

Comments

Provision should be made for offensive team being able to decline a foul which is followed in the same play by a basket. Sharp practice by defensive team in causing a foul to nullify a well-earned basket is on the increase and should be curbed.

I am loud and positive in advocating the use of a molded ball for the following reasons:

1. It gives greater uniformity of performance.
 2. It is livelier and has greater rebounding qualities thus contributing to relieving congestion around both bank boards.
 3. If standardized to the specifications equivalent to the 5-ply "last bilt" ball it will be the best yet devised for the game.
 4. The best ball on the market will be the white Last Bilt ball as soon as a more permanent white is devised.
-

I believe that it would be much better for the game if a player would be allowed to stay in the outer half of the free throw area as long as he cared to whether he had the ball or not. I think this would result in fewer wild passes out of this area to teammates because of lack of time to hold ball; it would also give players a chance to slow up the torrid pace that has been set and give the fans or spectators a chance to see some really fine ball handling and more clever block plays built around the center area if given more time for pivot man to stay here and it would not give the big pivot men any particular advantage.

Part III No. 13 I believe the Last-built ball as it is at present is too lively-teams that are not accustomed to its use are greatly handicapped.

In back court, travelling should be called loosely unless the defense is crowding or the offense is stalling-in other words if the offense is taking the ball down at a reasonable speed and has no opposition, I do not believe that travelling should be called rigidly. I would like to have fewer and better paid officials. These officials should be required to attend interpretation meetings. This would lead to more uniformity in the game. In Part III No. 18, the suggestion might be worth considering. In Part III No. 11, the deliberate foul may involve discussion.

I feel we have a very good game the way the rules now read. I would like to see the three fifteen minutes periods tried in college ball, for at least one season. Also the calling of the foul on the guard, and not on the dribbler has been a cause for discussion this year.

Teams that were used to playing with the 4 foot line under the goal were handicapped on floors using the 2 foot line.

I still favor some legislation in regard to an opponent who deliberately crashes the player who is scoring or about to score a basket. I have had players hurt time and again and all the officials have done to date is to foul the opponent.

I have the conviction that legislation should be made to aid the goal shooter who successfully makes a goal but because of a violation which in the minds of the official happened before the shooting is given one shot. My suggestion would be that a case of this kind could be handled as a case similar is handled in football where a gain is made and on the play the defense commits a foul. There would be a choice. In this basketball case, I would suggest that the captain have a choice of taking the goal with no foul assessed or not accepting the goal, take the free throw and penalize the defensive player fouling. Needless to say a good defensive man with three fouls might be taken out of the game but in so doing the offensive team would receive only a free throw opportunity if they considered the advantage this way.