issue are in theWinners lists starting on page 40)

The Unit 430 Board is proud to put forward its first initiative in attracting nonduplicate bridge players to the wonderful world of duplicate. You can help by telling your kitchen bridge friends about our special evening designed for them.
Please invite them for a fun evening of bridge on Friday, May 19 at 7:00 pm.
The event is designed for social bridge players who have had limited exposure to duplicate bridge. Bridge teachers will be on hand to assist the players. Other teachers who wish to help will be welcome to attend. Over coffee and dessert, Director Stephen Beaton will discuss the hands and answer questions.

Included with this event is an offer for free lessons, information on rookie games and best of all a free CD on How to Play Bridge from the ACBL.

## IMP League Playoffs

## Commisioner McBruce's Report

Again this year the IMP League playoff format borrowed curling's playoff system, where the top two teams play in a non-knockout match with the winner going directly to the final and the loser going directly to the semifinal, while the lower positions play for the other semifinal spot. This meant that in the final weeks almost all of the teams were either jostling for one of the coveted top two spots, or for a chance to get in the back door and run a string of upsets.


#### Abstract

ALERT: All teams who played in the '05-'06 Winter IMP League are cordially invited to the VBC Summer IMP League this summer. See page 25 for complete details on this laid-back, summertime, airconditioned version of the IMP League.


Flight A: Twelve teams played a round-robin to decide the six playoff spots. The top six were:

| LITWIN | 239 VPs |
| :--- | :--- |
| DIVINSKY | 223 VPs |
| WILSON | 209 VPs |
| POCOCK | 197 VPs |
| BART | 192 VPs |
| JOHNSON | 177 VPs |

The first round matches are:
\#1 LITwIN (Katrin Litwin, Aidan Ballatyne, Don Sache, Doug Hansford, Martin Henneberger, Larry Pocock) vs \#2 Divinsky (Nathan Divinsky, Don Brazeau, Larry Hicks, Ron Borg, Dan Jacob). The winner of this match goes directly to the final. The loser goes to the semi-final to play against the survivor of the other four teams, whose openinground matchups looked like this:
\#3 WILson (Mike Wilson, Bill Goldstone, Dave Glen, Cam Doner, Phil Hernandez) defeated \#6 Johnson (Martin Johnson, Chris Christofferson, Gus Axen, Duane Tilden, Ken Danielsen, Dennis Groden).
\#4 Pocock (June Pocock, Les Fouks, Kathy Adachi, Michael Yuen, Wilf May, Sherman Kwan) vs \#5 Bart (Brad Bart, David Breton, Peter Cooper, Mike Dimich, Bob Gerrie, Nick Stock).

Flight X/B: Ten $0-3,000$ teams played a roundrobin to decide which five would survive to the playoffs. Six teams were also eligible for Flight B (01,000 ) and three of them made the separate Flight B playoffs:

| Keith | 182 VPs |
| :--- | :--- |
| Walker | 174 VPs |
| Robson | 159 VPs |
| Nalos* | 155 VPs |
| GILRAINE | 137 VPs |
| MORSE* $^{*}$ | 128 VPs |
| MEYER* | 122 VPs |

In the Flight B playoffs, \#1 Nalos (Andrew Nalos, Grant Gayman, Andrew Lee, Rob Luo, Olga Guitelmakher, Jadwiga Polujan) will play \#3 Meyer (Larry Meyer, Rod Coote, Jim McKenzie, Bob Takashita) in the Flight B Final. Meyer defeated \#2 MORSE (Greg Morse, Andy Hellquist, Sam Krikler, Jacqui Phillips, Todd Schindeler) in the semifinal.

The Flight X first-round playoff matches are:
\#1 Keith (Don Keith, John Demeulemeester, Kathy Bye, Marylou Varga, Christa Mead, Ken Ramsay) vs \#2 WALker (David Walker, Pearl Minkoff, Stan Bodlak, Christina Jacob, Sandi White, Anne Nagy). The winner of this match goes directly to the final. The loser goes to the semi-final to play against the survivor of the other four teams, whose opening-round matchups stack up as follows:
\#4 Nalos (Andrew Nalos, Grant Gayman, Andrew Lee, Rob Luo, Olga Guitelmakher, Jadwiga Polujan) vs \# 5 Gilraine (Gary \& Faye Gilraine, Jim Kerr, Maarten Tjebbes, Rod Gulston). The winner plays \#3 Robson (Sandra Robson, Don Sharp, Patti Adams, Les Baldys, Tom Cotton) for a spot in the semifinal.

Flight C: Five teams of non-Life Masters played a round-robin for three playoff spots in the first Flight C division in several years. The leaders at the end:

| BLYTHIN | 88 VPs |
| :--- | :--- |
| Keogh | 80 VPs |
| WURZ | 74 VPs |

\#1 Blythin (Pattie Blythin, Allan Karro, Mhairi Longridge, Chieko Oka, Ross Deegan, Lorna Hawes) has clinched a bye to the final and will play the winner of \#2 KeOGH (Paul Keogh, Bob \& Marilyn Sewell, Ron Graham, F. Spencer) and \#3 Wurz (Joe \& Kathy Wurz, Madeleine Bourgouin, Frances Corney).

Next time: reports on the final matches in all flights, if the captains let me watch. (They might not. After all, I might learn something....)

## Monthly Unit Games

## Bart repeats in 2005 race

Monthly Unit Games are played the first Saturday evening of each month (with a few exceptions) at the Vancouver Bridge Centre, starting at $7: 30 \mathrm{pm}$. They are open to all players and the entry fee is $\$ 9.00$, with a $\$ 2.00$ discount to anyone who played the previous game. Most games are matchpoint pairs, there are team games scheduled for June 3 and October 7.

The schedule for the remainder of 2006:

| May 6 | June 3 (teams) | July 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| August 5 | September 9 | October 7 (teams) |
| November 4 | December 2 |  |

Our Monthly Unit Game Director is Richard Dunn (604/940-9809). He will try to accommodate people arriving without partners or teammates as long
as they arrive by $7: 15$. The Vancouver Bridge Centre (604/255-2564) will also take the names of people looking for teammates or partners during the week preceding the games. Strat limits for the Monthly Unit Games are 2000 for Flight B and non-LM (under 500) for Flight C.

The masterpoint leaders in each flight win prizes of free plays to next year's games. For the second consecutive year, Brad Bart topped all players in 2005 and has won free plays to all the MUGs of 2006. Six free plays go to the annual winner in Flight B and Flight C, although prizes were transferred last year since Brad won both Flight A and Flight B. The strat you begin a calendar year in is the one you are eligible for that year.

William Ge is the early leader for 2006, with a first, a second, and a fourth so far. There are still a lot of potential masterpoints not being given out because there are not enough pairs of under 500 non-Life Masters at the games. A minimum of five such pairs means the top two will receive overall awards.

| A | B | C | June 4, 2005 MUG (10 teams) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  | Jesse Chu, David Hooey, Sefton |  |
| Levine, Bruce McIntyre |  |  |  |


| A | B | C | Sept. 13, 2005 MUG(16 tables) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  |  | June \& Lary/Pocock |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | Stuart Carr/Barry Yamanouchi |
| 3 |  |  | Peter Morse/Gilbert Lambert |
| 4 | 2 |  | Don Keith/Ram Hira |
| 5 | 3 |  | David Breton/Kai Zhou |
| 6 | 4 |  | Armando Andreoli/Kal Kaleem |
|  | 5 |  | Marlene Powell/Myra Johnston |
|  | 6 | 2 | Grant Gayman/David Hooey |
|  |  | 3 | Stephen Pickett/Silvia Comanescu |
|  |  | 4 | Eda Kadar/Bob Sabiston |


| A | B | C | Oct. 1, 2005 MUG (16 teams) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 |  | Chris Diamond, Dennis Groden, <br> Mike \& Ben Takemori <br>  <br> Bob Gerrie |  |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | Stephen Pickett, Ken Ramsay, <br> 4 |
|  | Andrew Zorawski, Edward Hui <br> David Breton, Nick Stock, Haroid <br> Hansen, Trevor Epp |  |  |
| 5 | 4 | Nigel Fullbrook, Sima Sadri, Ken <br> Lochang, Priscilla Brown <br> (not enough under-500 teams for <br> Flight C overalls) |  |


| A | B | C | Nov, 5, 2005 MUG(101/2 tables) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 |  | Anne Smith/Gail Heuchert |
| 2 | 2 |  | Peter Cooper/Brad Bart |
| 3 | 3 |  | Ram Hira/Bob Walters <br> 4 |
| 5 | 4 | Kathy Bye/John Mullen |  |
| Nigel Fullbrook/Pauline |  |  |  |
| 6 |  | McClafferty <br> Bernice \& Al French |  |
|  | 5 | Susan Peters/Joel Martineau <br> (not enough under-500 pairs for |  |
|  |  | Flight C overalls) |  |


| A B C | Dec. 10, 2005 MUG <br> Christmas Game <br> (10 tables) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Judy Harris/Brad Bart |
| 22 | Vicki \& Mike Moffatt |
| 3 | Doug Cowan/Stephen Beaton |
| 4 | Angela Fenton/Stella Alliston |
| 53 | Sima Sadri/Anita Morse |
| 6 | Dave House/Laurence Betts |
| 4 | Tao Feng/Kai Zhou |
|  | (not enough under-500 pairs for |
|  | Flight C overalls) |
|  | Final 2005 Monthly |
| A B C | Unit Game Standings MP |
| 11 | Brad Bart.......................15.57 |
| 22 | David Hooey.................. 11.14 |
| $3 \begin{array}{lll}3 & 3\end{array}$ | Marlene Powell............... 11.04 |
| 44 | David Breton .................. 10.24 |
| 55 | Myra Johnston.................. 9.90 |
| 662 | Grant Gayman.................9.28 |
| 7 | Gilbert Lambert................ 9.07 |
| 8 | Ben Takemori.................. 8.26 |
| 973 | Kai Zhou........................ 8.25 |
| 10 | Larry Pocock ................... 7.95 |
| 118 | Samantha Nystrom ...........7.69 |
| 118 | Nick Stock...................... 7.69 |
| 13 | Peter Morse.....................6.52 |
| 14 | Al French ........................6.05 |
| 1410 | Bernice French .................6.05 |
| 16 | Dennis Groden................. 5.98 |
| 1611 | Diane Ayukawa ................ 5.98 |
| 18124 | Armando Andreoli............. 5.87 |
| 19135 | Edward Hui..................... 5.47 |
| 2014 | Cathy Miller..................... 5.10 |
| 15 | Stuart Carr ...................... 4.99 |
| 16 | Julien Lévesque ................ 4.74 |
| 17 | Christa Mead................... 4.61 |
| 18 | Aban Gerrie..................... 4.38 |
| 196 | Barry Yamanouchi ............ 3.42 |
| 20 | Robert Luo..... |

## Need Silver Points?

## Unit 430's STaC, June 5-11

Can there be anyone left who is unfamiliar with those four letters (STaC) and what they mean? Maybe, so let's go to the refresher course:

In the late 1980 s , the ACBL was faced with a problem: too many Regionals were killing the attendance at Sectionals in many areas. To solve this problem without axing the extra Regionals all at once (Memphis has since then reduced the number of Regionals somewhat), the ACBL invented silver points, masterpoints won at Sectional tournaments only. They added a requirement of 50 silver points to become a Life Master. (Those who were not LMs at the time silver points were introduced had one-sixth of our total points converted to silver points as credit for our struggles thus far.)

This solution worked fairly well for most people, but players in rural areas far away from the nearest ACBL tournament complained that silver points were far more difficult for them to win. A player in Vancouver has about a dozen Sectional tournaments each year that are within a two-hour drive, including some local ones and a handful that are close enough that a day trip is possible. A player in Port Hardy or Salmo or Lillooet or Ucluelet is going to be lucky to find two or three a year that are reachable, and most will require driving and accommodation.

To combat this frustration, the ACBL invented the Sectional Tournament at Clubs, a week-long competition open to clubs in big cities and little towns. When you play in a club STaC game, you will probably have to pay a small surcharge to cover the sanction fee. Winners in all strats will see larger masterpoint awards than usual, since this is a sectionallyrated event. All awards are in those difficult-tocollect silver points. The highest scores from each club are sent to the STaC Director who determines which players had the highest scores out of all of the participating clubs. If that's you, the award on your club printout may be replaced by a much higher award - as much as 12 or 14 points for the top spot! And these overalls awards are also silver points!

If you need silver points, you don't want to miss this. Even if you have all the silver you need, you can significantly increase your masterpoint total with a good week.

Unit 430's STaC will be held during the week preceding the Penticton Regional, June 5-11. Clubs from all areas of British Columbia, Alaska, and Washington State are invited to attend. Each day there will be one competition for morning or afternoon open games, and another for evening open games. (Masterpoint limited games can also participate, but cannot win overall awards.) It's a great way to tune up your game for Penticton!

