

Australian National Congress Canberra, 22-23 July 2017

South Australia's Representatives at this year's ANC are:-

SA Open Team

Nicolas Croft & Joachim Haffer
Philip Markey & Justin Williams
David Anderson & George Smolanko

SA Women's Team

Judy Hocking & Therese Demarco
Yadi Parrott & Felicity Smyth
Jackie Ward & Sue Phillips

SA Seniors' Team

Roger Januszke & John Zollo
Kevin Lange & David Parrott
Henry Dyall & Robin Pellen

SA Youth Team

David Gue & George Bartley
Ben Curtis & Jamie Simpson
Jack McDonald & Jarvis Dunsford

In the ANC Restricted Butler, the ABF are sponsoring two pairs from South Australia; Bill Bradshaw & Peter Dieperink and Erica Ji & Terry Pearson.

Contents

ANC SA State Representatives	1
A Tight Slam	1
Club News: The Riverland Bridge Club	2
A Bridge Tale from the Crypt.. ..	3
Regional GNOT Final 2017.....	4
Coulda, Woulda, Shoulda	5
New Bridge Laws	5
More About the New Laws	7
Women's & Seniors' Playoff Points.....	9
Results.....	10
SABF Matters.....	11
Coming Events.....	12

A Tight Slam

Ingrid Cooke

♠	T9532	♠	QJ4
♥	T762	♥	A
♦	8	♦	AKT54
♣	J75	♣	AQT8
♠	A6	♠	K87
♥	KQ843	♥	J95
♦	72	♦	QJ963
♣	K632	♣	94

When East opened 1♦ and rebid 3NT over West's 1♥ response, West bid 6NT. Five pairs were in 6NT but only two pairs (both sitting East) made it.

So how to do you make 12 tricks in NTs? Firstly, count your tricks. You have one spade, three hearts, two diamonds and probably four clubs. This gives you ten tricks and you need to find two more. To make your contract, the spade finesse has to work so your only hope for your 12th trick will be if the hearts break 4-3. So win the first trick in hand and cash the ♥A. Cash the ♣A and breathe a sigh of relief when both follow. Now cross to the ♣K, play the two top hearts and concede a heart. You now have your contract. If North had five clubs you could have finessed the ♣J back to hand. (If South had all the clubs the contract is down.)

Note that if West is the one playing the hand, a spade lead will defeat the contract since this will remove the crucial spade entry to hand. A spade lead by North would force declarer to play for a 3-3 diamond break which isn't there.

It's so easy when you look at the hands after the event!

Riverland Bridge Club News

The Riverland Bridge Club held a very successful two-day workshop with Lauren Travis and Justin Williams. The workshop on improving bridge play was held over the weekend, 22-23 April with 18 members attending. The Club used monies received through the ABF Marketing Grant to fund the lessons.

Lauren and Justin provided attendees with written notes, explanations and examples on the whiteboard as well as practice boards. Improving members' play, in a social and fun environment, can only make the Club stronger. The Riverland Club would like to encourage other Clubs to apply for the ABF Marketing grant if offered in the future.



Photo: Lauren Travis and Justin Williams from Adelaide; Gerard Scott, Loxton; Kaye Quast, Waikerie; Cathy Adams, Loxton

Helen Shannon

On Thursday 18 May, a celebration was enjoyed by all members of The Riverland Bridge Club on the occasion of Mrs Helen Shannon's 96th Birthday.

The club took this opportunity to honour Helen's outstanding contribution to bridge in Loxton by announcing that the annual Riverland Bridge Club Pairs Trophy would henceforth be named the Helen Shannon Trophy.

Helen had learnt bridge when young and after marrying and settling in Loxton with husband John, she continued to play with a group of friends.

In the early 1960s, Mrs Joan Scholz, President of the Loxton Hospital Auxiliary, suggested a bridge club might be another method of raising funds. Helen took over the role of tutoring and teaching existing and new members.

The Hospital Bridge Club continues to meet 45 years later with Helen still attending each Monday and still imparting her knowledge in an encouraging and appreciative manner. Thousands of dollars have been donated to the Hospital during that time.

Ten years ago, the Riverland Bridge Club was formed where a more competitive game of Duplicate Bridge is played, with permanent partners playing for points to win a weekly contest and gain Australian Masterpoints.

