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Cormack Trophy Winners

Best Women's team in the NZ Teams:

Team Pawson


Same Sex Pairs Winners:

Mark \& Paul Hangartner

## Airport Shuttle

If you want a shuttle to Hamilton Airport you must put your name on the whiteboard in the hotel foyer by 2 pm Saturday.

Today's Schedule

- NZ Teams Final
- Youth Test (NZ v Australia)
- Congress Open Swiss Pairs
- Congress Open Restricted Swiss Pairs 0930
- Congress Intermadiate Swiss Pairs 09301345
- Prize-giving Dinner

1930


## Coup of the Day 8

## Vienna Coup

The Vienna Coup is so named because it was first performed back in the heyday of Whist in Vienna in the 1860s. The coup is an unblocking play, the cashing of a winner, in preparation for a squeeze against one of the defenders.
To make the situation as clear as possible, we will look at only a partial hand diagram:


Declarer in a no trump contract requires all the remaining tricks but has only three winners. However, East is guarding both the major suits so could come under some pressure.

Say that declarer cashes the $A$ at this point. West and North follow suit and East does indeed have to give up her stopper in one of the majors. However, she can afford to pitch a heart because declarer will have no way back to hand to cash the queen after taking the heart ace. Though East was squeezed out of her heart stopper, this was of no benefit to declarer.

Now see the difference if, in the diagram position, declarer cashes the ace of hearts before leading to the diamond ace. Now East is truly squeezed. If she unguards the heart, declarer is in the correct hand to cash the queen while, if she instead discards a spade, the remaining honour falls under the ace and the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{J}$ is a winner.

Cashing the ace of hearts was the Vienna Coup and would have been both necessary and successful whichever defender was guarding both major suits.

If North's small diamond had actually been a heart, there would have been a positional squeeze against West even without cashing the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, so long as declarer read the position correctly, but East would again not have been under pressure. The Vienna Coup would again have made the squeeze effective against either defender, the low heart being discarded from dummy when declarer cashes the A .

## The Only Chance

In bridge we often have to take our only chance, but that chance all too often doesn't work out. However, sometimes the bidding strongly suggests that our play will succeed, as on this deal from the Point-a-Board Teams.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A A } 6 \\
& \text { •K } 108632 \\
& \text { - J } 4 \\
& \text { * J } 106
\end{aligned}
$$

- Q932
- J54
- A 108
* K 43

North opens with a weak $2 v$ after two passes and East overcalls $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and declares $4 \boldsymbol{n}$. The lead is the queen of hearts.

On the face of it, declare has three side-suit losers plus the ace of trumps (one loser goes away on the king of clubs). How to bring that number down to two?

Declarer wins the ace of hearts and plays a spade. North wins and exits with the jack of clubs so South wins the ace and continues with a second club. Declarer wins the king of clubs, discarding a heart from hand, ruffs the last club and draws the missing trump. Now the elimination is complete and he can play three rounds of diamonds. South wins but is endplayed, forced to give a ruff and discard, so declarer's last heart goes away as he ruffs in dummy, and the contract is home.

After North opened $2 v$ and South showed up with only a singleton spade, the endplay was a huge favourite to succeed, requiring only that South hold five-plus diamonds or both the queen and jack. And, of course, had South held only four diamonds, he would have had seven clubs and would probably have made an opening preempt as dealer.

## Brainteaser 8

USA has the largest rail network in the world, some $240,000 \mathrm{~km}$ of line, but what is the longest single railroad in the world?


## New Zealand Teams Semi-final Set One - Coutts v Jones

The New Zealand Teams semi-finals started with a bang, with a potential grand slam on the first deal.

## Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

^ Q 852

- J 82
- J 63
* Q J 9

A AK43
$\checkmark$ Q 543

- 8
- A 1054
$W_{S}^{N} E$

ค 9

- AK 10
- AKQ10974
* 82

ค J 1076

- 976
- 52
* K 763

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jones | Don | Millington | Courtney |
| - | Pass | 1 | Pass |
| 1 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

East could, I suppose, make some kind of strong two-level opening but, once she has opened $1 \star$, has no good rebid, unless perhaps playing some artificial method. Jenny Millington chose $4 \diamond$, which should really have shown a fourth heart, no doubt hoping that three honours would be good enough. She could hardly bid only $3 \diamond$, when game or slam would be missed far too often, while 3NT might show the big diamond suit but was hardly appropriate with just three low cards in the unbid suits.
Barry Jones asked for key cards and Jenny showed two plus the queen, which must have caused some temporary confusion as Barry was looking at the queen himself. Probably he worked out that the queen held was actually in diamonds. Anyway, with the path looking a little murky, this was not the time for a grand slam hunt, and he settled for $6 \vee$.
Rosie Don led the queen of clubs so Barry won the ace and played hearts from the top. When both red suits behaved he had all 13 tricks for +1010 .
You don't like their auction? Well, OK, but the auction from the other room was hardly a thing of beauty either. There, Liam Milne too opened $1 \star$ and had to find a rebid over $1 \vee$. He chose the very descriptive natural jump to $3 *$ to force to game. Tony Nunn raised to $4 *$ in readiness for a slam hunt, and Liam tried to show his heart support by bidding $4 \vee$. No such luck. Tony used Key-card and now the 5v response showed two key cards without the trump queen (clubs being trumps, of course). Tony settled for 6\% and Liam corrected to $6 *$.

There were again 13 tricks, this time scoring +940 so 2 IMPs to Team Jones.
When asked, Michael Courtney said that his partnership play a $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ rebid to show six diamonds, three hearts and a hand too good for $3 \diamond$. That would clear the initial hurdle, but East would still have something to spare.

In the other semi-final, Linlin Hu and Herman Yuen stopped in 3NT for +520 , but Shane Harrison and Jamie Thompson found a route to the excellent 7NT for +1520 and 14 IMPs to Team Thompson versus Team Liu.
The successful auction saw Jamie open $1 \star$ and raise the response to $4 v$. Shane asked for key cards and followed up with a 5 NT grand slam try over the three key-card response. Of course, if partner had all the missing key cards and $\vee$ Q, Jamie wanted to be in Seven so he jumped to 7 - and Shane converted to 7NT.
Team Jones picked up another couple of IMPs on Board 2 , then came two flat boards.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


Rosie opened a strong no trump and Barry doubled in fourth seat, showing 16+. That gave Jenny a tough choice of calls. She clearly had to bid the long hearts, but at what level? Two Hearts doesn't look enough but perhaps 3v would have been forcing and that looks to be too much. Perhaps some kind of Lebensohl sequence, 2NT followed by $3 v$, would fit the bill on an invitational hand?
In practice, Jenny bid a simple $2 v$ and Michael found an aggressive take-out double - except that Rosie wasn't sure what it meant and said she thought maybe penalty? She took it out anyway, having a good five-card spade suit, but perhaps the explanation prevented Jenny from competing to $3 \checkmark$ ?