Virtually all local clubs will be running STaC games during the week. Go get those silver points!

| A B C | January 7 MUG ( 12 tables) |  | March 11 Monthly Unit Game |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Gillbert Lambert/Peter Morse | A B | Annual Unit Party (33 tables) |
| 2 | Stella Alliston/Angela Fenton | 1 | Ben Takemori/Mike Dimich |
| 31 | David Breton/Nick Stock | 2 | Gerry McCully/Rhonda Foster |
| 42 | William Ge/Xingke Zhang | 3 | Don Sache/Gord McOrmond |
| 5 | Dianne Isfeld/Martin Henneberger | $4 / 51$ | Eric Pan/Tao Feng |
| 677 | Don Sache/Mike Wilson | 4/5 | Peter Morse/Gilbert Lambert |
| $6 / 73$ | Elena \& Brian Ransom | 62 | Jadwiga Polujan/Andrew Lee |
| 4 | Julie Smith/Peter Cooper | 3 | Kai Zhou/Baixiang Liu |
| 5/6 | Anita Morse/Joan Richards | 4 | Armando Andreoli/John Demeule- |
| 5/6 | Faye \& Gary Gilraine |  | meester |
| 1 | Elain Duvall/Al Warner | 56 | Insa Fricker//sabel Chemoff |
| 2 | Heather \& James Garrison |  | Patti Adams/Pauline McClafferty |
| A B | February 4 MUG (13 teams) |  | Elly Boshell/Homa Boustani lan \& Glenda Affleck |
| 11 | Gray McMullin, Bruce McIntyre, Ken Lochang, Samantha Nystrom | A B | April 15 MUG (14 tables) |
| 22 | Tao Feng, Eric Pan, Kai Zhou, | 11 | Yue Su/William Ge |
|  | William Ge | 22 | Harold Hansen/Trevor Epp |
| 33 | David Breton, Olga Guitelmakher, | 33 | Duane Tilder/Gus Axen |
|  | Elena \& Brian Ransom | 44 | Patti Adams/Diane Ayukawa |
| 4 | Peter Morse, Don \& Sheila Sache, | 5 | Larry Pocock/Chris Diamond |
|  | Gillbert Lambert | 6 | David Breton/Mike Dimich |
| 5 | Doug Cowan, Stephen Beaton, | 5 | Nick Stock/Bruce McIntyre |
|  | Angela Fenton, Stella Alliston | 6 | Joan Tang/Allan Karro |
|  | (not enough under-500 teams for |  | Baixiang Liu/Kai Zhao |
|  | Flight C overalis) |  | Norma Doucette/Chloe Clark |



## UPRS Rankings

## New Flight A leader: Katrin Litwin

The April 30, 2006 Unit Player Ranking System tables are on the next page. It took more than two pages of the Spring 2003 Matchpointer to describe the system's details, and I refer those of you who need to know everything about how the UPRS system works to that article. The only scoring change since then was a chance in the award for sectional knockout team events: as I wrote in the Summer 2003 issue, these have tripled from the award originally given.

A quick explanation? All right. The UPRS system is a points-based rating system in which the points you won decay over time, so that a year later only one-quarter of your points remain. This means you need to keep playing, and winning, to keep your ranking on the lists. Players are ranked as individuals. To win UPRS points, you need to finish in the overalls in any event run by Unit 430 within Unit 430: this means Sectional tournaments, Monthly Unit Games, the Unit Finals of Special Events, and the IMP League. Not included are the STaC and all other club-level events, District or Zone Finals of Special Events, Regionals, and NABCs.

There are three UPRS lists. Flight A points are awarded for any event that carries an upper masterpoint limit of 2500 points or higher (or no limit at all). Flight C points are now awarded for events limited to 500 masterpoints. Anything in between scores points toward the Flight B list. When there are multiple flights or strats counting toward the same UPRS list, as in Flight A/X events (both unlimited), the lower flight(s) or strat(s) scores half of the points of the one above. Of course, with stratifying, a player may win points on more than one UPRS list for a single win. And players remain on the Flight C list until their points earned there decay once they become ineligible for under-500 events.

Each event covered by the UPRS has a Flight A first-place point value pre-assigned, regardless of attendance. Other awards are derived from this Flight A first-place award. The highest award is for the IMP League regular season winners, who get 50,000 ; sec-ond-highest is 30,000 for winning a two-session event at a Sectional. The Flight B first-place award is always one-eighth the Flight A first-place award. The Flight C first-place award is always $1 \%$ of the Flight A first-place award. This means developing players can tell when they are ready to move up. When your total on one list is about the same as your total on the next higher list, this is concrete evidence that you are ready to move up to the next level (although it might take a while before you are
ready to challenge the leaders!).
On the next page are "thirteen tables" of players for each UPRS flight, the standings computed at the end of the IMP League regular season (after which there are no more UPRS events until May). The last column shows the percentage of the leader's total. When the points decay, this stays constant, making it a useful indicator of the size of a lead.

Anyone not on these lists may be on the monthly Top 200 lists the computer churns out once the data is entered. Let me know if you are interested and I'll tell you how you are doing!

The 16.9 MB UPRS spreadsheet now contains 9,157 winners, covering every event since the Monthly Unit Game of January 2000. The 1,000 points for winning the January 2000 MUG have decayed and are now worth 0.17 points on the current list. Events before then which have not been included would be virtually insignificant to the current standings. The first leaderboard was prepared on December 31, 2001, and a new leaderboard has been prepared at the end of every month since. Here are the historical leaders and the end-of-month leaderboards in which they took over the lead:

Flight A historical leaders: Mike Hargreaves (Dec. 2001), Bryan Maksymetz (May 2002), Gord McOrmond (Jan. 2003), Dan Jacob (Apr. 2003), Ben Takemori (Apr. 2005), Dan Jacob (Nov. 2005), Ben Takemori (Mar. 2006), Katrin Litwin (Apr. 2006).

Flight B historical leaders: Ron Fox (Dec. 2001), Kenny Chan (Mar. 2002), Les Baldys (May 2002), Kenny Chan (Sept. 2002), Ping Ding \& Jane Fyfe (Nov. 2002), Les Baldys (Apr. 2003), Kenny Chan (Sept. 2003), Marion Crowhurst (Apr. 2004), H.K. Ho (Nov. 2004), Sima Sadri (Jan. 2005), Grant Gayman (Apr. 2005), Sima Sadri (May 2005), Edward Hui (Jun. 2005), Grant Gayman (Sep. 2005), Sima Sadri (Nov. 2005), Grant Gayman (Apr. 2006).

Flight C historical leaders: Andrew Nalos (Dec. 2001), Alice \& Gary Thomas (Mar. 2002), Stuart Carr (May 2002), Brian Ransom (Sept. 2002), Ross Lam (Nov. 2002), Gail Heuchert (Jan. 2003), Grant Gayman (May 2004), David Huang \& Alex Chuang (Sept. 2004), Grant Gayman (Nov. 2004), Tao Feng (Mar. 2006), Hsiang Li (Apr. 2006).
(The UPRS standings will likely be included only on the online version of the Matchpointer from this point on, although new editor Ben Takemori may list some of the top names from time to time as a spacefiller.)

Flight A UPRS Leaders

1. Katrin Litwin ........ 128,031.77 (leader)
2. Aidan Ballantyne... $127,998.9399 .974$
3. Dan Jacob..............99,186.68 77.470
4. Martin Henneberger. $88,838.50 \quad 69.388$
5. Doug Hansford........ $85,220.3966 .562$
6. Larry Pocock........... 84,918.52 66.326
7. Don Sache.............. 81,641.48 63.767
8. Ben Takemori ......... 80,939.40 63.218
9. Kathy Adachi.......... 75,807.64 59.210
10. Larry Hicks............. $72,129.4956 .337$
11. Mike Takemori........ $64,369.6050 .276$
12. Michael Yuen.......... $61,271.3147 .856$
13. John Hurdle............ $56,330.8543 .998$
14. Les Fouks...............55,628.34 43.449
15. Ron Borg............... 54,960.55 42.927
16. June Pocock ........... 54,001.93 42.179
17. Gerry McCully ......... $53,384.8741 .697$
18. Mike Dimich........... 49,217.99 38.442
19. Trudy Hurdle .......... 48,673.26 38.017
20. Peter Morse............ 47,909.05 37.420
21. Gus Axen ............... $45,793.4735 .767$
22. Brad Bart .............. 45,062.24 35.196
23. Nicholas Stock....... $43,706.00 \quad 34.137$
24. Bob Gerrie.............. 41,368.58 32.311
25. Mike Wilson ........... 40,882.52 31.932
26. Kathy Bye ............. 40,520.05 31.648
27. David Breton .......... 40,247.33 31.435
28. Cam Doner............. 37,048.78 28.937
29. Don Brazeau........... 35,893.95 28.035
30. Stanford Christie ..... $35,884.8728 .028$
31. Sheila Sache........... $35,496.89 \quad 27.725$
32. Craig Zastera ......... 35,454.86 27.692
33. Ken Scholes ........... 34,558.85 26.992
34. Nathan Divinsky...... 34,178.85 26.696
35. Bjarne Christoffersen $33,886.57 \quad 26.467$
36. Martin Johnson .......32,684.01 25.528
37. William Ge............. 32,100.04 25.072
38. Steve Vincent.......... 31,767.53 24.812
39. John Demeulemeester31,735.03 24.787
40. Duane Tilden.......... 31,695.20 24.756
41. Dave Glen .............. 31,451.70 24.566
42. Rhonda Foster ........29,954.60 23.396
43. Christa Mead ..........29,881.27 23.339
44. Marylou Varga ........29,803.33 23.278
45. Bill Goldstone ......... 29,435.79 22.991
46. Don Keith...............28,854.43 22.537
47. Samantha Nystrom.. 28,174.00 22.005
48. Ken Ramsay ...........27,762.25 21.684
49. Felipe Hermandez ....27,199.68 21.244
50. Doug Fraser............26,480.04 20.682
51. Sandra Fraser .........26,243.03 20.497
52. Peter Herold ...........26,242.62 20.497

Flight B UPRS Leaders

1. Grant Gayman........ 11,428.40 (leader)
2. Andrew Nalos......... 11,121.79 97.317
3. Andrew Lee............ 11,043.20 96.629
4. Olga Guitelmakher .... 9,616.92 84.149
5. Jadwiga Polujan ....... 9,485.68 83.001
6. Robert Luo............... 8,309.31 72.708
7. Sima Sadri............... 6,376.27 55.793
8. Greg Morse .............. 5,700.67 49.882
9. Andy Hellqvist.......... 5,700.67 49.882
10. Edward Hui.............. 5,395.03 47.207
11. Alex Chuang............ $5,238.43 \quad 45.837$
12. Larry Meyer............. $5,030.91 \quad 44.021$
13. Jim McKenzie........... $4,852.5542 .460$
14. Chang-Shan Chen .... $4,573.9340 .022$
15. John Chen ............... 4,573.78 40.021
16. Hsiang Li................. 4,256.75 37.247
17. John Demeulemeester $4,233.5637 .044$
18. Rod Coote............... 4,216.24 36.893
19. Walter Zielinski........ $4,207.7436 .818$
20. Jack Lee.................. 3,869.54 33.859
21. Jocelyn Krug ............ 3,778.04 33.058
22. Jackie Phillips .......... 3,741.78 32.741
23. Kam Tang................ $3,680.30 \quad 32.203$
24. Tao Feng ................ 3,483.09 30.477
25. Ken Ramsay............ $3,446.03 \quad 30.153$
26. Todd Schindeler........ $3,416.35 \quad 29.893$
27. Samuel Krikler.......... 3,359.79 29.399
28. Kenny Chan ............. 3,328.91 29.128
29. Anita Morse ............. 3,327.86 29.119
30. Myra Johnston.......... $3,268.8028 .602$
31. Rosalee Hardin......... 3,220.07 28.176
32. Bob Takishita ........... 3,019.74 26.423
33. Marla Gropper .......... $2,865.0025 .069$
34. Gail Heuchert........... 2,820.32 24.678
35. H.K. Ho................ $2,753.1224 .090$
36. Colleen Walker ......... 2,677.85 23.432
37. Daniel Groves........... 2,612.14 22.857
38. Sharon Erwin ........... 2,612.14 22.857
39. Kai Zhou.................. $2,606.8622 .810$
40. Jennifer Chalfan........ 2,573.68 22.520
41. Chris Moore ............. 2,573.68 22.520
42. Don Keith ............... 2,537.16 22.200
43. Baixiang Liu............. 2,499.21 21.868
44. Marylou Varga ......... 2,372.09 20.756
45. Patricia Stickland...... 2,339.30 20.469
46. Rangie Sylvestre ....... $2,275.20 \quad 19.908$
47. Kazuko Koda............ 2,258.11 19.759
48. Sean Abernathy ........ 2,130.21 18.640
49. David Wright............ 2,130.21 18.640
50. Eric Pan .................. 2,005.00 17.544
51. David Huang ............ $1,946.43 \quad 17.032$
52. Christa Mead............ $1,939.5616 .971$