Helen adapted to this more rigorous form of playing bridge very quickly and with her partner of ten years, Bev Dalzell, has been able to successfully play in the weekly competition and against State Champion players at the annual Congress. She was also awarded a congratulatory medal for achieving the first grand slam bid and made in the newly formed club.

All members of the Loxton Club enjoy and admire Helen's graciousness, her sense of humour and her ability to always look a million dollars.

Long may she continue to play two or three times a week the bridge she loves. **Kate Yates, Secretary.**



Photo: Bev Dalzell and Helen Shannon with the Helen Shannon Trophy.

We had a partnership
misunderstanding. I assumed my
partner knew what he was doing.

A Bridge Tale from the Crypt

David Lusk

If only they would tell you in advance that your choice of lead is worth 30 IMPs to your side!

In the Autumn National Open Teams with the opponents Vulnerable, you pick up this hand as West:

West(Dealer)
 ♠ KQ654
 ♥ AJ5
 ♦ T3
 ♣ 653

East	South	West	North
Pass	1♣	1♠	X
4♠	5♣	Pass	6♣
6♠	Pass*	Pass	7♣
Pass	Pass	X	All Pass

*South's pass in this auction showed first round spade control.

It is your lead. Do you see a logical alternative to leading your ♥A? If you do, you are a genius as long as you select the right alternative. In the real world, you would almost certainly lead the ♥A. South ruffs this and leads the ♠A. You may wish to follow how things went from there by looking at the diagram below.

N-S Vul

West	North	East(D)	South
♠ KQ654	♠ 9	♠ JT72	♠ A83
♥ AJ5	♥ K9843	♥ QT762	♥ Void
♦ T3	♦ A54	♦ QJ97	♦ K862
♣ 653	♣ K742	♣ ♠Void	♣ AQJT98

After cashing the ♠A, declarer ruffs a low spade with dummy's lowest club. He next ruffs a heart and plays another spade, ruffing low again. When he leads another heart to ruff, your Jack appears and, with the K and 9 left in dummy, he draws trumps by playing a club to the ♣K and then dummy's remaining club back to hand.

Next he discards a diamond on his last club and is left with just his four diamonds. This is the position reached with 5 tricks to play:

West	North	East(D)	South
♠ ----	♠ ---	♠ ---	♠ ---
♥ -	♥ K9	♥ QT	♥ --
♦	♦ A54	♦ QJ9	♦ K862
♣	♣ ---	♣ ---	♣ T

Once South leads his last club, throwing the low diamond, what does poor East keep? He must part with one card out of ♥QT and ♦QJ9. Obviously a heart is no good as Dummy's 9 will grow up, so he has to throw a diamond. Declarer now plays a diamond to dummy's ♦A followed by the ♥K. His remaining cards in hand, the ♦K and ♦8 both score tricks now because of the earlier squeeze on East. This scored 2330 and was worth 18 IMPs after E-W were doubled in 5♠ at the other table and gave up only 500 points.

To give you an idea of the quality of declarer's play on this hand, the only other pair who reached 7♣ managed to go 2 light. In fact, not one other declarer out of more than 30 could engineer 13 tricks.

So was there a winning lead? Yes, there was but you'd say that it would have to fall out of West's hand by accident. Can you figure out what you must do to save a 29 IMP turnover?

Only a diamond lead defeats 7♣. To get the timing right on the hand, declarer needs a diamond link in both hands. The ♦A to reach dummy for a last heart trick and the ♦K in hand to reach two winning tricks in the ending which eventuated.

Regional GNOT Final 2017

Terry Pearson

The Regional GNOT Final will be held at the Tanunda Football Clubrooms on Sunday, 13 August 2017, hosted by Bridge in the Barossa. If you haven't already organised your team for this excellent event, I will give you three good reasons why you should.

- First, it's teams – indisputably the premier form of bridge.
- Second, the winning team will qualify to compete at the GNOT in Tweed Heads in November.
- Third, you might get to play a hand as memorable as this one.