Jenny led the singleton king of diamonds against $2 \boldsymbol{A}$. Next she switched to the eight of clubs so Barry could win
pianola

- JLT
the king and cash two more diamonds, on which Jenny discarded her remaining clubs. Ace and a third club for a ruff now meant a swift one down for -100 .
At the other table, Liam and Tony were down one in $4 \vee$ for -50 so that was another 4 IMPs to Team Jones.


## Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | - A 109 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 95 |  |  |
|  | - Q985 |  |  |
|  | * K 83 |  |  |
| ค KQ 862 | N |  | J 3 |
| - K 108 |  | W E | AJ 73 |
| - K J 2 |  |  | A 104 |
| * Q 5 |  | S | J 1064 |
|  | - 754 |  |  |
|  | - 642 |  |  |
|  | -763 |  |  |
|  | * A972 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jones | Don | Millington | Courtney |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Jenny's 1 NT was a one-round force so, having neither a sixth spade nor a second four-card suit, Barry had to rebid in his lowest three-card suit. Two No Trump was natural and invitational, and Barry had enough to go on to game.
Michael led the $\oplus 2$ and Jenny played low from the dummy. Best would have been for Rosie to put in the eight, forcing the ten, and setting up a third-round club lead through the remaining jack-six. That would not be sufficient to defeat the contract unless declarer took a losing red-suit finesse. In practice, Rosie went up with the king and returned a club, ducked to dummy's queen. Jenny led a spade to the jack then a second spade to the king and ace. Now Rosie played a club to Michael's ace and he returned a diamond to the queen and king. Jenny led a heart to the ten and queen but had the rest for +400 .
Liam and Tony stopped in partscore, making +180 but losing 6 IMPs. It was 15-0 in favour of Team Jones.

## Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.


^A
-K8763

- KQ6
* AJ32


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jones | Don | Millington | Courtney |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \downarrow$ | $2 \boldsymbol{~}$ | $3 \downarrow$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \downarrow$ | All Pass |  |  |

Rosie made a weak jump overcall and Michael raised in competition. At a different vulnerability, Rosie would no doubt have saved over $4 \checkmark$ but, being vulnerable, there was unlikely to be a big profit from doing so despite her seventh spade and she instead decided to try to defeat $4 \vee$ by leading her singleton club.
Barry won the queen of clubs and led a heart to the king and ace. Rosie returned the queen of spades, which Michael overtook with the king but, of course, that lost to the ace and Barry played a heart to the queen. When the jack fell he had just to concede a diamond; 1 1tricks for +650 .
At the other table Pat Carter and Julie Atkinson found the save in 4 A doubled. This was down two for -500 , so another 4 IMPs went on to the Team Jones tally and they led by 19-0.

## Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.



Michael opened 4n and that silenced everyone - Jenny could not double in fourth seat as that would have been for take-out, so 4^ scooped the pool.

Barry led his club. Jenny won the ace and returned a club for him to ruff and now he played king and another heart to the ace. Michael ruffed and laid down the king of spades but nothing good happened there and he eventually lost three spades and a diamond for down three and -150 .

Going down three rarely feels that great, but the 4a opener had actually worked very well as E/W could make 11 tricks in either red suit. In fact, at the other table the contract was 3 NT , making 11 tricks for +460 after a spade lead round to East's tenace, and Team Coutts were on the board with 7 IMPs.


## Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.



One Club could have been two cards, $1 *$ showed hearts, and $1 v$ exactly three-card support. Two No Trump was natural and invitational and Barry had nothing to spare so passed.
Michael led a low spade to the nine, jack and king and Jenny played a club to the ten and ace,. Rosie returned a spade so Michael won the ace and cleared the suit and now Jenny played a second club, the queen losing to the king. Michael cashed the long spade and exited with a diamond and Jenny, slightly lazily won the ace and claimed eight tricks for +120 . Of course, the fall of the $\% 9$ would have meant an overtrick had she played the hand out.
At the other table, the contract was $2 \boldsymbol{A}-3$ by N/S for -300 so Team Coutts picked up 5 IMPs.
The set score was 19-12 in favour of Team Jones, but their 12 IMP carry-over advantage meant that Team Coutts actually led by 24-19 overall. There were three more sets to play.
Team Liu won the set by 27-23 in the other semi-final but Team Thompson had a 12 IMP carry-over so led by 35-27 overcall.

## Player Sponsorship

The Waikato Bays Region sponsors three individuals to play at the National Congress each year.
Each of the three gets a $\$ 200$ contribution from the Region to help with their expenses. Not only is this good for the players concerned, but it is also good for the congress, as each needs
a partner so there may be six extra players taking part.
In 2017 the three sponsored players are two from Taupo and one from Aroha.

## Better to be Lucky than Good

Being both lucky AND good makes you unbeatable. Given a choice between the two, lucky can be an awfully potent force in the bridge world. Take this example from the Point-a-Board Teams.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

| A J 8763 <br> - Q95 <br> - J32 <br> * 63 | - Q 5 <br> - K J 3 <br> -A98654 <br> * 52 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $W_{S}^{N} E$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{*}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } 102 \\ & 10842 \\ & \text { K } 107 \\ & 1097 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | - A 94 <br> - A 76 <br> - Q <br> * AK Q J 84 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East |  | South |
|  | Carter |  |  | Hutton |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  | 1** |
| Pass | 2 | Pass |  | 4 |
| Pass | 4 | Pass |  | 7\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |  |

Malcolm Carter passed the North hand and Tony Hutton opened $1 ヶ$ in fourth seat. Now Malcolm jumped to $2 \star$, maximum pass and unbalanced. This caused problems for Tony, as this hand could have opened $2 \star, 10-13$ with six diamonds. Did Malcolm therefore have a weak sevencard suit?

