

Published Tuesday through Saturday mornings during the University year, the Daily Collegian is a student-operated newspaper.

The Daily Collegian

Successor to THE FREE LANCE, est. 1897

Editorials represent the viewpoint of the writers, not necessarily the policy of the paper. Unsigned editorials are by the editor.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1934 at the State College, Pa. Post Office under the act of March 3, 1879.

DIEHL McKALIP, Editor

WILLIAM DEVERS, Business Manager

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Night Editor, Fran Fanucci; Copy Editors, Phyl Propert, Rog Beidler; Assistants: Bill Eisenberg, Jane Casselberry, Becky Zahm, Barbara Budnick, Ron Arentz, Pauline Metz. Ad Staff: Peg Porter, Nancy Peterson.

Revised Constitution Good But Conservative

The revised All-University constitution, to be presented to All-University Cabinet tomorrow night, is essentially the present constitution rewritten in more specific terms.

It has maintained "confederate-type" student government and made two major changes: the addition of a supreme court to the judicial system and a provision for Cabinet to rescind acts of major organizations considered detrimental to University and student welfare.

Other than these, the constitution generally defines terms used in the old doctrine and throws out a few verbose passages.

The constitution is basically good, although conservative. It allows Cabinet and the Supreme Court the power to recommend only.

At present this seems proper. It would take much careful thought to decide if Cabinet, or any student legislature, could and should have further power. But thinking of future years, we are faced with an honest question. What is a student cabinet's capacity for assuming power and responsibility?

The administration has stated at various times it will vest in students as much responsibility as students show themselves capable of responsibility is to be judged. Will Cabinet, working under a confederate-type constitution, EVER have chance to show the required amount of responsibility?

There is little doubt that Cabinet will eventually pass the bulk of the revised constitution. But we urge the members to understand what they are passing.

Specifically, we ask that they assure themselves they really want Cabinet to have the power to rescind acts of member organizations deemed "detrimental to the good name of the University and the welfare of the student body."

We suggest at this point Cabinet demand a definition of these terms. What constitutes a detriment to the good name of Penn State and what IS the welfare of the student body?

We ask further that Cabinet understand the proposed court system, and realize that under it, so far as external power is concerned, the Supreme Court and Cabinet are on a par. Both can recommend only.

However, so far as control or check over each other are concerned, the Court has the advantage. It can reprimand or recommend action to Cabinet; Cabinet is given no say over actions of the Court.

Nor does the revised constitution define the court's powers or place any restrictions on possible penalties given. In short, the Supreme Court will be checked by the administration only.

The revised document does not warrant cynicism. Except for those parts pointed out above, the constitution is a good clarification of student government policy.

But Cabinet and the student body must not be naive about its implications or blind to the inhibited sort of student government it is perpetuating.

—Peggy McClain

Lucky Numbers

We are sorry, but you upperclassmen cannot live in the West Dorms unless you hold one of 240 lucky numbers.

This is the case as the Department of Housing goes about the task of filling the dormitories for next fall semester. It is a game of chance to dwell in Hamilton, McKee, Watts, Irvin, or Jordan Halls. The rest of the openings will be filled with incoming freshmen.

According to the present plan of selection, anyone may apply for West Dorm housing if they will be a senior with a 1.0 or better All-University average, a junior with a 1.5 or better, or a sophomore with a 2.0 or better next year. From all these applicants, representatives of the Association of Independent Men will choose 100 would-be seniors, 70 juniors, and 70 sophomores.

Anyone else who wishes to enjoy the relative pleasures of University dormitories will be put into the Nittany and Pollock dormitories. This includes many upperclassmen, men who have given money and one or more years of satisfactory study to the University, who will be placed in these less desirable and convenient facilities.

The reason the upperclassmen are pushed aside is to make room for the frosh. The comparatively luxurious quarters in the West Dorms are dangled as bait before the eyes of prospective students. And it works. Often this swings the balance and brings a student here only to be pushed out in favor of another crop the next year.

Suffer on, upperclassmen; there seems to be no recourse. The frosh live like kings for a year at least. In the meantime only a select 240, select in that their name came out of a hat first, will enjoy what belongs to all of you because of your seniority. Gain solace, if possible, in the fact that there soon may be good dorms for all.

Hell Week: IFC Releases Survey Results

By DON SHOEMAKER

Results of the survey on hell week practices, taken by the Interfraternity Council hell week practices committee, show that 96 percent of the fraternities polled feel hell week is necessary and should be continued.

This is to be expected, and perhaps hell weeks do serve a purpose. Most fraternities feel they serve two purposes:

1. They get necessary jobs done.
2. They unite the pledge class.

According to the results of the survey, it seems that hell week practices are aimed toward fulfilling one of these two purposes. The question is how well do they succeed?

Results, based on replies from 30 of 52 fraternities which were sent questionnaires, show that:

- One hundred per cent make pledges do more house-cleaning than usual.
- Forty-three per cent do work in the community during hell week.
- Fifty-three per cent assign pledges work during

breaks in class schedules.

Thirty-seven per cent require pledges to do personal favors for brothers.

These practices, we suppose, could be classified as fulfilling the first purpose—getting work done.

The rest of the activities included in the report seem to fall under the second purpose: uniting the pledge class. Results here showed:

Seventy-three per cent require pledges to recite house histories over the phone.

Seventy-six per cent use general hazing practices including quiz sessions, mock rituals, and various mental and physical ordeals.

Thirty-seven per cent paddle pledges.