Before we went to last year's GNOT, we were warned that our opponents would bid very aggressively against us and that turned out to be true, but I can't help thinking that on this hand, it helped more than hindered us. Sitting West, Vulnerable against not, I pick up:

♠ Q
♥ Q3
♦ AKQT75
♣ Q754

In first position, partner opens 1♣. Almost before I can say, 'At least four,' South dives in with 2♠, which suits me because it gives me the opportunity to bid 3♦ directly. That achieves three things: it shows the strength of my hand (more or less a game-force relying on the safety net of our known club fit), implies a lack of interest in no-trumps since I could have bid 3♠ asking for a stopper, and allows partner to make a rebid that will clarify the nature of his hand.

Before he gets the chance, though, North leaps to 4♠. Partner's options have become somewhat limited, but he doesn't think too long before bidding 5♣, sending the strong message that his club suit is good enough to play opposite my theoretical 'xx' tolerance and suggesting if not extra values then a 'pointy' kind of hand, rich in controls, but more suitable for playing than punishing 4♠.

Our style is not to open our 10 counts with one of a minor no matter how shapely they are, so even if I assume John's clubs are AKxxxx, he must also hold a major suit honour. For his free bid at the five level, it must surely be an ace - or there'll be a short sharp visit from the post-mortem fairy - and our opponents' bidding suggests that it will be the ♥A. With second round control of spades and a side suit that either will run or can be ruffed out with sufficient entries guaranteed through my club support, I bid 6♣.

South contemplated his lead for nearly five minutes before laying down the ♠A, but it didn't help. This was the full deal:

Dealer: East

E/W Vul

North

♠ K653
♥ J852
♦ J432
♣ 6

West

♠ Q
♥ Q3
♦ AKQT75
♣ Q754

East

♠ J8
♥ AT64
♦ 8
♣ AKT932

South

♠ AT9742
♥ K97
♦ 96
♣ J8

PS: I didn't ever find out the auction at the other table, but clearly our team mates didn't compete quite so aggressively, which paid off, because our opponents somehow settled in 4♣....

It's not enough to win the tricks that belong to you. Try also for some that belong to the opponents.

Alfred Sheinwold

COULDA...WOULDA...SHOULDA!

Colum Entsch

NOTE: Experienced players are invited to move smoothly to the next article without reading on. This column is for novices who still have much to learn about this enticing, alluring, endlessly beautiful game we love to play. This column is for those whose post mortems are tinged with chagrin over the ones that got away. Those readers are urged to think carefully and commit themselves to a line of play before turning the page and discovering the answer!

Morah's article in the last newsletter put me in mind of a hand from a couple of years ago. Sitting South, I get to 5♥ on these cards:

♠ T 8

♥ T 9 8 6 3

♦ 7 3

♣ A Q J 3

♠ K 7

♥ A Q J 7 2

♦ A Q T 9 5

♣ K

West cashes the ♠A and then plays another spade to my king, which seemed a promising start. I have no club losers, so all I have to do is avoid losing two tricks in the red suits. I can finesse for either red king, but I only have one entry to the table (by overtaking the ♣K) so I can only take one of those finesses. With only three hearts and six diamonds out, I figured that the♥K is more likely to be singleton, so I decided to lay down the ♥A and use the club entry to finesse the ♦K. Both followed small to the ♥A, so I am guaranteed a heart loser. Oh well. It seemed like my only chance now was to find the ♦K onside, so I used my club entry to play small to the ♦Q and went one off when the ♦K turned up in the West hand. I was by no means alone in going one off in 5♥, but I saw that there were also plenty of people in 4♥ or 5♥ who made 11 tricks. It turned out that there was a better option than just relying on the 50 per cent diamond finesse. I **COULDA** made this contract. Perhaps you **WOULDA** found the right play?

Turn to page 6, column 1 to find out...

NEW BRIDGE LAWS

David Anderson

The new 2017 Laws of Duplicate Bridge will come into effect at all SABF events on 1 September. A seminar for bridge club directors is planned to familiarise them with the changes.

LAW CHANGE NOTES FOR CLUBS

Please note that a further document aimed more at Directors will be sent out soon.

Law 1c Clubs, when replacing decks, should replace them with decks which have symmetrical backs.

Law 7 Note that boards must now be kept in the centre of the table **in the correct orientation**.