Tony jumped to $4 \diamond$, Minorwood, and the $4 \checkmark$ response showed one key card. There was no way to find out whether this was the ace or the king, but Tony decided to guess that it was the ace and bid $7 \&$ !

The opening spade lead went to the queen, king and ace. Tony drew trumps and played a diamond to the ace and ruffed a diamond, a heart to the jack and ruffed another diamond, and that established the rest of the diamonds. Now a heart to the king allowed him to cash the diamonds and his spade losers went away; 13 tricks for +2140 .

So how lucky was that? First, the one key-card was indeed the ace rather than the king; second, the heart finesse worked; third, diamonds were three-three. I suppose that the only consolation for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ was that at least it was point-a-board, so it was only a board, and not the huge swing they would have conceded at IMPs.

I heard another story about this deal. After North opened $3 *$, far from being everyone's choice, I would hope, South put her into $6 \diamond$. The lead was a spade round to the queen and declarer led a low diamond towards the bare queen at trick two. East ducked! The queen of diamonds scored so declarer can back to hand with a spade ruff and
played ace and another diamond. The three-three break meant all declarer's problems were over, the third heart going away on the clubs for +1370 and another winning board.

## When is a Tie not a Tie?

The NZ Teams quarter-final match between Bach and Thompson ended with the scores tied at 92 IMPs apiece. Extra boards, you think? Well, that would often be the case but not in this particular one. There had been a very slow table which had not managed to play one of the boards, and one team had achieved a particularly good result at the table which had played the board.

In these circumstances, Law 86 B 1 is applied.

## 86 B1

## Single Result Obtained

In team play when the director awards an adjusted score and the result at the other table between the same contestants is clearly favourable to one side, the director shall award an assigned adjusted score (see Law 12C1(c), but for multiple adjusted scores see B2 following).

The score assigned was the datum of all the other results achieved on the board, and this gave an 11 IMP swing to the Thompson team, who therefore won the match by 103-92 without the need for extra boards.

You learn something every day - this is the first time I have ever seen a match decided in this fashion.

## Brainteaser Solution

Russia's Trans-Siberian Railway is $9,289 \mathrm{~km}$ in length.


## Decisive Deal

The NZ Teams quarter-final match between Jarvis and Liu was very close throughout. Team Liu eventually won it by 5.35 IMPs, this being the decisive board from the final segment.

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

- J 742
- Q J 94
- Q 52
* K 2

ค AK963
$\checkmark$ A

- K 10
* 87654

| N | ^ Q J 8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $W^{N} E$ | - KJ8632 |
| S | - A873 |
| - 5 |  |
| - 75 |  |
| - J 964 |  |
| * A Q J 10 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chen | Kenneth | Hиo | Kathy |
| - | Pass | 1v | 2\% |
| Dble | Rdbl | $2 \vee$ | Pass |
| 2^ | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

Kathy Yule overcalled and Kenneth Yule redoubled, but if anything the club bidding helped E/W as it implied that there would be little wastage on the E/W cards. When Chen bid spades at his second turn (an immediate 2A would not have been forcing), Huo splintered, showing spade support with short clubs, and Chen took control, asking for key cards then for the trump queen. Six Spades showed the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ but denied a desire to show any side-suit kings along the way.

Kenneth led the king of clubs, which Chen ruffed in dummy. He led a heart to his ace, ruffed a second club and cashed the king of hearts for a club discard. Next Chen ruffed a heart then played three rounds of diamonds, ruffing. He ruffed a club with the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$, a diamond with the a A, and exited with a club. Kenneth, down to nothing but trumps, had to ruff and lead into the A A 9 at trick 12 to give the contract.

Very nicely played for +1430 , and with the Team Jarvis E/W stopping in game at the other table, worth 13 IMPs to Team Liu, more than the eventual margin of victory.


Cock \& Buu


## New Zealand Teams Semi-final - Set Four - Liu v Thompson

Having trailed by 51-64 at the midpoint in their NZ Teams semi-final against Team Thompson, Team Liu had turned the match around in the third set to lead by 92-72 with 12 boards to play. Would there be another momentum shift or did Liu now have a following wind?

Board13. Dealer North. All Vul.
^ K Q

- AK 72
- A J 102
* K 74


Shiyu Huo opened a strong club and Michael Whibley overcalled. When Jun Chen doubled to show 5-8 HCP, Matthew Brown took the opportunity to introduce his own suit. Huo jumped to 2NT, 19-21, and Chen transferred then bid 3NT to offer a choice of games. Michael led the nine of hearts, overtaken by Matthew and won by Huo. He cashed the king of spades, and the second top heart then overtook the queen of spades and ran off all the spade winners, coming down to three cards in each minor. Now he played a diamond to the jack. Had Michael held the ace


Matthew Brown
of clubs, he would now have been endplayed to give declarer his ninth trick. On the actual lay-out, however, Michael could lead a club to Matthew who had three hearts to cash for down one and -100 .

With no E/W bidding in the other room 3NT was a much more comfortable prospect and after a diamond lead came to 10 tricks for +630 and 12 IMPs to Team Thompson, the perfect start for the trailing team.

\section*{Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul. <br> - 109 <br> - AQ42 <br> - Q954 <br> * J 108 <br> ^ K 652 <br> - 6 <br> - AK 1072 <br> * AQ3 <br>  <br> ^ J 8743 <br> - K7 <br> - J3 <br> * K 954 <br> ^ A Q <br> - J 109853 <br> - 86 <br> * 762 <br> | West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Huo | Whibley | Chen |
| - | - | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ |
| Dble | $4 \vee$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |}

Chen opened with a weak two bid and Matthew doubled. Huo's raise to $4 \checkmark$ was not sufficient to silence Michael, who bid 4a and played there.

