

several years have improved the game; that the molded type basketball has been (and still is) a godsend to every high school, Y.M.C.A. and smaller college which does not have adequate income to produce a new ball for every game or practice session; and that we cannot justify compelling schools to retain a backboard with half of its area wasted surface and a hindrance to the spreading of play to the sides and to the end area of the court.

This just about brings the family connections up to date. In the words of Red Skelton "Thanks for listenin'."

### Let's Stick to Facts

The sub-committee report contains some things which are good. For me, it is weakened by the attempt to castigate (Mister typesetter--please!) the officers of the Rules Committee, that committee's policies relative to the annual questionnaire and the National Collegiate method of choosing representatives. Furthermore, it contains a number of inaccuracies, in statement or implication, and statements which show little understanding of the purpose of, or the method of making up or distributing the questionnaire. It contains "below the belt" insinuations which are so grossly unfair that they give the final proposed code of ethics (drafted for someone else) a sour taste. Let's be specific.

The report criticizes Floyd Rowe for expressing an opinion (in a private letter) that majority opinion over the nation is against the outlawing of the molded type of basketball and the small backboard. Does Mister God resent freedom of speech? It would be out of character to become peevish when majority opinion does not coincide with personal antagonism toward articles which have proved their worth. By a rather remarkable type of logic a conclusion is drawn from Mr. Rowe's statement. It is: "Should we not have the privilege of suggesting items for the rules questionnaire?" What are the facts? The Rules Committee has always encouraged every group that has a legitimate interest in the game to submit suggestions for the questionnaire. The questionnaire is made from these suggestions. It is put in form by all members of the Rules Committee, many of whom are prominent members of the National Basketball Coaches Association and 2 of whom were members of the Research Committee of that body.

The report objects to the form of questions and cites: "The new fan-shaped backboard is legal where the home management chooses to install it." Of course, it studiously omits the heading which makes it clear that this question and others in the same group give each man a chance to vote yes or no on whether the present rule is satisfactory. Here is another objection which indicates straining at a gnat. The case is cited where one question is to be voted on by those who "coached, played, officiated or managed games on courts with the small backboard." The report studiously omits the heading which shows this to be in Part II which deals entirely with reports on experimentation and observation (rather than abstract opinion). It also fails to mention that on the same sheet there was a question where everyone (user or non-user) could record his opinion about the backboard rule. Would the report have us believe that the Rules Committee has no God-given right to find out what those who have used and observed an article or rule think of it? Frankly, Mister Scratch doesn't understand that kind of logic.

The report further frets: "The tabulations of results of the Questionnaire are questionable." As evidence, it shows that the grouping by sections of the country is not according to National Collegiate districts. To quote: "How can an N.C.A.A. representative determine the reaction of his district when the research tabulations