Law 9 Dummy may now attempt to prevent an irregularity by any player, but is still unable to draw attention to an irregularity which has occurred until play concludes, except for correction of a mistaken explanation by Declarer.

Law 13 When an incorrect number of cards is discovered before the player has made a call, the board will now be corrected and played, but may require the Director to later award an adjusted score.

This Law applies when one or more hands have more than 13 cards.

Law 14 This Law applies where there is a deck of less than 52 cards.

Law 15b If, after the beginning of the Auction period, one or more players discover they have previously played the board, the board is cancelled.

Law 20 If a player realizes they have given a wrong or incomplete explanation of partner's call or calls, they must call the Director prior to the facing of the opening lead.

A player may not ask questions for their partner's benefit or to elicit an incorrect response from their opponent.

Law 23 Comparable calls will be covered in the notes for Directors.

Law 24 This Law refers only to cards exposed during the Auction from the first call to the final pass. Law 49 refers to cards exposed by defenders during the play. For all other times the card is returned to the hand and Law 16 applies.

[Cont over in column 2]

[Cont. from page 5]

Here is the full deal:

	♠ T 8	
	♥ T 9 8 6 3	
	♦ 7 3	
	♣ A Q J 3	
♠ A 6 3 2		♠ Q J 9 5 4
♥ K 4		♥ 5
♦ K 4		♦ J 8 6 2
♣ T 9 5 4 2		♣ 8 7 6
	♠ K 7	
	♥ A Q J 7 2	
	♦ A Q T 9 5	
	♣ K	

After two rounds of spades, I have no more spades in either hand. When I cash the ♥A and both follow small, the only remaining trump out is the king. What I **SHOULD** have done next was eliminated the clubs by playing ♣K and overtaking with the Ace, cashing the ♣Q and ♣J (pitching two diamonds) and ruffing the last club in my hand to arrive at this position:

	♠ -	
	♥ T 9 8 6	
	♦ 7 3	
	♣ -	
♠ 6 3		♠ 5 4
♥ K		♥
♦ K 4		♦ J 8 6 2
♣ T		♣
	♠ -	
	♥ Q J 7	
	♦ A Q T	
	♣ -	

Now when I play a heart losing to the King, West must play either a black card or a diamond. On the lead of a diamond from West, both my diamond honours will win and I will ruff my last losing diamond. On the lead of any black card, I will get a ruff-and-discard. In other words, I will discard a diamond from dummy and ruff the club or spade in my hand, so that now I can cash my ♦A and I am left with only trump winners in dummy. Either way, 11 tricks are guaranteed!

(That worked out on this lie of the cards, but what if East had held the ♥K? If East had won the ♥K and made the mistake of leading a black card, again, I could use the ruff-and-discard in exactly the same way to make the balance of the tricks. If East had won the ♥K and returned a diamond, I would have had no choice but to put in the ♦Q and hope that East began with the ♦K as well. If West has it, I'll still be one off, but I'm no worse off than if I had simply tried that finesse to begin with.)

[Cont from page 5, column 2]

- Law 25 The criterion for judging when a call is unintended has become more stringent because loss of concentration is not justification for changing a call.
- Law 26 Players should be advised of the possible lead consequences when considering replacement calls.
- Law 27 Note that this Law refers to denominations (a suit or suits or NT) shown, not merely named.
- Law 30 Calls out of rotation may be withdrawn and later replaced with comparable calls which allow the offenders to continue bidding.
- Law 42 Dummy may now try to prevent *any* irregularity.
- Law 66 Declarer or defender may now inspect, but not expose, their own card played to a trick until one of their side plays to the next trick.
- Law 68 When claiming or conceding, the player must show their cards.
With the concurrence of *all four players*, play may now continue if the non-claiming or non-conceding side so requests, but the attained table result will then stand. This procedure can only be followed if the Director has not been called.
- Law 75 Players should note that it is an infraction to explain an agreement where one does not exist, e.g. by stating an opinion as if it were an agreement, or "I'm taking that as...".



POSITIONS VACANT EDITOR

**Contact a member of the
Management Committee if
you would like to take on
this role**

MORE ABOUT THE NEW LAWS ...