After a heart to the ace and club switch, Michael won in hand and led a spade up. Chen won the ace and returned a club but that was it for the defence; +450 .
Somebody did too much bidding at the other table, where Shane Harrison and Jamie Thompson saved in $5 v$ over 4a and that was down five for a bloody -1100 . The 12 IMPs won on the first deal had gone straight back again.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bullet \text { Q J } 10873$ |  |
|  | - K 107 |  |
|  | \& J 986 |  |
| $\wedge$$\wedge$$\bullet$ K 253 |  | ^ AJ 1074 |
|  |  | - A964 |
| - A864 | W E | - Q9 |
| $\div$ K 73 | S | * 52 |
|  | ค K Q 82 |  |
|  | - 5 |  |
|  | - J 532 |  |
|  | * A Q 104 |  |

- K 107
* J 986

pianola

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Huo | Whibley | Chen |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{v}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{v}$ | Pass |
| 3^ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Huo opened a weak two bid and when that came round to Matthew he doubled. Facing a passed hand, Michael was unwilling to commit to game so cuebid $3 v$ as a good $3 n$ bid and passed the 3 a response. He would have been mildly surprised to see Chen double the final contract.
Huo led the queen of hearts, Matthew winning in hand with the king and leading a trump. That got the not entirely unexpected bad news and he put in the jack, losing to the queen. Chen returned a diamond and Matthew had little option but to run it, losing to the king. Back came the jack of hearts to the ace and ruff, and now Chen played ace and another club. There was still the king of spades to come so the contract was down one for -200 .
At the other table, Linlin Hu and Herman Yuan left their opponents to play $3 \vee$ and that was down three for -150 and 8 IMPs to Team Liu.

## Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.



It's a matter of personal styler, but I wouldn't open that East hand, or at least not with 1n - I might consider opening a weak no trump. Matthew showed a constructive raise but, for obvious reasons, Michael was not interested. Chen led the four ofdiamonds to the jack and queen. It looked natural, with a diamond ruff looming, to lead a low spade to the ace then play a second round, but that meant two trump losers to go with the three aces and the contract was down one for -50 .

In the other room, E/W reached 4n doubled and were two down for -300 and 6 IMPs to Team Thompson.
At the midpoint in the set, Team Liu had added 1 IMP to their lead and, with six boards to play, a 21 IMP deficit required only two substantial swings to turn the match around. That is not the way it happened.

## Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- 974
- K 863
- A
* K Q 942

> ^K 63
> - 952
> - K983
> * J 65

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Hиo | Whibley | Chen |
| - | - | - | 1\% |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | $2 \vee$ |
| Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | 4 | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | Rdbl | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 5NT |
| Pass | 7v | All Pass |  |

Chen opened a strong club and the $2 *$ response showed $8+$ HCP with at least five clubs. Hearts were agreed and cuebidding commenced. When Michael doubled the $4 *$ cuebid Chen left it round to his partner and the redouble confirmed first-round control. Now he took control by asking for key cards and, on finding that all were present, bid 5NT to invite the grand slam. With a potential source of tricks in clubs, Huo had a clear 7『 bid.
Matthew led a diamond. Chen won the ace, drew trumps and tested the clubs so soon had all 13 tricks for +1510 .
Shane and Jamie missed the grand slam at the other table, stopping a level lower for +1010 but 11 IMPs to Team Liu.
Both N/S pairs bid a cold small slam on the next deal and flattened it by making the overtrick, but then Team Liu put the match safely to bed with three substantial swings in a row.

## Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

$\wedge-$
$\bullet 72$
A Q 10543
$\&$ AQ 862


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Huo | Whibley | Chen |
| - | 1 | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | 5 | Dble | All Pass |

Huo's 1 opening was Precision so didn't promise the suit at that point. However, when he next bid at the five level, vulnerable against not, it was clear that he had an extremely two-suited hand. Michael had a close decision whether to double or to bid $5 \boldsymbol{A}$, but the former looked like a sure plus while the latter might not be as the minor-suit honours might not be working in a spade contract. He doubled and that ended the auction.
A heart lead would have netted +500 , but the king of spades, possibly starting a forcing defence, can hardly be criticised. Huo won the ace of spades, pitching a heart from hand, and led a club. On seeing Matthew show out, he put in the queen, losing to the king, and Michael returned a heart. That was ducked to Matthew's jack and he now switched to a spade, ruffed by Huo. Now came the key play from declarer's perspective - he laid down the ace of diamonds. The fall of the bare king was wonderful news for Huo, he continued with a low club from hand. Michael had to win the jack and played a heart, but Huo could ruff with the ace and draw trumps with dummy's ten and nine then finesse against the jack of diamonds. That was just one down for -200 .
At the other table 4a was doubled and made with an overtrick for +690 and 10 IMPs to Team Liu.

## Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

ค. 5

- J 1053
- J 952
* K 1087


Michael opened with a pre-empt and Chen doubled for take-out. Huo responded in his four-card major and was left to play there.

Michel did not lead a top diamond, as would many, preferring the singleton club. Matthew won the ace and returned the two of clubs, suit preference for diamonds, and Michael took his ruff then cashed the ace of diamonds. After some thought, he continued with the king of diamonds but Matthew ruffed it to give a second club ruff
and there was still a heart to come for down two and -100 .
At the other table, $3 *$ doubled was left in and proved to be unbeatable. Plus 670 meant a further 11 IMPs to Team Liu.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ^ K Q J } 103 \\ & \vee K \\ & 1092 \\ & * \text { Q } 983 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ค 9842 <br> - J 10 <br> - AJ 63 <br> * K 65 | $W_{S}^{N} E$ |  | ค 76 <br> - AQ 543 <br> - KQ 5 <br> * AJ 2 |
|  | ค A5 <br> - 98762 <br> - 874 <br> - 1074 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brown | Hиo | Whibley | Chen |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 24 | Dble | 3n | Dble |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

With N/S announcing that they had the spade suit and would be able to run it in a not trump contract, Michael and Matthew got to the reasonable heart game.
Three rounds of spades forced Michael to ruff low and he was over-ruffed. Still, a decent heart split would see the contract home courtesy of the marked on the auction heart finesse. Michael won Chen's diamond switch with the ace and played the ten of hearts to the king and ace then back to the jack of hearts, learning the bad news. There was a trump to be lost so the contractw as down one for -100 .
At the other table, N/S played 2n , making just the five trump tricks, for -300 and 8 IMPs to Team Liu.
The set score was 62-19 in favour of Team Liu, and they were through to the final by a score of 154-91. In that final, to be played over $6 \times 12$-board segments, they would face Team Coutts who, having gone into the fourth quarter of their semi-final against Team Jones down by 10 IMPs, dominated the final set and won by 115-83.


