

Students Favor No Dorm Hours

By CARRIE KALB

There is a movement on campus which would like to abolish dorm hours for the women residents of Santa Clara. At the present time women are required to come in at 12 midnight on week days and 2 a.m. on weekends. Sophomores, juniors and seniors also are allowed extensions until 4 a.m. To test the feeling on campus toward this proposal, THE SANTA CLARA asked if the University had the obligation to regulate dorm hours and whether or not they should be abolished.

In an interview with Miss Mary Cay Ward, Assistant Dean of Students, she stated that the women needed some form of supervision to check on them for their own protection. "I think parents expect girls to be more supervised than men. The hours are lenient enough that they don't have to be abolished. Some women aren't mature enough to set their own hours. However, if a group of students would like to bring a proposal, I'd be willing to discuss it with them and perhaps set it up on a trial basis. Lack of hours sounds appealing, but I hope the girls would think of all sides carefully before it's put to a vote."

When Father Theodore Mackin, S. J., was interviewed he replied the University did not have an obligation to set dorm hours. He suggested that the women be offered a selection of the kinds of dorms, some with and some without hours and let the women decide for themselves. "In principle I am against dorm hours, but in practice the regulation must be made to fit the need, if any."

Some members of S.D.A. have taken upon themselves the organizing of groups to abolish dorms' hours. Jim Reilly, of S. D. A. com-



COEDS OFTEN MUST FACE A FINE PENALTY for being in after curfew, whether it be ten minutes or ten hours. Suddenly realizing one has only a couple minutes 'til the deadline can be a source of great frustration or relief, depending on the circumstances.

mented, "I don't think the school has the right to control the students' lives in the non-academic area. Students should make rules themselves either individually or collectively. Now is the time to prepare for making decisions in later life."

Susan Lawler, Head Resident, felt that the hours should not be abolished. She pointed out that the women have been given a lot of freedom in a short period of time. "They should prove they can handle what they have already before they get more. You have to learn self discipline and the rules are there to help you learn. Parents feel the University is supervising and helping their child grow, and if something happens to their daughter the University is often blamed."

Jeanne Bracken, '71, disagreed. "Values can never be forced on an individual. When the university regulates dorm hours it attempts to prevent the women residents from forming their own values by protecting them in the dorms."

Kayte Sherman, '72, felt that "the university does have the power to regulate dorm hours, especially for freshmen. I think other women students should have the power to decide on their own hours through a general vote."

Joe Latteri, '71, said "the University is only hurting its own cause, the education and the maturity of its Student Body by playing babysitter. If the student is not mature enough to think for himself, he is not mature enough to be in college."

Joe Somerville, '70, thought that "the University does have an obligation if the women residents are on campus for it is apparent that the parents of the women wish to have hours for their daughters by making them live on campus. Juniors and Seniors should have the right to live off campus."

Paul Ryan, '69, said "I see no reason for the school's imposition of these rules on women students, other than to underwrite the notion that SCU women are somewhat less mature than women at other schools. Regulations such as we have are long since dead for state schools."

In general, the majority, nearly 75 per cent, of students polled in the random sampling were for abolishing dorm hours and giving the women the chance to make their own decisions.