

By LINES from the SIDELINES

by CLAYTON HANNON

THIS IS the one for Oregon Tech's gridiron chargers to win if they are going to make their 1954 season a successful one. The OTI-OCE game in the past six seasons has been somewhat of a kick in the pants to the High Campus teams and coaching staff since relations between the two schools started, and it resembles another relationship, the one the KUHS Pelicans have with Grants Pass and Mei Ingram.

In 1948 when football was just an "added thing" at Oregon Tech, the Wolves under Bill McArthur scored a 19-5 win over the Owls to start the rivalry off on the wrong foot for the two-year college from Klamath Falls.

Since that time, McArthur's chargers have racked up five more wins in the same number of seasons. In 1949 by a 33-0 margin, then it was 26-0 in 1950 and 19-6 in '51. The last two seasons have been all OCE with 13-12 and 19-0 victories.

From these records and the comparison of the two schools (four year program to the two-year set-up at Oregon Tech) we can't see just how a few upstate sportswriters see Oregon Tech's football team as the heavy favorite in this Saturday afternoon's battle.

Porker '11' Arouses Curiosity

NEW YORK (AP) — Football fans the nation over are wondering how good the Arkansas Razorbacks really are as the surprise team of the Southwest Conference prepares to go after its eighth straight victory against SMU Saturday.

"On Saturday in Little Rock," Cronley hauls off, "rags-to-riches Arkansas and its flinty defense plus a surprisingly versatile and beefed-up ground-air attack would have been the equal if not the master of the four other members of the nation's present big five."

"On this particular afternoon Bowden Wyatt had his 'pore little Porker' so intent on victory over Rice that it was impossible for them to settle for anything else. They would have given UCLA, Ohio State, Oklahoma and Notre Dame all that these other giants of the U. S. gridiron could cope with."

"Now just a darn minute. How would the Razorbacks stack up with the Oklahoma Sooners if the teams were to meet tomorrow? Well, sir, I've seen the Sooners against California, Texas, Texas Christian and Colorado, to name the toughest foes so far in 1954. In their 13-point hammering of favored Rice the Arkansawyers were superior to any of those aforementioned foes of OU."

"They had class in their running and passing game and well mapped 6-2-3 defensive alignment which supplied the secondary with quick recovery facilities whenever All America candidate Dick Moele slipped through, thus keeping the speedster from making a single long touchdown dash."



Calvert Satisfies like no other whiskey! Rich, full-bodied flavor...and smoother going down...that's why millions have switched to Calvert, now one of the world's two largest-selling whiskeys!

\$4.05 4/5 Qt. \$2.45 Pint

COMPARE...and you'll switch to **CALVERT**

Lane Sees Major League Ball For Pacific Coast

CHICAGO (AP)—The start of a race by the National and American Leagues to establish clubs on the West Coast is approaching and General Manager Frank Lane of the Chicago White Sox predicts the move will come within three years.

ASSERT "It may come within three years," he said. "The time is rapidly approaching when one league or the other must move into the fertile area on the Pacific Coast."

Bill Veck, former club owner, who has been commissioned by P. K. Wrigley, owner of the Chicago Cubs, to investigate the possibility of establishing big league baseball on the coast, feels the National League should assert itself.

Veck, who has an option to purchase Wrigley's Los Angeles ball park, yesterday conferred in Brooklyn with Walter O'Malley, Dodger president. They agreed that the National circuit "had better get busy or lose the initiative to the American League."

They met briefly and spoke of the westward trend in general terms. A Dodger spokesman said "they did not speak about moving any certain club to California."

Lane pointed out that "it's a question now whether the National or American league will be first to grab the territory—but whichever one it is will be top dog."

EARMARKED "San Francisco already has approved a five million dollar bond issue to build a stadium," Lane continued. "The Los Angeles Park District has earmarked 10 million dollars for the same purpose."

Lane envisions the major league player limit being cut from 25 to 21 which would make 64 players available for use in organizing big league clubs on the coast.

"It would mean relaxing the present rules which govern the recall of optioned players," Lane said, "and also the rule requiring an injured player to remain on the disabled list for a minimum of 30 days. But all these things could be arranged without too much trouble."

NEW YORK (AP) — New Mexico's A. L. Terpening, a non-conformist in a season that has been marked by poor punting, leads the nation's collegians with the highest average hunked up this late in the football schedule since the all-time high was set four years ago.