## Point-a-Board Teams Final Rankings

SOMERVILLE (20)
KER (23)
LEI (36)
FRANCIS (31)
YANG (32)
LIU (44)
COLES (49)
REID (50)
BRAITHWAITE (41)
JENNER-O'SHEA (21)
ROBERTSON (29)
WILSON (33)
PARKER (13)
WU (30)
LIVINGSTON (38)
FISHER (40)
SCHUMACHER (9)
PERFECT (27)
JOHNSTONE (28)
OZENIR (46)
NEWTON (12)
HAWKINS (24)
SKIPPER (35)
CARR (5)
FOSTER (39)
WALLIS (25)
PARKES (45)
WATSON (2)
WORTHINGTON (10)
TERRY (19)
HUMPHREY (34)
MASTERS (37)
COOPER (18)
INGLIS (22)
BENNETT (7)
WALTERS (16)
FOIDL (26)
D'ARCY (42)
DRISCOLL (43)
FRASER-HOSKIN (4)
HARRIS (14)
HANNA (15)
HANCOX (6)
BOWERS (17)
HALL (3)
WINSOR (11)
BREWER (1)
FENWICK (8)

Points

## 90

88
87
82
82
82
80
80
79
78
78
78
76
76
76
76
75
75
75
75
74
74
74
73 73 72
72 71 71 70 70 70 69 69 67 66 66

## 66

## 66

 64 64 64 62
## 62

## 61

 60 59 51W-D-L
5-0-1
5-1-0
4-1-1
4-2-0
5-0-1
3-1-2
2-1-1
4-0-0
4-0-2
4-1-1
4-0-2
4-0-2
3-2-1
3-0-3
2-0-4
4-0-2
2-1-3
3-0-3
3-1-2
2-2-2
3-1-2
2-1-3
3-2-1
3-0-3
3-0-3
2-0-4
3-0-3
3-0-3
2-1-3
3-0-3
2-1-3
2-1-3
2-1-3
1-2-3
1-3-2
3-0-3
2-0-4
1-0-5
2-1-3
2-0-4
3-0-3
2-0-4
2-0-4
2-0-4
2-1-3
1-1-4
1-0-5
0-0-6
-hotheconterincicentre.

## New Zealand Seniors Teams

|  | Imps |
| :---: | :---: |
| WINIATA (18) | 111 |
| VAN RIEL (36) | 85 |
| HENSMAN (40) | 82 |
| HURLEY (31) | 87 |
| PALMER (33) | 59 |
| DOUGALL (9) | 54 |
| ABRAHAM (24) | 55 |
| CLAYTON (29) | 73 |
| MORRIS (19) | 31 |
| WATT (2) | 30 |
| DODDRIDGE (32) | 25 |
| ROBB (27) | 24 |
| HENTON (26) | 48 |
| ANDREW (28) | 10 |
| MCLEOD (7) | 17 |
| KELLY (25) | 12 |
| GROVER (35) | 23 |
| BROMFIELD (11) | 15 |
| WOOD (39) | -1 |
| DAVIS (13) | 14 |
| TOPLIS (37) | 1 |
| MEYER (5) | 0 |
| BUTLER (16) | -11 |
| BACH (38) | -14 |
| SUTICH (14) | -12 |
| MINCHIN (17) | -24 |
| NISBET (12) | -24 |
| WINTERS (30) | -18 |
| WALDVOGEL (20) | -41 |
| NEELS (21) | -55 |
| RUDDELL (34) | -42 |
| MACDONALD (22) | 4 |
| CHAPPELL (3) | -42 |
| CHAPMAN (4) | -64 |
| MCARTHUR (10) | -59 |
| BLOY (23) | -52 |
| HAYWARD (15) | -112 |
| BOULTON (8) | -66 |
| NORRIS (6) | -126 |
| MONAGHAN (1) | -97 |


| VPs | W-D-L |
| :--- | :--- |
| 86.16 | $5-0-1$ |
| 82.10 | $5-0-1$ |
| 81.46 | $5-0-1$ |
| 81.34 | $5-0-1$ |
| 76.87 | $4-0-2$ |
| 74.56 | $4-0-2$ |
| 73.03 | $4-0-2$ |
| 72.45 | $4-0-2$ |
| 72.14 | $5-0-1$ |
| 68.86 | $4-0-2$ |
| 66.09 | $3-0-3$ |
| 65.82 | $3-1-2$ |
| 65.80 | $2-0-4$ |
| 65.40 | $4-0-2$ |
| 64.47 | $3-0-3$ |
| 64.29 | $4-0-2$ |
| 63.47 | $3-0-3$ |
| 62.55 | $3-0-3$ |
| 61.56 | $4-0-2$ |
| 61.18 | $2-0-4$ |
| 58.34 | $2-1-3$ |
| 58.23 | $2-0-4$ |
| 57.75 | $4-0-2$ |
| 56.56 | $3-0-3$ |
| 55.28 | $2-0-4$ |
| 55.24 | $3-0-3$ |
| 52.87 | $2-0-4$ |
| 51.73 | $2-0-4$ |
| 51.40 | $3-0-3$ |
| 51.28 | $2-0-4$ |
| 50.31 | $2-0-4$ |
| 50.21 | $2-0-4$ |
| 49.53 | $2-0-4$ |
| 47.45 | $3-0-3$ |
| 47.20 | $2-0-4$ |
| 46.66 | $2-0-4$ |
| 43.14 | $2-0-4$ |
| 40.93 | $1-0-5$ |
| 34.19 | $2-0-4$ |
| 32.10 | $0-0-6$ |
|  |  |

## New Zealand Intermediate Teams

JOSEPH (4)
Imps

CULLEN (20)
RIGTER (19)
ROBINSON (22)
SOUNDRA (13)
BROADHURST (28)
CARDNO (17)
HEARN (11)
HOUGHTON (21)
BUSH (14)
WACKROW (3)
COOPER (27)
SCOTT (5)
GRAHAM (1)
KEIJZER (10)
COHEN (12)
RUSS (16)
SMITH (2)
SCHUMACHER (6)
ARLIDGE (26)
DIXON (23)
SCHUCK (9)
ROPE (8)
GRANT (25)
SAUNDERS (15)
COON (24)
PATERSON (7)
CRAWSHAW (18)

133
68
62
44
40
43
30
36
34
27
9
9
-1
-6
-3
-3
-6
$-13$
-18
-18
-29
-30
-34
-23
-42
-37
-52
-68
-143

VPs
92.94
79.36
74.40
73.38
70.46
69.13
68.97
68.10
67.85
64.38
63.05
59.23
58.83
58.80
58.25
57.92
57.60
56.12
54.49
53.87
53.17
53.07
53.00
51.11
49.65 2-0-4
$45.11 \quad 2-0-4$
43.39 1-0-5
24.37 0-0-6

