

Dr. Allen, of Kansas, pointed out that almost everyone forgot that Oswald Tower was the interpreter of the rules, whereupon Dr. Carlson said that since it was brought out "there is a rule book, and an official interpreter whom everybody seems to have forgotten, it will be well to continue with the Committee on Interpretations and Proposed Rule Changes."

Herbert W. Read, of Kalamazoo State Teachers College, set the keynote for the discussion he was to lead, when he outlined the place of the game and the position of the coach. He said that there were at least 30,000 high school teams playing basketball and hundreds of thousands of athletes participating. He raised various points, the suggestion of a czar, whether basketball would do best if it were speedier, should the public be considered, do the boys prefer a game of speed to skill, and the spirit of the game itself. Does the game enhance loyalty, enthusiasm and school spirit?

Mr. Read said that from his questionnaire, it was found the coaches liked the four-time outs, and also the new communication rule. The suggestion of a 12-foot radius around the centre circle brought comment from the floor. The suggestion of raising the basket to 12 feet from the floor brought more discussion. The question was whether it tended to aid or hamper the style of the smaller (or bigger) fellow. Some declare that the players were becoming smaller and wiser -- other coaches averred that they were becoming taller. The suggestion about a smaller backboard was unfavorably received, in Mr. Read's poll. The ten-second rule was minimized in importance.

The zone defense and face guarding brought much discussion. The question of eliminating them was offered, although many saw no harm in the zone defense. Mr. Read gave his impressions of the various interpretations of face guarding, as viewed in the East and West, where-upon Nat Holnan added that despite the criticism hurled upon the coaches in the New York City area, the coaches in that vicinity were most eager to see a uniformity of interpretation and willing to abide by whatever decision reached by the rules committee.

John Bunn pointed out four views from the rule book on block, or screening, and then called upon everyone to think seriously on that point for the meeting on the morrow. He added that, in Stanford's recent trip to the East, "three-fourths of the offense had to be discarded to obliterate any officiating difficulty. The officiating was good, commendable," he said.

Mr. Read declared that a re-survey showed that the coaches were in favor of freeing the foul circle from the foul line out, and Oswald Tower added that the rules committee, in his belief, would look favorably upon any suggestion acceptable to the majority of the coaches' association. Chandler suggested a rule which would allow a team, fouled in the closing minutes, to have the option of taking the ball out of bounds, rather than shooting the foul.

The talk on the possible elimination of the centre jump had John J. Gallagher, of Niagara University, say that players and sports writers in Buffalo, N.Y., found it resembling hockey and unsatisfactory. Cy Young, of Southern California, added that the elimination would tire the players to the point where substitutions were to be profuse. Mr. Norgrin, who spoke on how the elimination of the tap was received in his section; Rev. Coyne, of Columbia University, Dubuque, Ia., said that the elimination was whole-heartedly approved in his section; and, Harold Olsen said that the players in his game found they were no more fatigued with the elimination, than formerly.