Flight C UPRS Leaders

|  | Hsiang Li................... 836.96 | er) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | Chieko Oka ................ 632.69 | 75.595 |
| 3. | Chang-Shan Chen.........625.52 | 74.737 |
| 4. | Tao Feng...................6624.40 | 74.603 |
| 5. | Pattie Blythin..............605.39 | 72.332 |
| 6. | Allan Karro ................. 601.68 | 71.889 |
| 7. | Mhairi Longridge ......... 596.30 | 71.247 |
| 8. | Lorna Hawes ..............584.75 | 69.867 |
| 9. | Ross Deegan............... 537.39 | 64.208 |
| 10. | Kai Zhou ................... 510.45 | 60.989 |
| 11. | Grant Gayman............. 489.36 | 58.469 |
| 12. | Eric Pan.................... 470.43 | 56.207 |
| 13. | Baixiang Liu...............465.11 | 55.571 |
| 14. | Colleen Walker............ 443.05 | 52.936 |
| 15. | Zoran Peca ................. 418.44 | 49.995 |
| 16. | Alex Chuang ............... 400.94 | 47.904 |
| 17. | Andrew Nalos .............369.41 | 44.137 |
| 18. | John Chen ................. 365.90 | 43.718 |
| 19. | David Peppar.............. 283.23 | 33.841 |
| 20. | Tony Shyu................. 278.82 | 33.314 |
| 21. | Madeleine Bourgouin .... 268.69 | 32.104 |
| 21. | Kathy Wurz ................ 268.69 | 32.104 |
| 21. | Joe Wurz.................... 268.69 | 32.104 |
| 21. | Frances Corney ........... 268.69 | 32.104 |
| 25. | Ken Ramsay .............. 261.07 | 31.193 |
| 26. | Richard Kay................ 257.05 | 30.712 |
| 27. | Angela Image.............. 251.21 | 30.015 |
| 28. | Long Xie.................... 242.13 | 28.929 |
| 29. | Solveig Karlgren .......... 236.80 | 28.293 |
| 30. | Sachi Yamakami ......... 212.35 | 25.372 |
| 31. | Dominique Baker......... 210.30 | 25.127 |
| 32. | Kristina Bohdanowicz ... 205.92 | 24.603 |
| 33. | Matt Bohdanowicz........205.02 | 24.496 |
| 34. | Ataollah Amiri............. 195.28 | 23.332 |
| 34. | Zahra Jafroudi............. 195.28 | 23.332 |
| 36. | Murray Clements ......... 194.25 | 23.209 |
| 36. | Felice Clements........... 194.25 | 23.209 |
| 38. | Kun Shao .................. 190.45 | 22.756 |
| 39. | Bob Sewell ................. 179.13 | 21.403 |
| 39. | F. Spencer................. 179.13 | 21.403 |
| 39. | Marilyn Sewell ............ 179.13 | 21.403 |
| 39. | Paul Keogh................ 179.13 | 21.403 |
| 39. | Ron Grahamt ............... 179.13 | 21.403 |
| 44. | David Hooey ............... 171.56 | 20.498 |
|  | Yung-Chang Chen.........170.25 | 20.341 |
| 46. | Gilles St Pierre ............160.38 | 19.162 |
| 46. | Denis Lefebvre ............ 160.38 | 19.162 |
| 48. | Edward Hui ................ 159.09 | 19.008 |
| 49. | Alfred Lau ................. 152.87 | 18.265 |
| 50. | John Chen..................145.23 | 17.352 |
| 51. | David Huang............... 140.24 | 16.756 |
|  | Sunil Ray .................. 134.17 | 16.031 |

## Upcoming UPRS Events

How to Improve Your UPRS Ranking

|  |  | Flt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Event | AWARD |
| 6 May | Monthly Unit Game | 1,000 |
| 19-22 May | Victoria Day Sectional | varies |
| ( 30,000 for two-session events, 15,000 for knockouts, 10,000 for one-session events, 5,000 for side games) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 3 June | Monthly Unit Game |  |
|  | (Swiss Teams) | 1,000 |
| 30 June | IMP League Playoffs | 25,000 |


| DATE | EVENT | AWARD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 July | Monthly Unit Game | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ |
| 5 August | Monthly Unit Game | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ |
| 9 September | Monthly Unit Game | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ |
| 15-17 September | Evergreen Sectional | varies |

15-17 September Evergreen Sectional varies ( 30,000 for two-session events, 15,000 for knockouts, 10,000 for one-session events, 5,000 for side games) 7 October

Monthly Unit Game (Swiss Teams)
Early October IMP League begins huge
(regular season: 50,000 , playoffs: 25,000 )
Fall 2006 NAP Unit Final
20,000

## Ace of Clubs, Mini-McKenney

## Unofficial Standings from acbl. org

These are the players from Unit 430 who have won the most masterpoints at club games (the Ace of Clubs list, which includes all clubs in the ACBL) and won the most masterpoints anywhere you can get them (the Mini-McKenney list). Not just a repeat from the page 37 lists, these are the current 2006 standings.

Don't forget the following:
-Memphis only tracks the games that they receive. These results were compiled April 6 but this does not necessarily mean that all recent club games
and tournaments will be included.
-Whichever category you are in on January 1 is the category you're stuck in for that calendar year's race. Note the additional silver (S), red (R), gold (G) and pigmented ( P : silver, red or gold) point requirements for many ranks up to Life Master.
-The traditional ranks have, in the online lists at least, been discarded for 2006 in favour of " 20 to 50 masterpoint race" etc. We like the old headings so we continued them. We don't know if the ACBL is slotting people by masterpoints or by rank (some ranks have extra requirements to get in).

You can view current and 2005 races online: http://www.acbl.org/about/mpraces.html
Unit 430 Ace Of Clubs
(points won at club games only)
April 6, 2006 Standings (from ACBL website)

## ROOKIE (0-5, ANY COLOUR)

1. Diane Markham, Surrey .................... 3.63
2. John Irwin, Surrey ..............................3.27
3. Cynthia Kershaw, Chilliwack............. 3.19
JUNIOR MASTER (5-20, ANY COLOUR)
4. Roger Howard, Vancouver ............... 4.26
5. Sheila Ross, Vancouver ....................... 3.29
6. Richard Fuller, Surrey ....................... 2.96
CIUB MASTER (20-50, ANY COLOUR)
7. Lorna Hawes, Vancouver ................ 10.03
8. Allan Karro, Burnaby.........................5.44
9. Adam Melzak, Burnaby....................5.44
SECTIONAL MASTER ( 50,5 SIIVER)
10. Baixiang Liu, Vancouver................... 11.45
11. Trevor Epp, Vancouver ...................... 9.98
12. Mhairi Longridge, Vancouver............9.33

REGIONAL MASTER (100, 15S, 5R OR G)

1. Kai Zhou, Burnaby .......................... 16.45
2. Eric Pan, Burnaby ........................... 12.49
3. Gordon Wright, Vancouver............. 11.89

NABC MASTER (200, 25S, 15R, 5G, 50P)

1. Jim Munns, Maple Ridge .................. 9.23
2. Leonard Wild, W. Vancouver ........... 7.54
3. Patricia Chen, Vancouver.................... 6.88

LIFE MASTER (300, 50S, 25G, 50R OR G)

1. Colleen Walker, W. Vancouver ...... 16.98
2. Jo Ann Smith, Burnaby.................... 16.92
3. Marlene Powell, Burnaby................ 15.38

Bronze LfFe Master (500-1000)

1. Marla Gropper, Vancouver ............ 27.77
2. Andrew Lee, Richmond ................. 22.48
3. Rosalee Hardin, Vancouver.............18.30

SIIVER LIFE MASTER ( $1000-2500$ )

1. Richard Smillie, N. Vancouver........ 32.11
2. Carry Skoropada, Maple Ridge ...... 23.24
3. Tai Eng, Burnaby.............................21.68

GOLD LIFE MASTER (2500-5000)

1. Phyllis Gerber, Vancouver.............. 30.20
2. Stella Alliston, N.. Vancouver .......... 15.96
3. Al French, N. Vancouver.................. 15.64

## DIAMOND LIFE MASTER (5000-7,500)

1. Kathy Adachi, Delta......................... 18.70
2. Ev Hodge, Burnaby.......................... 18.69
3. Mary Fines, New Westminster ........15.24

HIGHER: Unit 430 's only Platinum LM $(10,000+)$, Cam Doner, has no club points in 2006 yet. Top Emerald LMs (7,500-10,000): Allan Graves (5.14) and Aidan Ballatyne (2.43.)

Unit 430 Mini-McKenney
(points won from all ACBL sources)
April 6, 2006 Standings (from ACBL website)

## ROOKIE (0-5, ANY COLOUR)

1. Chang-Shan Chen, RIchmond........ 14.80
2. Yizhong Wu, Vancouver ................. 12.43
3. Cynthia Kershaw, Chilliwack.............6.48

## JUNIOR MASTER (5-20, ANY COLOUR)

1. Long Xie, Burnaby. 20.37
2. Marta Zahorecz, Vancouver..............9.14
3. Burke Lundy, Burnaby ...................... 7.62

## CLUB MASTER (20-50, ANY COLOUR)

1. John Chen, Vancouver .................... 35.57
2. Richard Symyk, N. Vancouver......... 27.96
3. Xingke Zhang, Richmond................ 13.59

## SECTIONAL MASTER ( 50,5 Sitver)

1. Zoran Peca, Vancouver................... 40.75
2. Baixiang Liu, Vancouver.................. 32.59
3. David Peppar, Chilliwack................24.45
REGIONAL MASTER (100, 15S, 5R OR G)
4. Tao Feng, Burnaby ..... 49.72
5. Kai Zhou, Burnaby. ..... 41.37
6. Samuel Lai, Richmond ..... 36.32
NABC MASTER (200, 25S, 15R, 5G, 50P)38.19
7. Feliciy Fane, Vancower
8. Feliciy Fane, Vancower ..... 27.15
9. Patricia Chen, Vancouver. ..... 25.59
LIFE MASTER ( $300,50 \mathrm{~S}, \mathbf{2 5 G}, 50 \mathrm{R}$ OR G)
10. Jack Lee, Richmond. ..... 100.28
11. Kam Tang, Richmond ..... 79 .34
12. Jadwiga Polujan, Pt. Coquitlam ..... 78.45
BRONZE LIFE MASTER (500-1000)
13. Chris Diamond, Vcr-Wpg. ..... 102.03
14. Colin Ransom, Furry Creek ..... 82.45
15. Doreen Ransom, Furry Creek ..... 81 .16
SHIVER LIFE MASTER (1000-2500)
16. Brad Bart, Burnaby. ..... 146.26
17. Ben Takemori, Burnaby ..... 123.36
18. Martin Henneberger, Coquitlam .. ..... 102.29
GOLD LFE MASTER (2500-5000)
19. Peter Morse, N. Vancouver .......... 117.89
20. Doug Hansford, Delta. ..... 115.00
21. Don Sache, Delta ..... 111.17
DUMOND LIFE MASTER (5000-7,500)
22. Bryan Maksymetz, Coquitlam. ..... 157.87
23. Rhonda Foster, New West. ..... 132.06
24. Gerry McCully, New West. ..... 115.12
Higher: Unit 430's only Platinum LM $(10,000+)$ Cam Doner, has 202.09 points. Top three Emerald LMs (7,500-10,000): Dan Jacob (209.27), Allan Graves (106.68), and Aidan Ballatyne (47.15.)
Questions about these lists? Most will be an-
swered at www. acbl .org

# Ace of Clubs, Mini-McKenney 

Final 2005 Standings from acbl. org
These are the players from Unit 430 who have won the most masterpoints at club games (the Ace of Clubs list includes all clubs in the ACBL) and won the most masterpoints anywhere (the Mini-McKenney list).
-The bracketed numbers to the right of the mas-
terpoint totals are ranks in the top 25 of District Nineteen (BC, Alaska, and Washington State). A number in [square brackets] is an ACBL-wide top 100 ranking.
-Whichever category you were in on January 1, 2005 was the category you were stuck in for the 2005 race. Note the additional silver (S), red (R), gold (G) and pigmented ( P : silver, red or gold) point requirements for many ranks up to Life Master.