Jacob Duschek & Laurie Kelso

Law 23A – Comparable Calls

The 2017 Laws introduce a new concept: *comparable calls*. This concept will be used when an insufficient bid or a call out of turn has been made and not accepted; if the offender makes a comparable call at his legal turn, his partner will not be obliged to pass in the continued auction, and there will be no lead restrictions. In all the examples in this article, it is assumed that South made an insufficient bid or a call out of turn, and it is understood that West does not accept the infraction. I will make some assumptions about the meaning of the calls, mostly according to popular use among tournament players. In practice, the Director must always investigate the methods used by the actual pair.

Definition of Comparable Calls

Let us first see the definition of comparable calls as given in Law 23A:

A call that replaces a withdrawn call is a comparable call, if it:

1. has the same or similar meaning as that attributable to the withdrawn call, or
2. defines a subset of the possible meanings attributable to the withdrawn call, or
3. has the same purpose (e.g. an asking bid or a relay) as that attributable to the withdrawn call.

The intention is clear: If the illegal call does not provide any substantial information other than what is subsequently conveyed by the legal call, that legal call is deemed to be a ‘comparable call’.

Same or Similar Meaning

In practice there will be a ‘grey area’, as indicated by the wording in Law 23A1, “same or *similar* meaning”. A difference in meaning will normally be either in terms of strength or distribution. We will discuss these one at a time.

Similar Strength

Consider the following everyday example. East is dealer, but South opens 1♥ out of turn (not accepted).

East now opens 1♠:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
		1♠	2♥

Obviously, the 2♥ overcall does not have exactly the same meaning as the 1♥ opening. The opening bid shows about 11-20 HCP, whereas the overcall shows about 9-16 HCP.

The difference in the maximum strength of the two bids is rarely relevant in this auction, so let us focus on the minimum. The overcall can be made with reasonable playing strength on a hand which is just short of an opening bid. The difference in strength, both at the top and at the bottom of the range, is small, and we can accept the meaning as “similar”, i.e., it is a comparable call. There is a good chance that South’s mistake will not influence the result.

Should however South’s mistake nevertheless affect the auction or the play, i.e., if the additional information from the illegal opening bid (which is *authorized* for North) turns out to be useful for North, the Director adjusts the score. Note that the Director must not apply UI principles; instead, he must assess the likely auction and play had the illegal call never occurred at all. (This issue is worthy of a separate article.) The problem is somewhat different if South overcalls at the one-level after an opening bid out of turn. Now the overcall might be made on certain hands containing just 6-7 HCP, and the potential difference in strength could be quite large. Deeming this type of overcall comparable would now be quite dubious.

Another example of “similar meaning” pertains to a 1NT opening out of turn. Let us assume that it shows 15-17 HCP. When South overcalls 1NT or 2NT in the legal auction, it will be a comparable call even if the overcall shows 15-18 HCP (and promises a stopper). We can also accept this if the opening shows 14-16 HCP, but not if it shows 12-14 HCP.

Similar Distribution

We can also accept differences in the distribution shown, but not as freely as strength differences.

North is dealer, but South opens 1♥ out of turn (not accepted). North now opens 1♥:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	1♥	pass	2NT 1

1. 4-card support, game-forcing.

South’s 2NT response is game-forcing with at least 4-card support. Even if N-S play 5-card majors, 2NT should be accepted as being a comparable call. Both calls show a heart suit.

Let us instead consider the following example: East is dealer, but South opens 2♠, systemically showing at least 5-4 in spades and a minor, and 6-10 HCP (not accepted). East now opens 1♥:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
		1♥	?

[Cont over]

South is facing serious trouble. If he overcalls 2♠, he shows the same approximate strength, but the call only shows spades. This is not acceptable as a “similar meaning”, and it will not be a comparable call.

Alternatively, South could consider overcalling 2♥, a Michaels Cue bid. We can easily accept “at least 5-5” instead of “at least 5-4” (which we would do automatically under Law 23A2), however, the strength might be completely different; instead of the original 6-10 it could be extremely wide-ranging or maybe even two-tiered. Here a significant difference in strength will mean it is not a comparable call.

Subset of Meanings

Law 23A2 deals with situations where the calls clearly do not have “same or similar meaning”, but where the error is clearly of no importance because the legal call provides more precise information than the illegal call gave.