Terpening has averaged 45.3 yards on 30 punts, according to NCAA Service Bureau statistics released Thursday. Colorado's Zack Jordan was the last punter to average that well at this stage of the season and he was on the way to his 48.2-yard record back in 1950.

The major colleges' over-all average for the season is an abnormally low 34.9 yards.

All of the individual leaders, however, have respectable marks. Ted Rohde, Kansas, is the runner-up with 43.7, followed by three players above the 42-yard mark—Tennessee's Bob Brengle, Colorado's Carroll Hardy and Penn's Walt Hynoski. Jim Withrow of Oregon State is tenth at 41.

California's Jim Hanifan and Stanford's John Stewart—one-two in pass receiving—pulled away from the rest of the list last weekend. Hanifan, serving as a target for Pitchin' Paul Larson, the No. 1 passer, leads with 36 receptions. Stewart has 33. Dick James of Oregon has 22 and ranks seventh.

Ted Kluszewski is the first member of the Cincinnati Redlegs to lead the major leagues in home runs since Fred Odwell in 1905. Odwell hit nine that year.

NEW YORK (AP) — Some semblance of sanity is returning to the college football scene. Probably by the end of the season it will seem down low enough to engulf the forecasters.

Last weekend's gridiron workouts resulted in 39 correct picks and 12 mistakes for a .765 average. The season's totals now are 721 correct and 111 incorrect for .869.

SELECTIONS This week's selections:

Ohio State over Purdue: The Ohioans know that if they win this one they become a lead-pipe cinch to represent the Big Ten in the Rose Bowl. That will give them the needed incentive.

Oklahoma over Missouri: The Oklahomaans continue on their mer-

ry Big Seven way—not a conference defeat in eight years. Missouri is crippled for the game that means so much for the Tigers' Orange Bowl chances.

Arkansas over Southern Methodist: Arkansas simply is too stubborn to lose.

Notre Dame over North Carolina: Notre Dame has won its last two games from North Carolina by 34-14 scores. This one should be decided by about the same margin.

Army over Penn: Navy took the Quakers 52-6 and Army will try to do it as well.

Southern California over Washington: Southern California's backfield trio of Arnett, Dandoy and Crow getting almost as famous as Thirkens, Evers and Chance.

OTHERS The others without comment:

EAST: Navy over Columbia, Boston University over Boston College, Cornell over Dartmouth, Delaware over Lafayette, Holy Cross over Fordham, Brown over Harvard, Penn State over Rutgers, Colgate over Syracuse, Yale over Princeton, Temple over Scranton.

MIDWEST: Minnesota over Iowa, Wisconsin over Illinois, Cincinnati over Wichita, Kansas State over Iowa State, Michigan State over Michigan, Nebraska over Pittsburgh, Indiana over Northwestern, Oklahoma A&M over Kansas.

SOUTH: Mississippi over Houston, West Virginia over William and Mary, Florida State over Furman, Georgia Tech over Alabama, Kentucky over Memphis State, Louisiana State over Mississippi State, Maryland over Clemson, Mississippi Southern over Villanova, Richmond over North Carolina State, Davidson over Wofford, South Carolina over Virginia, Tennessee over Florida, Vanderbilt over Tulane, Virginia Military over Citadel, Duke over Wake Forest, Virginia Tech over Wayneburg, Auburn over Georgia, Southwestern over Texas, Texas Christian over Texas, Texas Tech over Tulsa.

FAR WEST: Oregon over Washington State, College of Pacific over Marquette, Stanford over San Jose State, Colorado over Mexico, Montana over Montana State, California over Oregon State, Wyoming over Brigham Young, Arizona over North Texas State.

NEW YORK (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high court Wednesday, the IBC attorneys centered on the baseball precedent, claiming that when baseball was exempted from the antitrust laws, so were boxing and all other professional sports.

Philip Elman, special assistant to the attorney general, said in arguing the government's case that the boxing setup is in no way comparable to that in baseball.

WASHINGTON (AP) — The future of boxing's "exclusive contract" rested Thursday with the Supreme Court, weighing a government challenge of the International Boxing Club.

The government urged the court to declare the fight game to be a business engaged in interstate commerce. Such a ruling would threaten the tight control the IBC has exercised over championship fights for the past five years.

APPEAL There was no way to determine when the court might rule on the Justice Department's appeal from a ruling by the U.S. District Court for Southern New York.

That court denied the government's monopoly charge. It held that boxing is analogous to baseball and the Supreme Court already has ruled baseball to be exempt from the nation's antitrust laws.

In legal arguments before the high