

The elimination of the centre jump was then brought up. Nat Holman led off the discussion in pointing out that the previous day's meeting centred upon uniformity of rules interpretation, and the morning's paper had brought forth the news that the Big Ten had eliminated the tip off for the coming year, and everyone knew that the International Federation of Basketball had passed a rule eliminating the tip off at the 1940 Olympics, (which 27 countries will follow), and then there were AAU rules, intercollegiate rules, and many other rules to follow. Where did uniformity come in?

A motion was made to "eliminate the center tip following field goals." Following remarks on studies and impressions presented by John Bunn, H. G. Crisp of the University of Alabama, Sam Barry of the University of California, Cy Young of Washington, and Lee, C. F. Kimbrell of Westminster College, Missouri, all of whom expressed opinion either for and against the proposal, the motion was carried, 60-9.

The next discussion was upon the interpretation of the pick-off play. Nat Holman was asked to demonstrate his interpretation upon the legality, and a long demonstration and explanation followed. Issues raised were whether a man has a right to any position on the floor, if he assumed that point first; and just what amount of space must exist between two opponents, previous to a contact and upon whom is the foul to be called. Holman, finally explained: "We feel, and we have some pictures here to show, that a man going from that side of the court has nothing to do with the play. The ball may be over there, and I go way across the floor, My man switches. I stand here, entitled to my position on the floor, and here is a player who wants to go after his own man and I check. There is contact. Gentlemen, who is to blame?"

Where upon, Chairman Read declared: "Nat, that is the whole issue. Your best point is that contact ensues here, and if you want to get contact out of the game, you are moving right along that direction. The thing that is clean cut is, do the rules permit that sort of thing? The majority of the people in the country say it is legal. The Metropolitan area says it is not, and you have your reasons right here. Thanks a lot, Nat."

John Bunn then read interpretations from Oswald Tower which he demonstrated. He read: "A player is entitled to take any position on the court not occupied by another player, provided that this position is not so close to the opponent that contact ensues when the opponent makes normal bodily movement." Continuing Dunn said: "Nat, according to your interpretation I would be fouling in this situation, if you chased him into me and I did not move. You chase him right into me, and I don't move. According to this, Nat, you say I have fouled."

Holman: "Yes, you have. "

Bunn: "Then there are the two differences of opinion we must resolve."

Holman: "We are digressing for a moment. You understand, around the East we took this stand: if John had the ball over there, and I cut around, if he has the ball he can do things for me. He is o.k., provided there is no body motion. If I chase Joe into you, the foul is on you because you did not have the ball."

Bunn: "There is a decided difference of opinion and rather than get into other phases, it seems we should agree or disagree on this."