View races online: http://www.acbl.org/about/mpraces.html

Unit 430 Ace Of Clubs
(points won at club games only) 2005 Final Standings (from ACBL Web Site)

## ROOKIE ( $0-5$, ANY COLOUR)

1. Trevor Epp, Vancouver [43]........... 46 (2)
2. Loma Hawes, Vancouver................ 33 (8)
3. Richard Kay, Abbotsford $\qquad$ 29 (10)

UNIOR MASTER (5-20, ANY COLOUR)

1. Kai Zhou, Burnaby [26]. .59 (2)
2. Sunil Ray, North Vancouver. .27 (15)
3. Baixiang Liu, Vancouver 25 (18)

CLUB MASTER (20-50, ANY COLOUR)

1. Gordon Wright, Vancouver ............ 32
2. Mhair Longridge, Vancouver.......... 27
3. Aziz Azizi, West Vancouver ............ 25

SECTIONL MASTER (50,5 SIIVER)

1. Hsiang Li, Burnaby 68 (5)
2. Leonard Wild, West Vancouver...... 49 (18)
3. Sharon Chercover, Vancouver ........ 44

REGIONAL MASTER ( $\mathbf{1 0 0}, \mathbf{1 5 S}, 5 \mathrm{R}$ OR G)

1. Suzette Behar, W. Vancouver ......... 64 (13)
2. Barry Yamanouchi, Surrey .............. 61 (15)
3. Andrew Zorawski, Coquitlam ......... 59 (16)

NABC MASTER (200, 25S, 15R, 5G, 50P)

1. Antoniette Sheffield, Surrey............ 80 (5)
2. Marlene Powell, Burnaby ............... 63 (12)
3. John Ashwell, Vancouver................ 62 (14)

LIFE MASTER ( $\mathbf{3 0 0}, 50 \mathrm{~S}, \mathbf{2 5 G}$, 50R OR G)

1. Kazuko Koda, Vancouver................ 67 (4)
2. Jocelyn Krug, Vancouver................ 66 (5)
3. Clarence Dodd, Vancouver $\qquad$ 56 (10)

## Bronze Life Master (500-1000)

1. Richard Smillie, N. Vcr. [77]........ 133 (1)
2. Marla Gropper, Vancouver ........... 106 (4)
3. Debbie Williams, Langley............. 105 (5)

## SIIVER LIFE MASTER (1000-2500)

1. Tai Eng, Burnaby............................ 154 (3)
2. Ken Lochang Vancouver.............. 121 (7)
3. Amirali Alibhai, New West.

106 (20)

## GOLD LIFE MASTER (2500-5000)

1. Ernie Dietrich, Coquitlam............. 159 (1)
2. Al French, North Vancouver ......... 122 (4)
3. Dianne Isfeld, Coquitlam.............. 116 (5)

DIAMOND LIFE MASTER $\mathbf{( 5 0 0 0 - 1 0 , 0 0 0 )}$

1. Kathy Adachi, Delta...................... 129 (1)
2. Mary Fines, North Vancouver ....... 114 (2)
3. Wilf May, New Westminster........... 43 (15)

EMERALD LIFE MASTER $(7,500-10,000)$

1. Aidan Ballantyne, Burnaby ............. 20
2. Allan Graves, Vancouver................. 18
3. Dan Jacob, Vancouver...................... 3

Platinum Life Master ( $10,000+$ )

1. Cam Doner, Richmond 14
(no other Platinum LMs in Unit 430)

Unit 430 Mini-McKenney
(points won from all ACBL sources) 2005 Final Standings (from ACBL Web Site)

ROOKIE (0-5, ANY COLOUR)

1. Richard Kay, Abbotsford [81]........ 59 (5)
2. Trevor Epp, Vancouver .................... 51 (9)
3. Allan Karro, Burnaby........................ 41 (15)

JUNIOR MASTER (5-20, ANY COLOUR)

1. Kai Zhou, Burnaby [21]................ 108 (2)
2. Baixiang Liu, Vancouver [80].......... 74 (7)
3. Zoran Peca, Vancouver .................. 45 (12)

## CLUB MASTER (20-50, ANY COLOUR)

1. David Peppar, Chilliwack............... 59
(15)
2. Gordon Wright, Vancouver............. 52 (21)
3. Guoxu Zhang, Burnaby .................. 42

SECTIONAL MASTER (50,5 SIIVER)

1. Tao Feng, Burnaby......................... 131 (3)
2. Hsiang Li, Burnaby ......................... 95 (10)
3. Eric Pan, Burnaby ........................... 88 (12)

## REGIONAL MASTER (100, 15S, 5R OR G)

1. Ken Ramsay, W. Vcr. [20]............. 231 (1)
2. Jadwiga Polujan, Pt. Coq [44]....... 201 (3)
3. Colleen Walker, W. Vcr. [84]....... 176 (6)
NABC MASTER (200, 25S, 15R, 5G, 50P)
4. Edward Hui, Richmond [68]........ 193 ..... (3)
5. Stephen Pickett, Vancouver ..... 173 (4)
6. Marlene Powell, Burnaby ..... 172
LIFE MASTER (300, 50S, 25G, 50R OR G)
7. David Breton, Burnaby [53] ..... 237 (2)
8. Gail Heuchert, Vancouver ..... 172 (5)
9. Eurydice Nours, Richmond ..... 162 (6)
BRONZE LIFE MASTER (500-1000)
10. Richard Smillie, N. Vancouver..... ..... 199 (1)
11. Sima Sadri, W. Vancouver ..... 198 (2)
12. Nick Stock, N. Vancouver ..... 197
Silver Life MASter (1000-2500)
13. Rock Shi Yan, Burnaby [12] ..... 620 (1)
14. Brad Bart, Burnaby ..... 309 (4)
15. Kathy Bye, Burnaby. ..... 300 (6)
GOLD LIFE MASTER (2500-5000)
16. Bryan Maksymetz, Coq. [10] ....... 814 (1) ..... (1)
17. Gerry McCully, New West. [21] ... 708 ..... (3)
18. Mike Wilson, New West. ..... 549 ..... (4)
DIAMOND LIFE MASTER ( $\mathbf{5 0 0 0}-7,500$ )
19. Rhonda Foster, New West. [19]... 740 (1)
20. Michael Yuen, Vancouver. ..... 335 (7)
21. Kathy Adachi, Delta ..... 326 (9)
Emeraid Life Master $(7,500-10,000)$
22. Dan Jacob, Vancouver [37] ..... 628 (2)
23. Allan Graves, Vancouver [66] ..... 469 (5)
24. Aidan Ballantyne, Burnaby. ..... 292 (8)
Platinum Life Master $(10,000+$ )
25. Cam Doner, Richmond [7]...... 1,080 (1)

Questions about these lists? Most will be answered at the ACBL web site: www.acbl.org

## Special Events in a Box

For more information, contact Unit Co-Ordinator Howard Shimokura (604/737-1932) hshimok@shaw.ca

| EVENT | Qualifying Club Level Games | Uait <br> Tinal | District or Zone Final | National Einal | Subsidies Available |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COPC <br> Candahan Oren Paks Chaspionship | For the 2007 event the Club Q period is Sept. 1-Dec. 31. Top score in a club $Q$-game is eligible for Unit subsidy. | none | None. Any two paid-up CBF members may play in the Na tional Final, but if you didn't qualify at the club level, buy-in fee is $\$ 100$. | Canadian Bridge Fed. 2007 Bridge Week: Winnipeg MB May 26-June 2, 2007 | Unit subsidy to be updated in July. A CBF subsidy is also available. |
| CNITC <br> Cavadiav National TEAM CHthMPIONSHEP Flight As unlimited Filight B: 0-1,000 | Club qualifying period for 2007 is Sept 1 , 2006-Jan. 10, 2007. | none | Spring 2007 | National Finals in: <br> COPC: June 1-2 <br> CNTC-A: May 26-June 2 CNTC-B: May 27-June 2 CWTC: May 27-June 2 | Unit subsidy to be updated in July. A CBF subsidy is also available. |
| CWTC <br> Canadian Women's <br> TEANS EHMMPTONSHIP | There are no club or uni games. Any team of fe members may enter the | qualifying ale CBF ne Final. | Spring 2007 | Also: a Seniors Teams and an IMP Pairs Championship. | Unit subsidy to be updated in July. No CBF subsidy. |
| GNT <br> GRavD Natioval TEAMS <br> Championship Flight <br> Fiight A: $0-5,000$ <br> FBight B: 0-2,000 <br> Flight C: $0-500$ non-LM | Club Qualifying begins in October and goes to early March of 2007. One session team games may be run. | none | Completed for 2006. | 2006 Summer NABC: Chicago IL July 13-23, 2006 <br> (all flights) | US $\$ 1400$ to each flight-winning team from DINO. $\$ 706.92$ in Unit subsidy. |
| NAP <br> NORTH AMIRREAN Pais <br> Flight A: unlimited Fight B: $0-2,003$ flight C: $0-500$ non-LM | Club Qualifying June 1 thru August 31. Any dub can run a Q-game. | Fall 2006 | October 21, 2006 in Renton at the Seattle Fall Sectional | 2007 Spring NABC <br> St. Louis MO <br> March 8-18, 2007 <br> (all flights) | 2nd, 3rd place at District Final split \$749.48 Unit subsidy. (ACBL pays winners.) |

CLUB MANAGERS: North American Pairs Club Qualifying period is June 1-August 31. NAP details, page 49. CBF Canada-wide Erin Berry Rookie Master Game: Monday evening, September 25, 2006.

## Special Events

## compiled by McBruce

Julien Lévesque was the Special Events Co-Ordinator for most of his time on the Unit Board, and he did a very good job. He was irked by the WBF decision to hastily move the 2006 World Championships back several months, since this left local organizers like him scrambling for dates in new and untried parts of the calendar for local and zone qualifiers. When the Canadian team at the last World Championships asked Unit 430 for a donation, over and above the money the CBF had raised for them, Julien felt strongly that this was improper, but the rest of the Board did not, and the disagreement caused Julien to resign from his position on the Unit Board. After a long period in which we scrambled to get things done (during which Julien did help us out), Howard Shi$3 \%$ mokura has recently been added to the Unit Board and has taken on the role of Special

Events Co-Ordinator.
Meanwhile, there is a fair bit to catch up on after so long without a Matchpointer.

CBF Bridge Week 2005: In the open CNTC, four players from Unit 430 competed on two teams. Dan Jacob's team, with Bryan Maksymetz, finished second in the round-robin but lost in the quarterfinals. Mike Hargreaves's team, with Aidan Ballantyne, finished fourth in the round-robin, won their quarterfinal match, but lost in the semifinals. In the under1000 CNTC Flight B, nine local players competed on two teams: Andrew Lee's team with Sima Sadri, Marylou Varga, John Demeuelemeester, and Christa Mead; and Kenny Chan's team, with Samuel Lai, Kam Tang, and Jack Lee. Neither team made it out of the round-robin.

In the CWTC, ten local players competed on three teams: June Pocock and Kathy Adachi; Dianne Isfeld, Sandra Robson, Gina Diamond, and Eurydice Nours; and Rhonda Foster, Samantha Nystrom, and Marcia Christie. The Isfeld team didn't make it out
of the round-robin. The Pocock team finished second in the round-robin but lost in the semi-final. The FOSTER team finished first in the round-robin, won their semi-final, but lost by 28 IMPs in the final.

The new Canadian IMP Pairs Championships had a local winner: Eurydice Nours finished fourth in the B Flight. In the COPC National Final, Dan Jacob and Bryan Maksymetz finished tenth, and Dianne Isfeld and Martin Henneberger finished sixteenth.

CBF Bridge Week 2006 qualifying: The B.C. Zone Finals in the CNTC were held in early December. Winning the nine-team event was the team of Bryan Maksymetz, Doug \& Sandra Fraser, Mike Gamble, and Dan Jacob. Flight B winners were Kam Tang, Samuel Lai, Jack Lee, and Tao Feng. The following week, five teams contested the CWTC Zone Final (another was held in Victoria) and the winners were Dianne Isfeld, Tove Chen, Patti Adams, and Samantha Nystrom.

CBF BRIDGE Week 2006: as stated above, was held earlier than usual: February, in Mississauga ON. (The earlier dates meant that the subsidy funds for the CBF events were paid earlier than usual and those funds are currently depleted until the Unit's year-end in July.) The Unit 430 contingent had an excellent tournament in Mississauga:

In the open CNTC, nine local players on three teams competed: Gerry McCully on a team with Mike Wilson, Cam Doner, and Martin Henneberger; Bryan Maksymetz on a team with Dan Jacob; and Brad Bart on a team with Ben Takemori and Chris Diamond. The McCully team didn't qualify for the quarterfinals, but the MaKsymetz and Bart
teams finished \#1 and \#8 and met in a quarterfinal. MAKSYMETZ won, won their semifinal, and claimed the championship with an 11 IMP win in the final!

The under 1000 CNTC team of Kam Tang, Samuel Lai, Jack Lee and Tao Feng finished fourth in the round-robin for the last semi-final spot, but lost.

In the CWTC, four local players on two teams competed: June Pocock with Kathy Adachi, and Rhonda Foster with Marcia Christie. The Pocock team finished 1VP from the top of the round robin, and played the third-place FOSTER team in one semifinal. The Foster team won this match by 20 IMPs and then went on to win the final by 62 !

In the COPC, Brad Bart, playing with Rashid Khan of Toronto, won the event! That's three Canadian titles won by local players in one year! Peter Morse and Martin Henneberger were sixth.

Grand National Teams: The 2005 District Finals of the GNT produced several local winners: Dan Jacob, Cam Doner and Bryan Maksymetz were on the Championship flight winning team. They made it to the semifinals in Atlanta. Nick Stock, Eugene Chan, David Breton and Samantha Nystrom were on the Flight B (under 2000) winning team. They augmented their team with Brad Bart and lost in the quarterfinals in Atlanta last summer.

The 2006 District Finals in Renton produced several winners from Unit 430. In the Championship Flight, Bryan Maksymetz was a member of the winning team. The Flight B under-2000 winners included Mike and Vicki Moffatt. The Flight C winners were Tao Feng, Sam Lai, Jack Lee, and Kam Tang. Good luck to all in Chicago this summer!