Sixty-six per cent require pledges to wear coats and ties during hell week.

Thirty per cent require pledges to carry various objects to class. These include anything from goldfish to basketballs.

Thirty per cent take pledges on rides out of the borough—and usually make them walk back.

Drivers: Beware

A mental case streaked down the Pennsylvania turnpike at 100 miles per hour yesterday. He stopped when he smashed into a tractor-trailer truck the state police had commandeered and parked across the highway.

Mental cases going 100 miles per hour are not the only maniacs of the roads. So is anyone who drives a speed which is excessive for conditions. So is anyone who even fails to stop for a stop sign, let alone a truck parked cross-ways on the highway.

Also, it might be pointed out the 100 mile per hour case actually came out better off than anyone who might be involved in a minor accident. He did not live to have to answer for his mistake, if it can be called that.

This case might serve, too, to illustrate another point: It proves you can not trust the other driver. There that darn truck was parked across the highway and what could the poor fellow do about it. You just can not count on the other fellow to do even his share of thinking, let alone some for you.

So, remember, do not come anywhere near imitating this chap's speed or carelessness. It does not take a truck or 100 mile per hour speeds to stop a faulty driver.

Gazette . . .

Today

CHESS CLUB, 7 p.m., 3 Sparks

KAPPA PHI KAPPA, 7:30 p.m., Tau Kappa Epsilon

NEWMAN CLUB, Daily Rosary, 4:30 p.m., Our Lady of Victory Church, Novena, 7 p.m., Church

PERISH RIFLE, 7 p.m., Armory, Class A Uniform

PENN STATE BARBELL CLUB, 7 p.m., 102 Willard

PLAYERS ADVERTISING CREW, 6:45 p.m., Schwab

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL

John Arnold, Stephen Behman, Richard Brandt, James Byrne, Richard Coats, Helen Cunningham, Hans Gach, Robert Hackman, Maria Hammel, Irene Jacob, Lawrence Lillioch, William Murray, Marcia Ripper, Jane Schroppe, Joyce Stark, Carol Turner, Florence Woolley.

Little Man on Campus

By Bibler



"Now, if you want to take econ under Prof. Snarf, I've got all the assignments for the same course when Giffon taught it in the summer. —They both give the same blue books. —Now, you wanted to take English 4 . . ."

Wood or Splinters?

Adam's Other Rib

By PEGGY McCLAIN

Wooden obstacles or platforms—which will the three political parties come up with this campaign season? Good planks, "vote-getting" planks, or no planks at all, are the three alternatives.

The trend so far seems to be away from the plankless platform, that Lion party came up with last fall. Apparently campus politicians feel that this is neither a strong enough vote-getting device for an

All-University election nor a concrete enough pattern for potential leaders to carry into office with them.

The parties may have a good point there—to the extent that specific planks would have been wasted in the fall election. Only two All-University Cabinet seats—frosh and sophomore presidents—came out of these elections. Two men could do little, on their own, in the way of legislation.

Thus, plankless platforms (which essentially were pledged to be conscientious student leaders and support and advance good student government) were about the only things the fall elections could have hoped to fulfill.

The spring elections are a slightly different story. Five Cabinet seats come from these. Five among 25 (the total number of Cabinet seats) does not look particularly impressive on paper, but five "devoted" student leaders can spread an amazing amount of influence.

Thus, it seems that planks might have a worthwhile role in this spring's campaign. BUT—there are planks and there are planks.

The first group may be considered with the greatest skepticism. These include the "impressive sounding but impossible" run of promises that seldom escape party platforms. They are manufactured to attract attention to the sponsoring party and are included on the list with little intention or hope, on the part of the cliques or candidates, of being carried out.

In this category were such former planks as revision of women's hours, elimination of Saturday classes, revision of dormitory housing procedure, ad infinitum, all equally unfeasible for parties because they do not lie within the scope of Cabinet or the classes.

Also in this category are planks already initiated by other campus groups, and promises to "investigate this" and "look into that" (and inevitably stop at that point). And the seemingly favorite type in this category is the plank to "support" a foregone (and more or less obligatory) idea, like Centennial, freedom, or the weather.

The second category of planks

can be defined only as feasible by students, fairly original, and meeting a current need." It is hard to dig up examples of these from campus political history, because parties have come up with very few of them in the past.

However, even this type of plank cannot be considered the sole criteria for judging candidates and their parties. A surplus of votes cast for a candidate does not guarantee fulfillment of campaign promises.

Unfortunately, or fortunately as the case may be, candidates once elected are theoretically divorced from their parties. They are under no legal obligation to try to put through party planks. The only check parties and the student body has on these elected officers is accumulated pressure to "do something about what you promised." Often, even this gets no results.

And thus, discrimination is of greatest value in looking over and selecting party planks. Promises falling under both of the above categories, will no doubt show up on campaign literature.

Probably the safest rule to follow when trying to decide just how feasible a plank is, is either check up on it or forget about it . . . or better yet, demand that campus parties do the checking before the plank is published. So be it.

Constitution Revisions Discussed by WSGA

Women's Student Government Association Senate discussed revisions of the elections code and bylaws of the proposed Constitution yesterday.

Senate will meet at 6:30 tonight in the WSGA room in White Hall to continue discussion of the proposed code and bylaws.

Tonight on WDFM

Time	Program
7:25	Sign On
7:50	Stand By
8:00	Open to Question
8:30	Masterworks from France
9:00	Call Card
9:15	News
9:30	Light Classical Jukebox
10:00	Thought for the Day