W-D-L
5-0-1
5-0-1
4-0-2
5-0-1
4-0-2
3-0-3
4-0-2
3-0-3
4-0-2
3-0-3
4-0-2
3-0-3
3-0-3
3-0-3
2-0-4
2-1-3
3-0-3
3-0-3
1-1-4
3-0-3
3-0-3
3-0-3
2-0-4
3-0-3

# New Zealand Teams 

## Semi-finals

| Coutts | $115-83$ | Jones |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Liu | $154-91$ | Thompson |

Final (after 2 of 6 Sets)
Coutts
89-21
Liu

## Youth Test

(after 2 sets of 6)
New Zealand 34-71 Australia

Hotil \& conferince centre

# Open Swiss Pairs after 3 of 9 Rounds Top 50 (of 132) 

|  |  | Imps | VPs | WDL Next |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | PAMELA DRAVITZKI / REBECCA OSBORNE (47) | 64 | 51.43 | 3-0-0 | 100 |
| 2 | KITTY MUNTZ / LEIGH GOLD (100) | 68 | 51.09 | 3-0-0 | 47 |
| 3 | TRUDY LANGE / ROSEMARY MATSKOWS (64) | 45 | 47.45 | 3-0-0 | 128 |
| 4 | JAMES YANG / YUZHONG CHEN (128) | 44 | 46.84 | 3-0-0 | 64 |
| 4= | PETER HIRZEL / ROGER TOPLIS (63) | 43 | 46.84 | 3-0-0 | 17 |
| 6 | EFFIE GALLIE / SARAH GREEN (17) | 52 | 44.93 | 2-0-1 | 63 |
| 7 | SERHAT OZENIR / REBECCA WOOD (117) | 34 | 44.04 | 3-0-0 | 26 |
| 8 | JAMIE THOMPSON / MICHAEL WHIBLEY (26) | 55 | 43.36 | 2-0-1 | 117 |
| 9 | WAYNE BURROWS / CLAIR MIAO (13) | 37 | 42.96 | 3-0-0 | 3 |
| 10 | DIANA LEES / ALISTER BUCHANAN (3) | 30 | 42.70 | 3-0-0 | 13 |
| 11 | GEO TISLEVOLL / MICHAEL WARE (20) | 29 | 42.40 | 3-0-0 | 90 |
| 12 | ALAN DICK / HEINI LUX (90) | 28 | 41.77 | 3-0-0 | 20 |
| 13 | ANNE SOMERVILLE / KATE DAVIES (33) | 33 | 41.21 | 2-0-1 | 5 |
| 14 | GINA HSU / ALAN CURRIE (5) | 32 | 40.96 | 3-0-0 | 33 |
| 15 | MARTIN BLOOM / PETER GILL (40) | 25 | 40.95 | 3-0-0 | 82 |
| 16 | YIWEI QI / EDDY TAN (82) | 25 | 40.32 | 3-0-0 | 40 |
| 17 | STEVE GRAY / LINDSEY GUY (102) | 28 | 39.48 | 2-0-1 | 46 |
| 18 | OWEN CAMP / PATRICK CARTER (46) | 24 | 38.97 | 2-0-1 | 102 |
| 19 | IAN BRASH / CHRIS TURNER (66) | 25 | 38.74 | 2-0-1 | 88 |
| 20 | ANNA KALMA / SONIA CRAWFORD (88) | 24 | 38.64 | 2-0-1 | 66 |
| 21 | MARK ROBERTSON / SYLVESTER RIDDELL (105) | 23 | 38.32 | 2-0-1 | 31 |
| 22 | JOHN PATTERSON / MURAT GENC (31) | 20 | 37.98 | 2-0-1 | 105 |
| 23 | ARTHUR BENNETT / GILLIAN BENNETT (72) | 21 | 37.88 | 2-1-0 | 12 |
| 24 | CHRIS ACKERLEY / DOUGLAS RUSSELL (12) | 21 | 37.76 | 2-0-1 | 72 |
| 25 | RICHARD LAPTHORNE / NEIL HAWKINS (131) | 20 | 37.53 | 2-0-1 | 125 |
| 26 | TRISH DOWNWARD / MARY BUCKLAND (125) | 29 | 36.95 | 1-0-2 | 131 |
| 27 | NEIL STUCKEY / GLENIS PALMER (71) | 20 | 36.91 | 2-0-1 | 89 |
| 28 | GREG BUZZARD / MARILYN JACKSON (89) | 19 | 36.70 | 2-0-1 | 71 |
| 29 | HELENA DAWSON / ANN BAKER (70) | 18 | 36.64 | 2-0-1 | 98 |
| 30 | JUDY MCLEOD / KAREN MARTELLETTI (98) | 15 | 36.56 | 2-0-1 | 70 |
| 31 | MARK / PAUL HANGARTNER (114) | 17 | 36.55 | 2-0-1 | 55 |
| 32 | GARY DUNCAN / RUSSELL DIVE (55) | 16 | 36.50 | 2-0-1 | 114 |
| 33 | EVA SHAND / LES VARADI (35) | 18 | 36.47 | 2-0-1 | 9 |
| 34 | RICHARD DOUGLAS / BOB SEBESFI (9) | 22 | 35.84 | 1-0-2 | 35 |
| 35 | ELIZABETH FISHER / BLAIR FISHER (83) | 12 | 35.69 | 3-0-0 | 27 |
| 36 | GRAEME STOUT / JEFF MILLER (27) | 24 | 35.40 | 1-1-1 | 83 |
| 37 | JOHN SKIPPER / DAVID SKIPPER (97) | 11 | 35.26 | 3-0-0 | 60 |
| 38 | CARLOS PELLEGRINI / VAL GARDINER (60) | 12 | 34.92 | 2-0-1 | 97 |
| 39 | LYNETTE MORGAN / IAN BOND (91) | 12 | 34.84 | 2-0-1 | 28 |
| 40 | JETER LIU / JOHN WANG (28) | 17 | 34.79 | 2-0-1 | 91 |
| 41 | WILLIAM LIU / GEORGE SUN (21) | 4 | 34.60 | 2-0-1 | 41 |
| 42 | TONY OBERDRIES / MAURICE CARTER (41) | 13 | 34.48 | 2-0-1 | 21 |
| 43 | FIONA TEMPLE / JOHN KRUINIGER (19) | 11 | 34.20 | 2-0-1 | 7 |
| 44 | ASHLEY BACH / JOHN DAVIDSON (7) | 9 | 33.87 | 2-0-1 | 19 |
| 45 | MICHAEL JOHNSTONE / PAULA GREGORY (108) | 8 | 33.73 | 2-0-1 | 121 |
| 46 | BRUCE BATCHELOR / MOSS WYLIE (44) | 17 | 33.63 | 2-0-1 | 80 |
| 46= | RUSSELL WATT / NOLA CLARK (121) | 9 | 33.63 | 2-0-1 | 108 |
| 48 | FERN MCRAE / DAVID MCRAE (80) | 8 | 33.30 | 2-0-1 | 44 |
| 49 | BILL NASH / JIM WALLIS (29) | 9 | 33.09 | 1-0-2 | 115 |
| 50 | ANGELA BOULTON / PETER BOULTON (115) | 10 | 32.93 | 2-0-1 | 29 |