## Vancouver Bridge Club

St. David's Church, NW corner of Taylor Way and Highway 1, West Vancouver DIRECTOR:
Gilbert Lambert 604/524-6617 OWNER/MANAGER, PARTNERSHIPS: Homa Boustani 604/922-8577 Mondays at 10:00am
Wednesdays at 10:00 am \& 7:15 pm All games stratified

Wednesday morning games are jackpot games
Swiss Teams last Wednesday Evening of each month Party games on holiday Mondays

Club Championshin Games:
Wednesday, June 14 (pm) Monday, July 10 Wednesday, May 3 (am)
Wednesday, August 16 (am)

## Silver Point STaC Games:

 Monday, June 5 Wednesday, June 7 (am and pm)Handicap Games: Monday, May 15 Monday, July 5 Monday, August 14

Other Special Games:
MONDAY, MAY 22: Victoria Day Holiday Pairs

MONDAY, JUly 3: Canada Day Holiday Pairs

MONDAY, AUGUST 7:
BC Day Charity Holiday Pairs
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 4: Labour Day Holiday Pairs

## Results and Information:

 www. vancouverbridgeclub.caNORTH AMERICAN PaIRS: John and Trudy Hurdle won the Flight A Unit Final in October, and four other pairs qualified to the District Finals. Don Keith and Ram Hira won the B Final, with seven other pairs qualifying for the District Final. In Flight $C$ the winners were Adam Melzak and Robert Luo, with two other pairs qualifying for the District Final.

The November sectional was the site for the District Final. In Flight A, Dan Jacob and Bryan Maksymetz finished third. In Flight B, Edward Hui and Ken Ramsay won, with Nigel Fullbrook and Pauline McClafferty third. None were on the leaderboards at the National Final.
(See the article on page 49 about this year's NAP.)


UNIT 430 EVENTS
2005 Victoria Day Sectional May 20-23, Delta
TOTAL ATIENDANCE: 361 TABLES (LAST YEAR: 3981/2 TABLES - DOWN 9.4\%)

|  | B |  | Friday Afternoon Open Pairs | (281/2 tables) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 |  | Cam Doner/Gina Diamond Isabel Chernoff/Vicki Moffatt |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | Dennis Groden/Pe | Morse |
| 4 |  |  | Sherman Kwan/Ka | y Adachi |
| 5 |  |  | David Binney/Mern | McSpadden |
| 6 | 2 |  | Dee Ker/Ken Ram |  |
|  | 3 | 1 | John Chen/Hsiang |  |
|  | 4 | 2 | Ataollah Amir/Zah | Jafroudi |
|  | 5 |  | Anne Smith/Gail | uchert |
|  | 6 |  | Marion Crowhurst/ | an Richards |
|  |  | 3 | Colleen Walker/Ja | viga Polujan |
|  |  | 4 | Elsie Mackinnon/ | nne Drane |
|  |  | 5 | Daniela Zezulka/G | Ferguson |


|  | Saturday 2-session |
| :---: | :---: |
| A B C | Open Pairs (37, 20 tables) |
| 1 | Sandra Robson/IInsa Fricker |
| 21 | Gary \& Alice Thomas |
| 3 | Al French/Mary Fines |
| 42 | Jack Lee/Kenny Chan |
| 5 | June Pocock/Kathy Adachi |
| 6 | John Lien/Liz Stoneman |
| 7 | Jean Groome/lna Andersen |
| 3 | Sid Sega//Howard Rubin |
| 4 | Robert Walters/Peggy Pfeifer |
| 5 | Beverly Kanee/GIoria Prescott |
| 6 | Myra Johnstor/Mariene Powell |
| 1 | Zoran Peca/Colleen Walker |
| 2 | Vernon Forster/Beveriey Hall |
| 3 | Margaret \& Bruno Moras |
| 4 | Angela Image/Solveig Karigren |

Saturday 2 -session

|  | Consolation Pairs ( $151 / 2$ tables) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Cathy Miller/Clarence Dodd |
| 2 | Emie Dietrich/Debbie Williams |
| 3 | David Binney/Merrill McSpadden |
| 4 | Ping Ding/Jane Fyie |

$\begin{array}{lll}5 & 2 & 1 \text { Allan Karro/Jerry Drozdzik }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}6 & 3 & 2 & \text { Ataollah Amiri/Zahra Jafroudi }\end{array}$
43 David \& Claire Ward
54 Jane \& Howard Shimokura
6 Edward Hui/Ken Ramsay
Ben Lapidus Bracketed
Brocke Rank Knockout Teams (32 teams)

Friday Afternoon

| A B C | Senior Pairs (10 tables) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Sheila Sache/Kathy Bye |
| 2/31 | Ron Groome/Elaine Levins |
| $2 / 32$ | Robert Walters/Peggy Pfeifer |
| 4/5 | Joerg Schneider/Boonie Anderson |
| $4 / 53$ | Bev Kanee/Tomie Yamanouchi |
| 6 | Sandra Robson/Susan Mitchell |
| 1 | Breda Prestage/Rae Fee |
| 5 | Dee SteivPaul Harding |
| 2 | Bennie \& Catherine Vaughan |
| 3 | Lina \& Simon Cheng |

Friday Afternoon
Rank 199er Pairs (3 tables) 1. Brenda Robinson/Evelyn Ware 2. Gwen Johnson/Barb Johnson

Friday Evening

| A B C | Friday Evening <br> IMP Pairs <br> (191/2 tables) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Gary Phelan/Dan Watson |
| 1 | Bill Osten/John Demeulemeester |
| 2 | Tom Cotton/Gail Perrin |
| 1 | Charley Zhang/Tony Shyu |
| 5 | Debbie Williams/Emie Dietrich |
| 2 | Gerald Paul/Anne Norman |
| 5 | Robert Walters/Pegey Pfeifer |
| 6 | Donna \& AI Freeze |
| 3 | Edward \& Margaret John |
| 4 | Bennie \& Catherine Vaughan |


| Rank | Unit 430 Top 23 June 2005 STaC | MP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | Phyllis Gerber | 16.35 |
| 3. | Samantha Nystrom | 16.27 |
| 4. | Loraine Hurren | 15.59 |
| 4. | Don Lecky | 15.59 |
| 8. | Kathy Adachi | 13.82 |
| 9. | Brad Bart | 13.80 |
| 16. | Ben Takemori | 12.12 |
| 17. | Ben Ong | 11.97 |
| 18. | Cathy Miller | 11.95 |
| 22. | Maria Dabrowski | 11.44 |
| 26. | Yuko Fujieda | 10.97 |
| 29. | Olive Macdonald | 10.58 |
| 31. | Bob Blake | 10.23 |
| 32. | Adam Dabrowski | 10.10 |
| 36. | Helen Montgomery | 9.81 |
| 38. | Angela Fenton | 9.17 |
| 39. | Myra Morgan | 8.98 |
| 43. | Sherman Kwan | 8.33 |
| 48. | Wink Andres | 7.82 |
| 48. | Ann Andres | 7.82 |
| 50. | Dan Watson | 7.77 |
| 51. | Dianne Isfeld | 7.68 |
| 52. | Doris Frizzell | 7.65 |

1,162 players won a total of $2,356.44$ silver points at the 2005 Unit 430 -sponsored Districtwide STaC (Sectional Toumament at Clubs.)

This includes the points listed on the club recap sheets and the overall awards that replaced them if your score got into the nation-wide rankings for that particular session. The leader was Rose Bolson of Lake Forest Park WA, with 18.91.

Complete masterpoint lists are posted at www.d19.org and also at www.acbl.org. The following are the players whose score held up for a District-wide first place in one of the strats. (We haven't included the limited-masterpoint games where there were no competing clubs.)

> A B C Monday Daytime Open
> 1 Maria \& Adam Dabrowski (Vancouver Bridge Club)
> Don Lecky/Lorraine Hurren (Squamish Bridge Club)
> 1 Bob Blake/Roy Bishop (Vancouver Lawn Tennis \& Bridge)
> A B C Tuesday Daytime Open Ben Takemori/Angela Fenton (Vancouver Bridge Centre)

A B C Wednesday Daytime Open Bard Bart/Ben Ong (Vancouver Bridge Centre)
 Bridge Centre)

## A B C Saturday Daytime Open Samantha Nystrom/Eugene Chan (Vancouver Bridge Centre)

| A B C | Sunday Daytime Open |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Phylilis Gerber/Helen Montgomery (East Richmond Bridge Club) |
| 1 | Shirley Fitterman/Jeannette |
|  | Greenhut (East Richmond Bridge | Club)

2005 Evergreen Sectional September 9-11, Queensborough Total Atiendance: 223 tables (LAST YEAR: 301 tables - DOWN 25.9\%)

| A B C | Friday Afternoon Open Pairs (28 tables) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Marcia Christie/Rhonda Foster |
| 2 | John Lien/Liz Stoneman |
| 1 | Harvey Bridges/Jean Bridges |
| 4 | Bjarne Christoffersen/Mike Wilson |
| 5 | Jadwiga Polujan/Andrew Lee |
| 3 | Jocelyn Krug/Grant Gayman |

## Winners List Changes

## Too many winners, too little space!

Starting with this issue of the Matchpointer, the rules for getting into the winners lists have changed:

## Previously Included:

Unit 430 Sectionals: overall winners in all strats
NABCs: list of the top local players and notable results by local players in high-profile events
CBF Events: local players' results at CBF Bridge Week, and the Unit and Zone qualifying games
Regionals: any overall results I could find online for any Regional (usually I would check DINO Regionals, Oregon, Hawaii, California, and Alberta Regionals)
Sectionals/STaCs: any overall results I could find online for any nearby sectional or STaC (usually I would check all DINO Sectionals, plus a few Alberta sectionals)

## Included this time:

Unit 430 Sectionals, NABCs: same as before
CBF Events: local players' results at CBF Bridge Week only. Winners in the Unit and Zone qualifying games will be moved to the Special Events section.
Regionals: first place in a bracket or a strat only from now on, at DINO Regionals, plus Regionals in Ore-
gon, Hawaii, Alberta, Reno, Las Vegas, and Gatlinburg, which has become the "fourth NABC".
Sectionals: first place in a bracket or strat from sectionals in nearby Units only
STaCs: list of the top local players in the masterpoint lists, plus first place in a bracket or strat in a session where more than one club participates

This will result in many of you not getting listed when you would have been before. It will also result in me not going insane just thinking about the amount of work involved in getting, typing, and formatting these increasingly long lists. Because we've been off for so long, it's still a bunch of pages...

Next issue, new editor Ben Takemori may even cut the out-of-town winners lists down further. For the online I will try to keep a list of winners based on the rules above, but the print version may edit many of these out.

If you are missed somehow and you really want to be recognized for your accomplishment, there is a simple solution. Take a deal or two from your triumph, write it down with some comments, and send it in as an article. Feel free to describe the tournament and to mention that your fine decisions helped to win the event or the strat. As long as it contains something more than "we won our Flight on Friday morning at the Podunk Regional; list us please," you'll probably see it in the next issue.


| A | B | C | Saturday 2-session | Open Pairs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | (cont.) | Zoran Peca/Colleen Walker |  |  |
|  | 4 | David Peppar/Jim Munns |  |  |
| 5 | Beveriey Wardstrom/Susan |  |  |  |
|  | Richardson |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | Edward Hui/Kenneth Ramsay |  |  |

A $\times$| Sunday 2-session |
| :--- |
| Open Swiss |
| (20 teams) |

## 1 Kathy Adachi, June Pocock,

Michael Yuen, Les Fouks
2 David Breton, Nick Stock, Trudy \& John Hurdle
3 Larry Pocock, Don Sache, Brad Bart, Mike Dimich
4 Dan Jacob, Larry Hicks, Ron Borg, Mike Dorn Wiss
51 Bob \& Aban Gerrie, Dianne
Isfeld, Martin Henneberger
6
6
Katrin Litwin, Mike \& Ben Take-
mori, Aidan Ballantyne
2 Gray McMullin, Pauline
McClafferty, Kal Kaieem, Armando Andreoli
3 John Lien, Liz Stoneman, Jay Brandt, Gay Parrish
4 Gus Axen, Duane Tilden, Bjame Christoffersen, Martin Johnson

| B | C | D | Sunday 2-session <br> under-1500 Swiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 |  |  | Andrew Lee, Geraldine Lacroik, <br> Marylou Varga, John Demeule- <br> meester |
| 2 | 1 | Larry Meyer, Jim McKemzie, Rod <br> Coote, Walter Zielinski |  |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | David Hooey, Sunil Ray, Colleen <br> Walker, Zoran Peca |

## 432 Andrew Nalos, Grant Gayman,

 Ken Ramsay, Edward Hui54 Myra Johnston, Doreen \& Colin Ransom, Marlene Powell
653 Kai Zhou, Baixiang Liu, Eric Pan, Tao Feng
4 Rosemary Cunningham, Eileen Sayers, Richard Sturgess, Noorali Dhanani

## 2005 Evergreen Sectional Top Ten

1. Kathy Adachi ............................ 19.83
2. Michael Yuen.............................18.22
3. Bradley Bart ..............................18.14
4. June Pocock ..............................18.01
5. Dan Jacob ................................. 17.88
6. Nicholas Stock............................17.56
7. John Hurdle.................................15.45
8. Trudy Hurdle ............................. 15.45
9. Les Fouks .................................. 15.22
10. Aidan Ballantyne........................ 13.41

A total of 797.02 masterpoints was won by 244 players (a further 54 players played but did not win any) at the 2005 Evergreen Sectional.

