

The March 16 morning meeting started with President Carlson in the chair. Herbert Read, of Kalamazoo State Teachers College, set the keynote in declaring that he would first bring up the more important points of discussion and then wind up with the minor questions.

In discussing the three-second rule, Nat Holman asked the coaches to think of the high school players and proposed a ruling that would permit indefinite presence of a man at the foul line, with or without the ball and (cannot touch the foul line). In the discussion that followed, Mr. Read asked for a rule that left no doubt as to what was a foul, bringing to the attention of the coaches a remark made by a New York official that "we will call the rules any way you want them called. If you want them strict, we will call them that way."

Nat Holman moved for the adoption of the following rule: "...that the three-second restraining area be confined to the outer half of the foul circle and that a player be permitted to stand in the forward area, with or without the ball, as long as he pleases." A lengthy discussion then followed. John Bunn explained that the point was proposed for two reasons first, to aid in combating the zone defense; and secondly, to aid the high schools, which were handicapped with the present rule. Mr. Porter then explained that results of a questionnaire showed that high schools were in favor of retaining the present rule, whereupon Roy Mundorff, of Georgia Tech, said that the South had no reason for the three-second rule, but he personally was in favor of any rule that would improve the game of basketball.

Nick Kearns then made a beautiful talk upon the position of the officials. "As for the three-second rule, the chances are the coach will not use us again, if we get out there on that line and call two or three fouls on each team. We are trying to keep friendly to you, friendly to the crowd, and friendly to the players; and you have us on the spot. I will tell you why. The rule book says one thing, and you fellows are absolutely teaching blocking. I have been in basketball 21 years and there is so much action and so much blocking and so much personal contact, I want to see a coach go out and officiate a game. You say we do this and do that because you only see it from one angle. There is only one thing I want to leave with you. IF YOU TAKE THE RULE BOOK AND COACH THE GAME ACCORDING TO THE RULES, YOU HAVE ELIMINATED A LOT OF TROUBLE FOR US. For any man who coaches against the rules of basketball, it is almost impossible for that man to ask an official to officiate that game anywhere near satisfactory. I speak today for 300,000 officials, but I am lousy, I am no good, no one will ever use me again. Why am I out there? The game is getting impossible. I really think we might go John Hopkins University, where I will work for nothing and the coaches will be professors. At the same time, I defend you fellows, because you have to win to hold that job. I should like to see both teams win, but what am I going to do?"

Finally, upon a vote, the outer half of the foul circle was freed from the three-second limitation by a rising vote of 42-25. This decision will be recommended, as the sentiment of the coaches to the rules committee.

In a brief discussion that followed, sentiment was expressed to make the entire foul circle and lane free to all players without the ball, unlimitedly. By a show of hands, a large majority expressed approval, as a guidance for the rules committee.