A typical example is the following. East is dealer, but South opens a Multi 2♦ out of turn (not accepted).

East now opens 1♦:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
		1♦	2♠

South’s two calls definitely do not have “same or similar meaning” – but when we include the fact that South has (legally) shown which major suit he holds, 2♠ is a comparable call.

Same purpose

The following accident has happened more than once:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	2NT	Pass	2♣ 1
1. Stayman after 1NT			

South wants to hear about North’s major suits, but he thought he saw North opening 1NT. Does South’s 3♣ bid have the same or similar meaning as 2♣ ?

Not if we define “meaning” in terms of the set of the hands that could make the call! After the 2NT opening, South could easily hold 5 HCP and a 4-card major, wanting to enable N/S to make a qualified decision between 3NT and 4 of a major.

South’s insufficient bid tells North that South either has either both majors or a much stronger hand than 5 HCP. We should not really squeeze this in under the “same or similar” clause. But the auction has quite a different balance when one player asks and the other responds. This is the reason for Law 23A3: South asks for majors in both cases, so we deem 3♣ a comparable call.

Opening Pass Out of Turn

There is a particular subtopic of comparable calls pertaining to an opening pass out of turn. If East is dealer, but South passes out of turn, South must also pass at his legal turn regardless of what East does. Even if it can be argued that South’s legal pass has no meaning at all because it is required by law, we have to consider it a comparable call, particularly to avoid lead restrictions. And so, since it is a comparable call, information from the opening pass is authorized for North.

If South passes at North’s turn, we must first await North’s call. The most interesting case occurs after 1 of a suit from North, e.g., 1♥. There are several responses that deny an opening hand, e.g., 1NT and 2♥.

These are comparable calls under Law 23A2. One might object that South has denied a pre-emptive bid by passing out of turn, which he might have had for a 1NT response, but this small difference is easily contained by “similar meaning” (which is also applicable under Law 23A2). A response in a new suit, being forcing and unlimited, is not a comparable call.

Concluding Remarks

The concept of comparable calls is fundamental to the rectification of insufficient bids and calls out of turn. When determining whether a call is a comparable call, some flexibility towards the offender is in order, especially concerning the strength shown. If there is additional information from the illegal call, but the legal call is a comparable call, this information is authorized for the offender’s partner. If this turns out to give the offending side an advantage, the Director adjusts the score considering the likely outcome had the illegal call never occurred at all. (June 2017)



Women's & Seniors' Playoff Points (WSPQP)

David Anderson

Entry to the Women's & Seniors' Trials Finals will from 2018 be determined using a playoff point system similar to that used to qualify players for the Open Trials final.

Potential entrants can earn these playoff points in the following ways:

1. Each Open Playoff point shall be worth 3 WSPQP, i.e. Open points earned count treble.
2. Pairs finishing in positions 11th to 15th in the Swiss Pairs, or the Open Trials Qualifying, shall each receive 10 WSPQP.
3. Pairs finishing in positions 16th to 20th in the above two events shall each receive 5 WSPQP.
4. Players may also earn WSPQPs in the Open Trials Consolation, awards being 15 for a top 5 finish, 10 for 6th to 10th and 5 for 11th to 20th. Members of the respective previous year's State Team may also earn points, as follows:
 - That team finished 1st or 2nd: 30 WSPQP each, automatic qualification if both members of the partnership were in that team.
 - That team finished 3rd – each player receives 15 WSPQP.
 - That team finished 4th – each player receives 10 WSPQP.

As is the circumstance with the Open Trials, only half of the points earned in separate partnerships in Butler events, or separate teams, may be counted towards a pair's total.

Finally, should there be a vacancy in the Final for a pair, or pairs, without WSPQPs then the possible candidates shall be ranked on their placing in the Open Trials Qualifying. If they played separately, then their ranking will be the lower of the two.

Existing Open Playoff Point Awards

Swiss Pairs Championship – first 60, second 45, third 40, fourth 35, fifth 30, sixth 25, seventh 20, eighth 15, ninth 10, and tenth 5.

Open Teams Championship phase one – first 60, second 40, third 30, fourth 20, fifth 15, sixth 10, and seventh 5.

Open Teams Championship phase two – first 60, second 40, third 30, fourth 20, fifth 15, sixth 10, and seventh 5.