2005 Fall future Stars Sectional ОСtober 29-30,
Vancouver Bridge Centre
TOTAL ATtendance: 30 Tabies
LAST YEAR: 36 TABLES - DOWN 16.7\%

2005 FALL FUTURE STARS TOP TEN

1. Dominique Baker ..... 4.63
2. Yung-Chang Chen ..... 4.25
3. Hsiang Li ..... 3.48
4. Sachi Yamakami. ..... 3.34
5. Chang-Shan Chen ..... 3.23
6. Sam Yamanouchi ..... 2.34
7. Alex Lovie .....  2.34
8. Loma Hawes. ..... 2.07
9. Douglas Grant ..... 2.05
10. Barb Grant ..... 2.05

A total of 74.46 silver points was won by 53 players at the 2005 Fall Future Stars Sectional.


(continued on page 4


2006 TROPHY SECTIONAL MARCH 3-5, BURNABY
TOTAL Attendance: 280 tables
(JAN. 2005: 316 $1 / 2$ TABLES - DOWN 11.5\%)
(MARCH 2004: 295 TABLES - DOWN 5.1\%)
Friday Afternoon

|  |  | Open Pairs | (38 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Sheila Sache/Peter Morse |  |
| 2 |  | Trudy \& Joh |  |
| 3 | 11 | John Chen/ | an Chen |
| 4 |  | Mike \& Ben |  |
| 5 | 2 | Neil McAll | sten |
| 6 |  | Amirali Al | Butler |
|  | 3 | Barry Yam | mantha |

42 Daniela Zezulka/Gerry Ferguson
5 Olga Guitelmakher/Tove Chen
63 Rosemary Cunningham/ Eileen Sayers
4 Noorali Dhanani/Nizar Esmail
5 Rowena Huberman/Gladys Adilman
6 Allan Karro/Panvin Grigg
Friday Evening Henry Smilie Trophy Mixed Board-a-
A B C Match Teams ( 18 teams) Marcia \& Richard Christie, Gerry McCully, Rhonda Foster
21 Don \& Linda Mamula, Gay Parrish, Jay Brandt
3/4 2 Martin Henneberger, Dianne Isfeld, Gus Axen, Solveig Karlgren
3/4 Bill \& Monica Angus, Peter Morse, Sheila Sache
53 Henry Lai, Anne Scott, Andrew
Ross, Rhoda Tafler
41 Dimitri Chatokhine, Olga Guitelmakher, Tove Chen, Tony Remedios

Friday Evening
B C Side Pairs (25 tables)
Ram Hira/Robert Walters
Michael Yuen/Rock Shi Yan
Dee SteivPaul Harding
Wilf May/Kathy Adachi
11 Gilles St.Pierre/Denis Lefebvre
Sandra Robsor/Eugene Fomin
2 Anne Smith/Gail Heuchert
32 Robert Luo/Armando Andreoli
43 Zoran Peca/Richard Symyk
54 Baixiang Liu/Tony Shyu
5 Jim Munns/Richard Kay
6 Barbara Chase/Barbara Haagenson

|  | Aidan \& June Budd Hicks <br> Trophy Saturday Qualifying/ <br> Rank <br> Final Open Pairs (49, 28 tables) |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1. | Craig Zastera/Stanford Christie |
| 2. | Aban \& Bob Gerrie |
| 3. | Mike \& Ben Takemori |
| 4. | Doug Hansford/Gus Axen |
| 5. | Jack Lee/Baixiang Liu |
| 6. | Leslie Gold/Kathy Adachi |
| 7. | Mariene Powell/Myra Johnston |

## Saturday Evening

| A | B | C | Side Pairs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  | Joerg Schneider/Judy Murphy |  |
| 2 |  | John \& Trudy Hurdle |  |
| $3 / 41 / 2$ | Bill Osten/John Anthony |  |  |
| $3 / 41 / 2$ | 1 | Gerry Ferguson/Daniela Zezulka |  |
| 5 | 3 | 2 | Marta Zahorecz/Burke Lundy |
| 6 |  |  | Peter Herold/Ken Scholes |
| 4 |  | Rae Fee/Norma McNamara |  |
| 5 |  | Julie Smith/Susan Peters |  |
| 6 | 3 | Allan Karro/Yichun Tang |  |
|  | 4 | Tao Feng/Long Xie |  |
|  | 5 | Audrey Loy/Armando Andreoli |  |

Sunday Willie Weinstein
Trophy (for Flight A) Open
A $X$ Swiss Teams (27 teams)
1 Ken Scholes, Peter Herold, Aidan
Ballantyne, Katrin Litwin
2 Peter Morse, Sheila Sache, Danny Lee, William Ge
3 Mike Dimich, Ben Takemori,
David Breton, Nick Stock
4 Stanford Christie, Craig Zastera,
Trudy \& John Hurdle
51 Duane Tilden, Gus Axen, Martin Johnson, Bjarne Christoffersen
6/8 Sandra \& Doug Fraser, Bryan Maksymetz, Dan Jacob
Diane Ayukawa, Gladys Mackie, Helen Montgomery, Delphine Tablotney
Mike Wilson, Dave Grubbs, Don
Sache, Doug Hansford
2 Doreen McOrmond, Monica
Angus, Jill Stokes, Debbie Mineault
3 Dwayne Dicks, Dianne Isfeld, Martin Henneberger, Gray McMullin
4 Glenn \& Melinda Ponto, Stephen Beaton, Anne Scott

## Sunday Mary Clarke

Trophy (for Flight B)
$B C D$ Swiss Teams
( 25 feams)
$\begin{array}{llll}1 & 1 & 1 & J o h n \\ \text { Chen, Alex Chuang, Hsiang }\end{array}$ Li, Chang-Shan Chen
2 Andy Hellquist, Greg Morse, Dan Groves, Sharon Erwin
322 Kai Zhou, Baixiang Liu, Tao Feng, Long Xie, Eric Pan
43 Larry Meyer, Jim McKenzie, Kenn Gowan, Ted Dagan

Sunday Mary Clarke
Trophy (for Flight B)

| B | C | D | Swiss Teams$\quad$ (cont.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 5 |  | Stuart Carr, Cathy Miller, Anita <br> Morse, Sima Sadri |  |
| 6 | 4 | Colleen Walker, Zoran Peca, <br> Jadwiga Polujan, David Hooey |  |
| 5 | Ted \& Jessie Vesak, Allan Karro, <br> Joan Tang |  |  |

(Trophy Sectional Top Ten and final 2005 masterpoint race standings are on page 30)

2006 Spring Future Stars Sectional. April 15-16, Vancouver Bridge Centre

| D | E | Saturday Afternoon <br> under-300 Pairs |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | Chang-Shan Chen/Yung-Chang |
| Chan |  |  |
| Chen |  |  |

(The Sunday Afternoon session attracted only 4 pairs, one less than the minimum required to award masterpoints.)
2006 Spring Future Stars Top TEN

1. Hsiang Li ..... 4.36
2. Tony Shyu ..... 2.95
3. Yung-Chang Chen. ..... 2.56
4. Chang-Shan Chen. ..... 2.56
5. Terence Ho ..... 2.22
6. Alfred Lau ..... 2.22
7. Marta Zahorecz ..... 1.74
8. Burke Lundy. ..... 1.74
9. Kun Shao ..... 1.41
10. Zoran Peca. ..... 1.08
11. Richard Symyk. ..... 1.08

A total of 30.82 silver points was won by 31 players at the 2006 Spring Future Stars Sectional.

NABC WINNERS


3,816 players won masterpoints at the Spring NABC. The leader was Eddie Wold with 282.05. A major highlight was the second place finish by Dan Jacob and Bryan Maksymetz in the North American Pairs.

## Summer 2005 North American Bridge Championships Atuanta, July 21-31

## Unit 430 Top 18 at the

| Rank | Summer NABC | MP |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 6. | Bryan Maksymetz | 294.12 |
| 54. | Cam Doner | 152.77 |
| 134. | Dan Jacob | 114.12 |
| 355. | Samantha Nystrom | 70.50 |
| 679. | Rock Shi Yan | 44.45 |
| 686. | David Breton | 44.24 |
| 723. | Gioxu Zhang | 42.47 |
| 751 | Nick Stock | 41.85 |
| 800. | Brad Bart | 39.53 |
| 988. | Julien Lévesque | 33.33 |
| 1061. | Jadwiga Polujan | 31.54 |
| 1491. | Colleen Walker | 22.34 |
| 1546. | Ram Hira | 21.38 |
| 1574. | Eugene Chan | 20.93 |
| 2100. | Anita Morse | 14.42 |
| 2102. | Peter Morse | 14.40 |
| 2157. | Kal Kaleem | 13.85 |
| 2196. | Mike Wilson | 13.49 |

5,037 players won a total of $111,623.57$ masterpoints at the Summer NABC. The leader was Geoff Hampson with 348.09. Bryan Maksymetz finished 2nd in the Spingold Teams and third in the Grand National Teams to get to sixth on the list.

## NABC Daily Bulletins and complete masterpoint lists are posted at www.acbl.org.

FAll 2005 NORTH AMERICAN Bridge Championships
Denver CO, November 17-27

| Rank | Unit 430 Top 20 a Fall NABC | MP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76. | Bryan Maksymetz | 139.72 |
| 180 | Kathy Bye | 84.23 |
| 236. | Mike Wilson | 70.96 |
| 349. | Rock Shi Yan | 57.38 |
| 373. | Dan Jacob | 54.47 |
| 382. | Cam Doner | 53.51 |
| 644. | Allan Graves | 35.72 |
| 661. | Stephen Pickett | 35.30 |
| 673. | Peter Morse | 34.86 |
| 682. | Ken Ramsay | 34.59 |
| 717. | Edward Hui | 33.25 |
| 814. | Sheila Sache | 30.31 |
| 840. | Greg Morse | 29.47 |
| 840. | Andy Hellquist | 29.47 |
| 847. | Michael Yuen | 29.46 |
| 895. | Joerg Schneider | 27.68 |
| 931. | Doug Cowan | 26.70 |
| 1114. | Colleen Walker | 21.26 |
| 1187. | Shirley Teather | 19.74 |
| 1217. | Monica Angus | 19.14 |

3,698 players won a total of $84,445.40$ masterpoints at the Fall NABC. The leader was Zia Mahmood with 416.88 . Bryan Maksymetz was once again the Unit 430 leader, with high placing in several major events.
SPRING 2006 NORTH AMERICAN
BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS
DALIAS TX, MARCH 30-APRII 9

| Rank | Unit 430 Top Spring NABC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125. | Bryan Maksymetz | 92.98 |
| 148. | Dan Jacob | 84.35 |
| 249. | Don Sache | 65.27 |
| 287. | Doug Hansford | 58.61 |
| 291. | Jadwiga Polujan | 58.12 |
| 319. | Cam Doner | 54.75 |
| 333. | Robert Walters | 53.39 |
| 395. | Dennis Groden | 47.80 |
| 460. | Brad Bart | 43.50 |
| 510. | Katrin Litwin | 40.72 |
| 510. | Aidan Ballantyne | 40.72 |
| 547. | Peter Morse | 38.86 |
| 673. | Eurydice Nours | 32.14 |
| 675. | Michael Yuen | 32.11 |
| 745. | Colleen Walker | 29.18 |
| 1008. | Alice Thomas | 22.65 |
| 1312. | Denise Cobb | 17.55 |
| 1394. | Anita Morse | 16.20 |
| 1602. | Mike Wilson | 13.44 |
| 1640. | Grace Jeklin | 12.9 |

4,065 players won a total of $78,597.67$ masterpoints at the Spring NABC. The leader was Fred Chang with 353.25 . Bryan Maksymetz's total was based on several high finishes, including a sixth in a 65 table IMP Pairs game.