## Open Restricted Swiss Pairs after 3 of 9 Rounds Top 50 (of 58)

DAVE GARRETT / DENISE MAYHEW (8) JOANNE PATERSON / ALISON PRICE (1)
ELAINE RAYNER / ROSS STEWART (27)
JULIAN GLYN / PAMELA GLYN (45)
NAOMI HANNAH BROWN / PRISCILLA BLOY (22) 33
JACOB KALMA / JEREMY FRASER-HOSKIN (44) 38
PAM TIBBLE / SARAH GARLAND (24) 26
LIZ WILCOX / MICHAEL WILCOX (50) 31
JANICE BELL / NICK WHITTEN (23) 27
DONG GAO BI / WILLIAM WANG (58)
20
BRIAN SULLIVAN / BOB TRELOAR (35)
EDWARD ROGGEVEEN / JENA ROBINSON (38)
RICHARD CROSS / JEFF MEYER (43)
25

FRANCEY ROLLS / LYNNE FEATHER (39)
18
SUE WHITTEN / GREG WHITTEN (12)
BRIAN CRAIG / JOEY CHANG (34)
ANTHONY WILSON / ANDREW MICHL (31)
DIANE EMMS / JANE STEARNS (42)
LEN DENT / OLIVE DENT (17)
WAYNE GYDE / JOHN O'CONNOR (29)
ELIZABETH KEMP / RAY KEMP (26)
KEVIN WHYTE / CLARE COLES (36)
JAN ASHWELL / BRIAN ASHWELL (5)
SHIRLEY BAIN / GRAHAM YOUNG (40)
JOAN SMITH / JUDE HANSEN (16)
KELVIN TIBBLE / JENNY CARR (15)
CHRISTINE YUKICH / SUE GIBBONS (7)
JOHN RUDDELL / ALISON RUDDELL (30)
SUE BROWN / BOB BROWN (56)
ROSEMARY RITCHIE / ESTELLE DAVIS (10) -3
MATTHEW SCHUMACHER / KEVIN TURNER (49) -9
CAROLYN PARKER / NICK COMBER (51)
13
JANE WORTHINGTON / VICKI RUSSELL (28) -1
TONY SUTICH / LORRAINE SUTICH (46) -5
CAROL DICKSON / MARNIE NORRIS (20) -5
COLETTE FERMOR / GRAEME EUSTACE (11) -5
BEV BROMFIELD / RAEWYN MCLEAN (4) -11
PHIL RUTHERFORD / RAY CURNOW (54) -10
ANNE BAR'CLOUGH / DEBORAH TANGNEY (37) -18
SHERRYN MALTHUS / BARBARA GORDON (3) -10
JEFFREY CHANG / MARK THOMSON (48) -11
SUE BURNS / CHERYL PARSONS (6) -13
BIANCA VAN RANGELROOY / MARK LYNN (19) -11
JULIA WATSON / PETER WATSON (53) -14
JULIE BUNNELL / JANICE WILLOUGHBY (14) -17
PAUL CARSON-WENMOTH / BILL HUMPHREY (33)-20
HALEY FENWICK / JANE O'BRIEN (13) -19
SUE JENSEN / VIVIANNE NISBET (57) -22
ANNA CHAPPELL / MARILYN KENNEDY (2) -20
DAVID BREWER / LYNNE FEGAN (18) -24

VPs
46.94
46.19
45.71
45.43
43.32
42.85
40.78
40.63
40.03
38.79
38.46
38.15
37.89
36.64
35.66
35.13
34.55
34.47
34.33
34.22
33.73
33.66
32.70
32.24
32.04
31.49
30.81
30.29
29.93
29.70
29.63
29.46
29.06
28.64
27.63
27.15
26.39
26.31
26.30
25.99
25.41
25.23
25.22
23.99
23.21
22.10
21.58
21.58 1-0-2 13
$21.28 \quad 0-0-3 \quad 18$
20.47 0-1-2 2

WDL Next

2-0-1 1
3-0-0 8
3-0-0 45
3-0-0 27
3-0-0 44
3-0-0 22
3-0-0 50
2-0-1 24
2-0-1 35
3-0-0 38
2-0-1 23
2-0-1 58
2-0-1 39
2-0-1 43
2-0-1 34
1-0-2 12
2-0-1 42
2-0-1 31
2-0-1 29
2-0-1 17
2-0-1 36
2-0-1 26
2-0-1 40
2-0-1 5
2-0-1 15
1-0-2 16
1-1-1 56
1-1-1 10
1-0-2 7
2-0-1 30
2-0-1 51
1-0-2 49
1-0-2 46
2-0-1 28
1-0-2 11
1-0-2 20
1-0-2 54
1-0-2 4
2-0-1 3
1-0-2 37
1-0-2 6
1-0-2 48
1-0-2 53
1-0-2 19
1-0-2 33
1-0-2 14
0-0-3 57
$\begin{array}{ll}1-0-2 & 13 \\ & 18\end{array}$