State Teams Final – first 60, second 40, third 20, and fourth 15.

SABA GNOT Qualifying – first 60, second 40, third 30, fourth 20, fifth 15, sixth 10, and seventh 5.

State Pairs Championship – first 30, second 20, and third 10.

Open Trials Qualifying – first 60, second 45, third 40, fourth 35, fifth 30, sixth 25, seventh 20, eighth 15, ninth 10, and tenth 5.

WELCOME

ALEXANDRINA BRIDGE CLUB

Players meet at the Lutheran Church Hall, 2 Commercial Rd, Strathalbyn
For session times contact Norman Bullen: n.r.bullen2@internode.on.net

RESULTS

2017 ANOT

Open Pairs

1. Leigh Gold & Howard Melbourne
2. Mike Doecke & Bruce Neill
3. Philip Markey & Liam Milne

Seniors Pairs

1. Nigel Rosendorff & John Zollo
2. Andrew Braithwaite & Arjuna De Livera
3. George Kozakos & Michael Smart

Womens Pairs

1. Candice Ginsberg & Barbara Travis
2. Felicity Smyth & Judith Tobin
3. Sheila Bird & Karen Creet

Under Life Master Pairs

1. Raymond & Rita Jones
2. Terry Driver & David Schofield
3. Gary Frampton & Dave Sloan

Open Teams

1. Pauline Gumby, Avinash Kanetkar, Warren Lazer, Bruce Neill
2. Traian Chira, Laura Ginnan, Laurie Kelso, Sebastian Yuen
3. Peter Hollands, Chris Mulley, Tim Munro, Deana Wilson

Open Teams Final

1. Pauline Gumby, Avinash Kanetkar, Warren Lazer, Bruce Neill
2. Traian Chira, Laura Ginnan, Laurie Kelso, Sebastian Yuen

Under Life Teams

1. Joanne Bakas, Sally Fraser, Tassi Georgiadis, Catherine Thredgold
2. Gary Frampton, Kate Pinniger, Dave Sloan, Carla Sullivan
3. Bevin Brooks, Ingrid Cooke, Rodney Macey, Judy Zollo

CONSOLATION BUTLER - A GRADE

1. Ian & Vicky Lisle
2. Matthew McManus & Johnno Newman
3. Axel Johannsson & Liz Sylvester

CONSOLATION BUTLER - B GRADE

1. Terry Healey & Maureen Wilson
2. Sue Mann & Sam Swinton
3. Joanne Bakas & Tassi Georgiadis

CONSOLATION TEAMS

1. Elizabeth Adams, Jane Dawson, Murray Green, Andrew Peake
2. Marina Darling, Annette Maluish, Andrew Mill, Justin Mill
3. Nye Griffiths, Shane Harrison, Lakshmi Sunderasan, Justin Williams

SENIORS TRIALS

1. Roger Januszke & John Zollo
2. Kevin Lange & David Parrott
3. Henry Dyall & Robin Pellen

RESTRICTED ANC TRIALS

1. Bill Bradshaw & Peter Dieperink
2. Erica Ji & Terry Pearson
3. Elaine Kenny & Ann Matthews

SABA GNOT QUALIFYING

1. Russel Harms, Philip Markey, Jeff Travis, Justin Williams
2. David Anderson, Roger Januszke, George Smolanko, John Zollo
3. Andy Babiszewski, Phil Gallasch, Judy Hocking, Kevin Lange, Peter Popp

SWISS PAIRS CHAMPIONSHIP

1. Russel Harms & Jeff Travis
2. Paul Hudson & Felicity Smyth
3. Andy Babiszewski & Peter Popp

A GRADE ROTARY PAIRS

1. David & Yadi Parrott
2. George Bartley & David Gue
3. David Lusk & Howard Melbourne

B GRADE ROTARY PAIRS

1. Adel Abdelhamid & Julie Savage
2. Peter Teubner & Neil Welch
3. Bill Bradshaw & Peter Dieperink

ST VINCENT SWISS PAIRS CONGRESS

1. John & Terry Pearson
2. Milton Hart & Sharmini Hoole
3. Salam Al-Khoury & Adil Alkhoury

GOLDEN BUNNY EASTER TEAMS

1. Gopal Hingorani, Dianne Marler, Pam Morgan-King, Angela Norris
2. Adel Abdelhamid, Linda Alexander, Jeff Fallon, John Kikkert
3. Geraldine Eitzen, Jackie Franco, Sylvia Newton, Barbara Norman

Years ago there were only two acceptable excuses for not leading the suit your partner had opened; having no cards in the suit, and sudden death.