## Regional Winners

## 2005 California Captial Regional SACRAMENTO CA, MAY 30-JUNE 5

|  | Rank Gold Rush Knockout Teams |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Shi Yan, Alex Hong |
| Brat | Rank Eureka Knockout Teams |
| 1 | Shi Yan, Alex Hong |
|  | B C Saturday Morn. Side Game |
| 1 | Les Baldys |
| A | StratiFlighted Swiss Teams |
| 1 | Shi Yan, Alex Hong |
|  | 2005 Penticton Regional Penticton BC, June 13-19 |

## A B C Charity Open Pairs

1 Andra Thomson/Veronica MacDonald

| A | B | C | Tuesday Morning Side Game |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  |  | Diane Ayukawa/Al French |  |
| A | B | C | Tuesday Aft. Side Game |  |
|  |  | I | Andra ThomsorNeronica Mac- |  |
|  | Donald |  |  |  |


| D E F Tuesday Aft. 199er Pairs |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 111 | Elaine \& Ted Saunders |
| Bikt. Rank Great Weather Knockouts |  |
| II 1 | Don Sache, Dan Watson, Denr Groden, Mike Takemori |
| IV |  |
|  |  |
|  | Stephen Pickett, Andrew Zorawski |
| VIII | Barb \& Doug Grant, Zahra Ja- |
| A B C | Tuesday Open Pairs |
|  | Mike Moffat/Kathy Adachi |
| A B C | Tuesday Senior Pairs |
| 1 | Shiela Sache/Peter Morse |
| A B C | Wed. Morning Side Game |
| 111 | Ata Amiri/Zahra Jafroudi |
| D | Wed. Aftn. 199er Pa |
|  | Maureen Zop/Kathleen M |
| Brint. Rank Yeah! Summer Knockouts |  |
| 11 | Cam Doner |
| III | William Ge, Danny Lee, Fra Liu |
| D E F | Wed. Evening 199er Pai |
|  | Keith \& Peggy Graham |
| Brat. Rank Wed-Thu Comp. KO Consol. |  |
| IV 1 Adele Mackay |  |
| D E F Thu. Aftn. 199er Pairs |  |
| 11 | Mary Hewitthlarry Jacot |
|  | Annette Miller/Gillian Sch |

(continued on page 46)


| A B | C | Thu. Aft. Side Game |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | Eda Kadar/Bob Sabiston |

A B C Thu. Eve. Side Game
1 Melinda \& Glenn Ponto
$\begin{array}{rll}\text { D E } & \text { F } & \text { Thu. Eve 199er Pairs } \\ & 1 & \text { Donald \& Dianne McDonald }\end{array}$
A B C Thursday Senior Pairs
1 Shirley Laidlaw/Adrianne Damgaard

| Bist | Rank Sunshine Knockouts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | 1 |  | Richard Christie

IV 1 Don Keith, Marion Crowhurst, Ken Ramsay, Edward Hui
Bikt. Rank Sunshine Knockouts (cont.)
V 1 Diane McNames, Norma McNamara, Mariene Barber
VI 1 Bruce Partridge, Harry Kublik, Susan Mitchell, Judy Christensen

| A B C | Friday Morning Side Game |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | Dave PritchardJim Graf |

Brkt. Rank Oh Happy Days Knockouts
II 1 Willam Ge, Danny Lee
IV 1 Yvonne Drane, Gail Heuchart, Myra Johnston, Mariene Powell
VI 1 John Rousseu, Ronald Edgar
A B C Friday Open Pairs
1 David Peppar/Jim Munns
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { A } & \text { B } & \text { C } & \text { Friday Womens' Pairs } \\ & 1 & \text { Phyllis Gerber/Delphine Tablotney }\end{array}$

| A B C | Friday Senior Pairs |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Jim Groves Rosalyn Richardson |

D E F Friday Eve. 199er Pairs
Muriel O'Brien/Mona Vassos
1 Pauline Elliott/Pearl Challenger

| Rank | ne Ove |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1/2 | Al french/Diane Ayukawa |
|  | Fri-Sat Morning Comp. KO Consolation |
| II | Don Sache, Doug Hansfo Dennis Groden, Peter Mor |

D E F Saturday Aftn. 199er Pairs
1 Audrey Russell/Peter Weldon
A B C Saturday Open Pairs
Michael Yuen
A B C Saturday Senior Pairs AI \& Donna Freeze

Bikt. Rank Rainy Day Bracket KO
V 1 Andrew Nalos, Grant Gayman, Ken Ramsay, Edward Hui
VI 1 Neil \& Maureen McAllister, Linda Morgan, Anne Paris
VII 1 Tao Feng, Eric Pan, Baixiang Liu, Kai Zhou

| A B | C |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Saturday Evening Swiss |
| Doreen \& Colin Ransom |  |

Binc. Rank Saturday Compact KO
VI 1 Chieko Oka, Patricia Chen, Adele Mackay
Birt. Rank Sat. Compact KO Consol.
IV 1 Betty Harold, Rick Smillie, Jean Kabz, Jadwiga Polujan

A B C Sunday Open Pairs
1 Colieen Walker/Ken Lochang
A $\quad \mathrm{X}$ Sunday Open Swiss Teams Mike Wilson
B C D Sunday Limited Swiss Greg Lam
1 Tao Feng, Eric Pan, Kai Zhou, Baixiang Liu

A B C Sunday Senior Swiss
1 John Demeulemeester
2005 las Vegas Regional
Las Vegas Nevada, June 20-26
A B C Saturday Fast Pairs
1 Howard Rubin/Sid Segal
Birt. Rank Sat. Compact KO Consol.
I 1 Cam Doner
2005 Emeraid Empre regional Eugene Or, August 1-7

| A B C | Friday Open Pairs |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 |  |
| Larry Chow |  |

2005 KIondike Regional
EDMONTON AB, August 8-14

| A | B | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Charity Open Pairs |
| Les Fouks/June Pocock |  |  |


| 1 | 1 Michael Yuen, Bryan Ma |
| :---: | :---: |
| A B | C Wednesday Eve. Swiss |
| 1 | Rhonda Foster |
| A B | C Thursday Eve. Side Game |
| 1 | Martin Henneberger |
|  | 2005 Puget Sound Regional Bow WA, August 22-28 |
| R | Rank Kickoff KO |
| III | Alice \& Gary Thomas, Doreen \& Colin Ransom |
| A B | C Tuesday Evening Side Game |
|  | Art Fraser |


| A | B | C | Tuesday Swiss Teams |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 |  | William Ge, Shi Yan, Don Sache, |  |
|  |  |  | Doug Hansford |
|  | 1 | Denny Gibson |  |
| A | B | C | Tuesday Senior Swiss |
|  | 1 | John Rousseu |  |


| D | E | F | Wed. Eve. 199er Pairs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 |  | David Peppar/Richard Kay |
| A | B | C | Wednesday Open Pairs |
| 1 |  |  | Cam Doner |
| A | B | C | Wed. Eve. Side Game |
| 1 |  |  | Richard Christi/Gerry McCully |
| A | B | C | Wednesday Evening Swiss |
| 1 |  | Mike Wilson |  |


| Bit. | Rank | Senior Compact KO Consol. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III | I | Gerry McCully |
| Bikt. | Rank | Blumenthal KO Consol. |
| I | I | Rhonda Foster, Chris Moore, |
|  |  | Marcia Christie, Samantha |
|  |  | Nystrom |

Bint. Rank Midweek KO Teams
IV 1 Donald \& Dianne McDonald

| A | B | C | Thursday Open Pairs |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  | Brad Bart |  |
| D | E | F | Wed. Eve, 199er Pairs |
| 1 |  | Donald \& Dianne McDonald |  |
| A | B | C | Friday Afternoon Side Game |
| 1 |  |  | Michael Yuer/Les Fouks |
| A | B | C | Friday Evening Side Game |
| 1 | Eurydice Nours |  |  |

Bikt. Rank Wed.-Sat. Morning KO

$$
\text { I } 1 \text { Mike Wilson }
$$

A B C Fri.-Sat. Moming Swiss
11 Samuel Lai, Kam Tang, Jack Lee, Tao Feng
A $\quad$ X Saturday Open Pairs
1 Bob \& Aban Gerrie
B C D Saturday Limited Pairs
11 Stephen Pickett/Andrew Zorawski
Birc. Rank Weekend KO Teams
I 1 Dan Jacob
II 1 Kathy Adachi, June Pocock, David Breton, Nick Stock
III 1 Jeremy \& Marion Crowhurst, Anita Morse, Rangie Sylvestrie
A $X$ Sunday Open Swiss Teams 1 Dan Jacob
B C D Sunday Limited Swiss
111 Samuel Lai, Kam Tang, Jack Lee, Tao Feng

71st All Western Champonshil Santa Cara CA, August 30-September 5

| A B C | Wed. Evening Swiss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Cam Doner |

2005 SpOKANE REGIONAL SPOKANE WA, OCTOBER 17-23


(continued on page 48


| Rank | Weekend Side Overalls |
| :---: | :--- |
| $1 / 2$ | David Schmidt |


| A | B C | Sunday Senior Teams |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  | Andrew Lee, Rhoda Tafler, Ev <br> Hodge, Olive Macdonald |
|  |  | $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Hold }\end{array}\right)$ |


| A | B | C | Sunday Swiss Teams |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 |  | Dan Jacob, Larry Hicks, Saman- <br> tha Nystrom |  |

1/2 Colleen Walker, Greg Lam, Zoran Peca, Richard Symyk
1/2 Charlotte Alekson, Jim Balcom, Bill Osten
1 Dominique Baker, Sachi Yamakami, Rowena Huberman, Gladys Adilman

Hawail Regional.
Honolulu HI, January 16-22 (Apparently no ACBL Director in Hawaii knows what day it is, for there are few clues as to when these events took place on the ACBL.org listing)

| A B C Some Morning Side G |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Sandra Robson |
| D E F |  |
| 1/2 1 Alex Louie |  |
| A B C | C Unspecifie |
| 11 Alex Lovie |  |
| B C D Limited Swiss Teams |  |
| 1 Anita Morse, Sima Sadri, \& Colin Ransom |  |
| President's Day regional Santa Clara CA, February 14 |  |
| Bikt Rank Comp. KO Consol. |  |
| 11 | Cam Don |
| A $X$ | X Monday Open Swi |
|  | Cam Doner |

## Sectional Winners

2005 Skagit Spud Sectional Anacortes WA, Juir 8-10<br>Bind. Rank Yukon Gold KO Teams<br>I 1 Trudy \& John Hurdle<br>2005 Victora Fall Sectional Victorla BC, September 16-18<br>A B C Friday Afternoon Open Pairs<br>Ross Deegan

A B C Friday Evening Open Pairs
1 Ross Deegan
A B C Saturday Aftn. Novice Pairs
1 Ross Deegan
A B C Saturday Open Pairs
Rhonda Foster/Gerry McCully
1 Geraldine May
A $\quad \mathrm{X}$ Sunday $O$ pen Swiss Teams
1 Rhonda Foster
1 Carol Waters
2005 Khowna ThanksGing Sectional Khowna BC, Остовer 7-10
A B C Friday Evening Open Pairs
1 Bob \& Aban Gerrie
A B C Sunday Open Swiss Teams
1 Aban \& Bob Gerrie, Martin Henneberger, Dianne Isfeld

2005 Comox Valiey Sectional
COURTENAY BC, OCTOBER 28-30
A B C Friday Evening Open Pairs
1 Andrew Hopkinson/Doris Housley
Powel River Sectional
Powel River BC, January 20-22
A B C Friday Evening Open Pairs
1 Mike \& Fay McCarthy
A B C Sunday Open Swiss Teams
1 Mike \& Fay McCarthy, John \& Barb Storer

Peace Arch Sectional
Beungham WA, February 10-12
D E F Friday Aftn. Newcomer Pairs
1 Ann Audette/Sheila Gentry
D E F Sat. Aftn. Newcomer Pairs Richard Kay/David Peppar
A B C Saturday Open Pairs
1 Don Sache/Doug Hansford
D E F Sat. Eve. Newcomer Pairs
1 Richard Kay/David Peppar
A $X$ Sunday Open Swiss
1 Mike \& Vicki Moffatt, John Lien, Liz Stoneman

## Squamish Duplicate Bridge Club

Tantalus Seniors' Centre, 1471 Pemberton Street, Squamish
Mondays at 7:00 pm (closed July 3-September 4) Monthly Trophy Race Games Kay Roberts 1-604/898-3896

Howe Sound Bridge Club
Tantalus Seniors' Centre, 1471 Pemberton Street, Squamish Fridays at 1:00 pm (closed July-August)

Lorraine Hurren 1-604/892-9027

## Prepare To Qualify!

## NAP Stage One about to begin

The North American Pairs. A grass-roots, local, regional, and national event in which Unit 430 has a very bright record of successes. An event in which every participant, at every level, has a chance to win big points. And it all begins in June, with:

Stage One: Club Qualifying. A regular night at the club, stratified matchpoints, nothing specialuntil you win three or four masterpoints for first overall. Or you are in the top half of the field and get some masterpoints along with a mysterious " $Q$ " beside your name. What's this all about?

Clubs may schedule NAOP qualifying games between June 1 and August 31, one or two per month for each weekly session that they run. Qualifying games can be stratified (all flights together) or limited to Flight C ( $0-500$, non-LM) only, or limited to Flight C and Flight B ( $0-2000$ ) only. Anyone finishing at average or better qualifies to play in the next level in any flight they are eligible for. And if you finish ahead of more people in a flight than you are behind (or right in the middle), you earn a qualification for that flight even if you didn't quite make it to average. That's what the "Q"s are all about: qualification for the next level! A further wrinkle: if you earn a " $Q$ " in Flight A or B, you get an automatic qualification into any lower flight you are eligible for. (You can continue to play in other qualifying games with other partners once you have qualified: in fact, your presence increases the attendance, which bumps up the masterpoint awards a little bit.)