Coct \& BuL


New Zealand Intermediate Swiss Pairs after 3 of 9 Rounds Top 50 (of 64)

|  |  | Imps | VPs | WDL | Next |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | TONY JIANG / JULIA ZHU (14) | 80 | 54.67 | 3-0-0 | 6 |
| 2 | JAN BROWN / YVONNE HUGHES (6) | 45 | 46.68 | 3-0-0 | 14 |
| 3 | WARREN CARDNO / JILL PATTERSON (18) | 31 | 42.83 | 3-0-0 | 13 |
| 4 | KAREN SMITH / SUE COHEN (13) | 28 | 40.33 | 2-1-0 | 18 |
| 5 | ROCHELLE VAN HEUVEN / TIM RIGTER (52) | 26 | 40.04 | 2-1-0 | 44 |
| 6 | HAFIZUR KHAN / PREM SOUNDR'YAGAM (44) | 35 | 39.93 | 2-0-1 | 52 |
| 7 | CHRIS GLYDE / MARIA CASCI (55) | 26 | 39.68 | 2-1-0 | 7 |
| 8 | ANNETTE FEA / BRIAN GALLAHER (7) | 22 | 39.15 | 3-0-0 | 55 |
| 9 | ANN BLACKIE / ALAN BLACKIE (61) | 25 | 39.06 | 2-0-1 | 42 |
| 10 | SHARON MARRYATT / ANNA POWELL (42) | 22 | 38.99 | 2-0-1 | 61 |
| 11 | LIZ CRAWSHAW / WALT CRAWSHAW (51) | 20 | 38.77 | 3-0-0 | 24 |
| 12 | BREN BIRSS / PAMELA PEDERSEN (24) | 22 | 38.67 | 2-0-1 | 51 |
| 13 | BEVERLEY MCCONDACH / MAUREEN RUSS (15) | 20 | 38.65 | 3-0-0 | 17 |
| 14 | ANNE GORDON / MORGAN BOOKER (17) | 21 | 37.67 | 2-0-1 | 15 |
| 15 | BARBARA CAMPBELL / ANNE SHEARER (32) | 20 | 37.60 | 2-0-1 | 33 |
| 16 | JUDY SEATON / GRAEME SEATON (33) | 25 | 37.27 | 1-1-1 | 32 |
| 17 | NANCY BARTRUM / CHRIS FLEMING (31) | 15 | 36.89 | 3-0-0 | 2 |
| 18 | NICK EDGINTON / MANDY MACLEAN (2) | 18 | 36.88 | 2-1-0 | 31 |
| 19 | LEE MOSELEN / JESSICA MORRIS (58) | 15 | 36.41 | 2-0-1 | 25 |
| 20 | LANELL MONREAL / HEATHER ROBERTSON (25) | 15 | 35.91 | 2-0-1 | 58 |
| 21 | PETER DAFFURN / JUNE ZHU (23) | 19 | 35.77 | 2-0-1 | 1 |
| 22 | KIM CHUNG / SHARON BARTON (1) | 14 | 35.54 | 2-0-1 | 23 |
| 23 | ROGER GUNNING / RAEWYN G-THOMAS (28) | 12 | 34.93 | 2-0-1 | 38 |
| 24 | LOUISE SCOTT / MARION ARLIDGE (60) | 10 | 34.25 | 2-0-1 | 22 |
| 25 | ANN GROUNDS-TURNER / JOE TURNER (38) | 8 | 34.22 | 2-0-1 | 28 |
| 26 | JILL BURROUGHS / CLARE MARTIN (22) | -3 | 33.33 | 2-0-1 | 60 |
| 27 | ELIZABETH SCHUCK / DOUGAL WATSON (11) | 11 | 32.70 | 1-0-2 | 62 |
| 28 | DORIS CHAPMAN / EUNICE ECCLES (62) | 4 | 32.03 | 2-0-1 | 11 |
| 29 | MARGARET HEARN / NEIL HEARN (12) | -1 | 31.88 | 2-0-1 | 16 |
| 30 | GLENN BUSH / DENNIS MCKINLAY (16) | 8 | 31.49 | 1-0-2 | 12 |
| 31 | MARGARET FRASER / BEVERLEY PARLANE (3) | 2 | 31.17 | 2-0-1 | 4 |
| 32 | INGRID MINETT / PAUL MINETT (4) | 2 | 30.58 | 1-0-2 | 3 |
| 33 | CAROLINE GRIFFIN / CATHY CARROLL (39) | 2 | 30.25 | 1-0-2 | 53 |
| 34 | GLENICE HOUGHTON / JENNIFER HORNER (53) | 3 | 30.08 | 1-0-2 | 39 |
| 35 | JENNY POMEROY / JENNY COOPER (30) | -1 | 29.65 | 2-0-1 | 34 |
| 36 | RHONDA GRAHAM / BARBARA FITZGERALD (34) |  | 28.54 | 1-0-2 | 30 |
| 37 | ANNETTE MARTIN / BARBARA IMLACH (45) | -4 | 28.43 | 1-1-1 | 36 |
| 38 | WAYNE SMITH / LAURA GRIFFIN (36) | -5 | 27.81 | 1-0-2 | 45 |
| 39 | SUE SCOTT / JUDITH LAWTON (37) | -3 | 27.76 | 1-0-2 | 47 |
| 40 | CHRISTINE KNOWLES / LAUREN LEHNDORF (47) | -6 | 27.59 | 2-0-1 | 37 |
| 41 | GRAEME DUHS / GARTH ROBINSON (8) | -2 | 27.30 | 1-0-2 | 20 |
| 42 | ANNA MURPHY / DAVID MURPHY (20) | -10 | 26.86 | 1-0-2 | 8 |
| 43 | BEV DORE / PATRICIA CHIVERS (50) | -9 | 26.71 | 1-0-2 | 54 |
| 44 | ZACHARY YAN / VINCENT HE (54) | -1 | 26.35 | 1-0-2 | 50 |
| 45 | STUART GRANT / PAM WHITEHEAD (27) | -9 | 26.28 | 1-0-2 | 63 |
| 46 | CAROLYN JOHNSTON / KAYE MAIN (63) | -16 | 25.64 | 1-0-2 | 27 |
| 47 | PETER BALL / PAM ROPE (41) | -11 | 24.87 | 1-0-2 | 56 |
| 48 | IAN ROSS / PHIL THOMPSON (56) | -13 | 24.54 | 1-0-2 | 41 |
| 49 | RAEWYN KITCHING / CAROL JOSEPH (5) | -16 | 24.17 | 1-0-2 | 40 |
| 50 | CHRIS HEKE / ROBYN FINDLAY (40) | -21 | 22.91 | 1-0-2 | 5 |
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