Alfred Sheinwold

SABF MATTERS

2017 Management Committee

President	John Zollo	gzollo@bigpond.net.au
Secretary	Angela Norris	southaustbridgefed@gmail.com
Treasurer	Paul Walker	pvwalker@gmail.com
Education & Training	David Parrott	yadi.david@bigpond.com
Chairperson of the Tournament Subcommittee	David Anderson	revoke1@live.com
Youth Coordinator	Phil Gue	adelaidebridge@bigpond.com
Committee	David Anderson	revoke1@live.com
Committee	Bob Clarke	rclark01@ozemail.com.au
Committee	Jill Allanson	ejallanson@bigpond.com.au
Committee	David Parrott	yadi.david@bigpond.com
Committee	Sue Phillips	suejohnp@tpg.com.au
Committee	Margaret Walters	margaret.walters@bigpond.com
Committee	Jinny Fuss	vfuss@pacific.net.au
Committee	Jeanette Lunnie	jeanette.lunnie@bigpond.com

Tournament Committee

- David Anderson
- David Parrott
- Phil Gue
- Carole Foreman
- Bob Clarke
- Arthur Porter
- Felicity Smyth

Contact members of this committee about issues relating to the timing, format, and organizing of SABF events.

Club news wanted. This newsletter is published quarterly. **Copy deadline** for the next issue is **1 September**.



Director: David Anderson

GENEROUS CASH PRIZES

♣ **Sat 28th Oct** **Pairs** 2 sessions: 10am & 2.30pm
♣ **Sun 29th Oct** **Teams** 2 sessions: 10am & 2.30pm

- **New venue:** Loxton Lutheran Primary School, 6 Luther Rd, Loxton SA
- Cost: \$30 each player/day (includes a light lunch)
- Registration: from 9am, games start 10am
- Entries close: Thu 26th Oct
- Phone: Grace Altschwager-0402 067 741 or email: David Anderson-revoke1@live.com

SABF EVENTS

SABF Club Congresses

Saturday 8 July	Tanunda	Bridge in the Barossa - Pairs
Sunday 9 July	Tanunda	Bridge in the Barossa - Teams
Saturday 2 September	Glenelg	Glenelg Congress
Sunday 8 October	Edwardstown	Bridge in the City Congress
Saturday 28 October	Loxton	Riverland Congress - Pairs
Sunday 29 October	Loxton	Riverland Congress - Teams
Saturday 4 November	Gawler	Gawler Teams Congress
Sunday 31 December	ABC	New Year's Eve Congress

SABF Events July – September 2017

The full Calendar of Events for 2017 is available online at:-

http://www.sabridgefederation.com.au/docs/Calendar_of_Events/SABF_Calendar_2017.pdf

State Teams Phase 1 Venue SABA Thursday 7.30pm	22 June, 29 June, 6 July, 13 July, 3 August
State Singles Championship Venue SABA Monday 7.30pm	7 August, 14 August, 21 August, 28 August
Open Trials Qualifying Venue SABA Thursday 7.30pm	10 August, 17 August, 24 August, 31 August, 7 September, 14 September
State Teams Phase 2 Venue SABA Thursday 7.30pm	21 September, 28 September, 5 October, 12 October, 19 October
State Mixed Pairs Championship Venue SABA Sunday 9.30am	24 September

GNOT Qualifying

Regional GNOT Final	Tanunda – 13 August
Under Grand Master GNOT Qualifying	St Vincent – 27 August

SABF Youth Bridge and Cards Club

Every Saturday afternoon, 1.30pm to 3.30pm

Adelaide Bridge Centre, 209 Glen Osmond Rd, Frewville
For players aged 7-24, keen to learn bridge. Free Sausage Sizzle lunch.

Newcomers contact the Adelaide Bridge Centre, phone 83792044
or email adelaidebridge@bigpond.com