But even if you play only at the club level, you have the benefit of increased masterpoint awards for winners, sometimes three times as much as a regular club game would award. And, the small extra fee you pay goes to the District to help support the travel for the lacky ones who survive to the final stage. In an indirect way, this means your extra dollar or two tends to support local players, since Unit 430 sends far more players to the Nationals than our Unit merits by population.

So why on earth wouldn't you want to play this event at your local club? If your club manager has not scheduled an NAP Club Qualifying game, ask for one! It could be the beginning of a national championship for you and your partner!

Stage Two: The Unit Final. At the end of the qualifying period, a list of players who have qualified in each flight is prepared by the Unit and displayed at the September sectional. The Unit Final is a two-
session event which qualifies players to the next stage. The Unit makes no money from the Unit Final: all profits from it are cycled back into the NAP Subsidy fund to help players who get to the National Final.

The Unit Final will be held in late September or early October at the Vancouver Bridge Centre. Watch next issue for dates and times. At the Unit Final, you may play with anyone else who qualified at the club level. You aren't required to play with the player you qualified with.

Again, average or better, or top half of the field, qualifies for the next level, which is:

Stage Three: The District Final. Unit 430 is one of 24 Units in ACBL District 19, which consists of B.C., Washington State, and Alaska. The District Final location rotates between the Seattle Unit and the Vancouver Unit. The 2006 District Final will be held at the Seattle Fall Sectional in Renton WA, October 20-22. Normally the event begins Saturday afternoon and concludes Saturday evening, but there is a very small chance it may be increased to four sessions if the turnout for your flight is quite large.

Again, at the District Final, you may play with anyone else who qualified in any Unit Final, even people from outside Unit 430. The top three pairs in each flight are invited to play in the next stage, with ACBL subsidies going to the top two pairs in each flight (more for first place). Unit 430 also kicks in with subsidy support for pairs attending the next stage, which is:

Stage Four: The National Final. The next NAP National Final will be at the 2007 Spring NABC in St. Louis MO, from March 8-18. Usually the National Final is a four-session event, a two-session qualifier followed by a two-session final. In an average year, there are two or three Unit 430 pairs competing, and in 1997 Aidan Ballantyne and Gord McOrmond won the Flight A Championship in Dallas!

It may seem like a long shot to get to the National Final, but it's not: more than $50 \%$ of the players qualify in the first two stages, and the top three pairs in the third. You can qualify for the big show by putting together just three sessions of average bridge and one good two-session game. How hard is that?
(Only a few NAP Club Qualifying dates for this year have been scheduled, but we will try to post a list of those we receive at the May Sectional. At the September Sectional, we'll post a list of qualifiers to the Unit Final. Club managers should send me their qualifying game results, or a link to their location online, so that I can compile the list.)

# Unit Board Members 

## About to Change for 2006-07

The Unit Annual General Meeting takes place immediately after the Saturday afternoon session of the May sectional at Bonsor. This will be a fairly short meeting and the break time is extended a half-hour so that nobody needs to rush dinner. Please do your bridge civic duty and stay for the meeting.

One item on the agenda is the replenishment of Board Members for next year, and nominees are currently being collected by a Nominating Committee of Peter Morse, Richard Dunn and Gilbert Lambert. Any member of Unit 430 can also nominate from the floor at the meeting. Members attend about ten Board meetings a year and perform for Unit tasks.

Here are the members of the current Unit Board:

*Peter Morse<br>604/988-3927<br>(President, CBF Liaison, MUGs) pamorse@shaw.ca * members whose terms expire June 30, 2006.

Jennifer Ballantyne 604/438-3095
(VP, Trophies, DINO Liaison) jaballantyne@hotmail.com

Angela Fenton
(Secretary)
Beverley Hall
(Partnership Desk)
Gail Heuchert
(Tournament Co-Chair)
*David Hooey
(Memberships, Future Stars Sect.) karma@canada.com
*Bruce McIntyre 604/438-9735
(Matchpointer editor, IMP League) ooga@shaw.ca
Cate McKinnon 604/931-1318
(Education)
Cathy Miller
(Tournament Co-Chair)
*Joan Richards
(Treasurer)
*Howard Shimokura
(Special Events)
*Anne Smith
(STaC Co-ordinator)

604/929-4343
angelafenton@shaw.ca 604/220-5415
beverley_hall@telus.net 604/263-5599
gheuchert@telus.net 604/926-9297 604/931-1318 catemck@microsoft.com 604/421-2885 chattycathy1@shaw.ca 604/926-6354 richards6332@shaw.ca 604/737-1932 hshimok@shaw.ca 604/298-7879 annesmith0718@hotmail.com

## Parting Shots

## Advice for the new editor

Ben, I apologize.
Stringing things along for months before finally finishing my stint as editor frustrated a lot of people, but for you it must have been sheer torture. I can only hope that the instructions that I wrote, the initial meeting to give you a quick visual tour of the software I use, the templates I offer for your use and the help and advice I am happy to give whenever you need it is at least some comfort.
(But still, you really should go out of your way to insert a bunch of sarcastic cracks about me in your debut issue. I deserve it.)

You have my full support for any changes you wish to make to the print version of the Matchpointer. I will be your biggest fan, and not just because having you do the job frees me to do other things, but because I believe in you, perhaps more than you do at this point. You will be a great editor. Here's how:
$\perp$ Trust your voice. If you can tell a good story, you can write well enough to entertain people. I know you can tell a good story because I have heard you do it. There's nothing special about becoming a writer: you just need to get used to typing instead of telling. This is not English class, it's the Matchpointer. Everything's a story. Try to get the spelling right and the grammar reasonable, but remember that a great story always trumps a cool style.
$\vee$ Hack and slash. Over the years I have added many new departments to the Matchpointer. Take them out, and decide what you want to include. My stuff will live on in cyberspace anyhow.
$\diamond$ Get ready for the paparazzi. People will ask you when the next one is coming out all the time, even while holding the newest issue. (I sometimes want to ask them if they've read the last one yet and offer to give them a quiz.)

* Forget about articles aimed at specific classes of players. There is no reason a novice cannot follow a well-written article about squeezes; just as there is no reason an expert can know that he has nothing to learn from an article aimed at novices. Matchpointer articles should be aimed at everyone. Don't limit your audience.
- Style is unconscious. You can't deliberately develop one. You can create a distinctive look, but an overall style will take a while to fully emerge. Let your goal for the first few issues be to get the job done. The decisions you make to accomplish this goal will help define your style more than a choice of typefaces or borderline widths ever can.
$\checkmark$ Have fun! Don't detach yourself completely from the bridge world as you prepare an issue. Take a break; play a game; find an interesting deal and record it, maybe for the current issue, maybe for the next. Keep in touch.
Hope this helps. I look forward to reading your first issue; we all do. Good luck! -McBruce


## Tournaments \& Dates

May 1 - August 31, 2006

JULY 2006 (CONTINUED)
8 July Monthly Unit Game (pairs) at VBC, 7:30pm (details, page 32.)
13-23 Summer NABC: Chicago IL
20-22 Sequim WA Sectional
28-30 Spokane WA Sect. (0-200) AUGUST 2006
4-6 Seattle WA Sectional
5 August Monthly Unit Game (pairs) at VBC, 7:30pm (details, page 32.)
7-13 Calgary AB Regional
11 Matchpointer deadline for Summer issue, covering events thru Oct. 31, 2006
18-20 Nanaimo BC Sectional
25 Summer Matchpointer target release date for Ben Takemori's debut issue
21-27 Puget Sound Regional in Lynnwood WA (new site)
31 North American Pairs end of Club Qualifying period

## Unit 430 Main Events

## A One Year Planner

2006 Victoria Day Sectional May 19-22, 2006 at Bonsor Community Centre in Burnaby

Unit 430 Annual General Meeting
May 22, 2006, after the first
Saturday session (about 4:15 pm).

10th Annual Unit 430-sponsored District-wide STaC (Sectional Tournament at Clubs) Silver points at your local club! June 5-11, 2006.

2006 Evergreen Sectional
September 15-17, 2006 at the Queensborough Community Centre

2006 NAP Unit Final
Fall 2006 dates to be announced
Site: Vancouver Bridge Centre

2006 Fall Future Stars Sectional (0-300 masterpoints)
October 28 and 29, 2006 at the Vancouver Bridge Centre (unconfirmed)

2006 Round-Up Sectional November $10-13,2006$, at Bonsor Community Centre in Burnaby

2007 Trophy Sectional January 26-28, 2007 at the Engineers Hall in Burnaby

6th Annual Canadian Bridge Federation Canada-wide STaC (Sectional Tournament at Clubs) More silver points at your local club! February 19-25, 2007.

2007 Spring Future Stars Sectional April 14 and 15, 2007 at the Vancouver Bridge Centre (unconfirmed)

## Contributors

Thanks for your help!

Brad Bart<br>Richard Dunn<br>Dan Groves<br>Peter Morse<br>Brian Russell<br>Joerg Schneider<br>Anne Smith<br>Ben Takemori

All "It's Your Bid" Responders
Unit 430's many Club Managers
The growing number of helpful and informative local club web sites
all Matchpointer advertisers www.acbl.org www.cbf.ca www.d19.org

I thank everyone who has supported the Matchpointer with material and/or kind words during my editorship and urge you to keep the tradition alive by giving new editor Ben Takemori your full support.

MATERLAL (SEND SOME!) All suggestions and contributions are welcomed. Articles, letters, information, club news, or other submissions to the Matchpointer may be mailed or emailed to either the print or online editor, or given to any Unit Board Member or dropped off at a Unit 430 club. We encourage all members, from beginner to expert, to send bridge-related original material for publication.

MATCHPOINTER deadline schedule
New editor Ben Takemori will set up a deadline schedule to best suit his sched-
ule beginning with the next issue.
NEXT ISSUE: Summer 2006
(Ben Takemori's debut issue)

## Deadline:

Friday, August 11, 2006.

## Dates Covered:

August 25-October 31, 2006.

## Vancouver ACBL Unit 430 welcomes you to the



Lost en route? Directions: 604/220-5415
May 19-22, 2006 Bonsor Community Centre 6550 Bonsor, Burnaby (near Metrotown Centre)


## EVENT SCHEDULE \&

## FRIDAY, MAY 19

FRIDAY AFIERNOON START TIME: 1:30 PM Open Stratified Pairs
unlimited, $500-1500,0.500$
Senior Stratified Pairs
unlinited, $500-1500,0.500$
Future Masters Stratified Pairs
50-100, 20-50, 0-20
Friday Evening Start Time: 7:30 pm
Ben Lapidus Bracketed Knockout Teams
first of three sessions (two more Saturday)
Side Stratified IMP Pairs unfimited, 500-1500, 0-500
Future Masters Stratified Pairs

$$
50-100,20-50,0-20
$$

*** ACBL Members whth 0.5 masterpoints play FREEI *sue

## SATURDAY, MAY 20

SATURDAY Afternoon Start Time: 1:00 PM
Ben Lapidus Bracketed Knockout Teams semi-finals in all brackets
Open Pairs Qualifying
unlimited, 500-1500, 0-500
Future Masters Stratified Pairs
50-100, 20-50, 0-20
The Unit 430 Annual General Meeting will follow the afternoon session. The short meeting will leave plenty of time for a dinner break. Please attend.

Saturday Evening Start Time: 7:00 pm
(later than usual- the Annual General Meeting follows the aftemoon session) Ben Lapidus Bracketed Knockout Teams final-top bracker winner wins the Ben Lapidus Trophy Open Pairs Final Stratified Consolation Pairs
unlimited, 500-1500, 0.500
Future Masters Stratified Pairs 50-100, 20-50, 0-20

## SUNDAY, MAY 21

Sunday Afternoon Start Time: 1:00 pm StratiFlighted Open Pairs, first session

Fllght AX: unlimited, 0-3000
Fllght $B / C D: 750-1500,300-750,0-300$
Future Masters Stratified Pairs
$50-100,20-50,0.20$
Sunday Evening Start Time: 6:30 PM
StratiFlighted Open Pairs, second session
Fllght AX: unlimited, 0-3000.
Fllght B/CD: $750-1500,300-750,0-300$
Future Masters Stratified Pairs
50-100, 20-50, 0.20
MONDAY (VICTORIA DAY), MAY 22
Monday Start Times: 10:30 am, TBA
StratiFIfghted Swiss Teams [two sessions, VPs] Fllght AX: unllmited, 0-3000
Fllght B/CD: $750-1500,300-750,0-300$

Tournament Chair: Gall Heuchert, 604/263-5599, e-mall gheuchert@telus .net Partnerships: Bev Hall, 604/220-5415, beverley_halletelus .net Director-In-Charge: Brian Russell Single session entries will be sold for two-session pair games Entry Fees: $\$ 9.00$ (paid ACBL members), $\$ 9.50$ (non-members and unpaid Life Masters), $\$ 5.00$ for junior players (under 26) and/or full time students (with student ID). ACBL members with 0.5 MP play free in the Friday evening 0 -100 game.

