



St. Dunstan's Red and White Staff—1934 - 35

Back Row—F. Dunn, J. D. Ready, J. O'Hanley, J. L. MacDonald, J. A. MacDonald, L. J. Ayers, T. Butler,
Humour. Asst. Bus. Mgr. Chronicle. Humour Con. Editor. Con. Editor. Asst. Bus. Mgr.

Front Row—L. Monaghan, N. E. Trites, F. J. McNeill, S. D. Gillis, J. Doyle, J. W. Arsenault,
Exchanges. Athletics. Bus. Mgr. Editor. Asst. Editor. Alumni.

St. Dunstan's Red and White

Subscription, 75 cents a year..... Payable in advance

VOL. XXVI.

MAY, 1935

NO. 3

Staff

Editor-in-Chief.....S. D. Gillis, '35

Assistant Editor-in-Chief...J. H. Doyle, '35

Associate Editors

Exchanges.....L. F. Monaghan, '35

Alumni.....J. W. Arsenault, '35

Chronicle.....J. A. O'Hanley, '36

Athletics.....N. E. Trites, '35

Humour.....J. L. McDonald, '36

J. W. Dunn, '36

Contributing Editors

J. A. McDonald, '35 L. J. Ayers, '36

Business Manager

F. J. McNeill, '35

Assistant Business Managers

J. D. Ready, '35

T. P. Butler, '36

Editorial

Parting

*"The play is done; the curtain drops
Slow falling to the prompter's bell.
A moment yet the actor stops
And looks around to say—farewell."*

With the editing of this final edition of Volume XXVI. we will have completed our work and will vacate the editorial chair. It would be nice, and perhaps proper, to say that our hearts are laden with sorrow at the very thought of such. But that is not quite true. Often the work has been tedious. The student body, with the exception of a few, have shown an adamant lack of co-operation. This has greatly augmented the work of the staff,

and, at times, has made them feel that their efforts were little appreciated. We are glad to place these burdens on other and stronger shoulders, and to be able to wish them better success than we have had.

Though, human-like, we feel happy because we are soon to be rid of responsibility, nevertheless our feelings reach a low ebb when we realize what parting means. All those connections which we have made during our term of office and which we now hold so dear will be broken. We will remember, and in turn will be remembered, for a time. Gradually the cruel hand of time will obliterate both us and our memories. This we regret! But the play has run its course and naught can be done.

This is our last opportunity to speak to those who have been so kind and helpful to us. We thank them all—our contributors, our subscribers, and the faculty—for making our work as easy for us as they possibly could. Also we wish to commend and thank the associate editors and business managers for the fine co-operation they have shown us during the year, and to wish the remaining members of the staff luck and prosperity.

Awards

A decade ago the *Red and White* Staff deemed it advisable to offer prizes for the best literary contributions in order that interest in magazine work might be stimulated and that a larger and more varied amount of material might be on hand to select from. For the first few years this innovation had the sought-for effect and for this reason was continued. But alas! interest in awards has declined; this decline being very noticeable in this office during the past year.

This attitude of the student body towards their magazine is most regrettable. *Red and White* can be most successful only when each individual student views it as his own magazine and does his utmost to improve it. There are a few of these among this year's student body, and they are to be commended for their good work. But the rest——. Concerning them we can only say that their failure to shoulder their part of the burden cannot be attributed to lack of ability, but only to indolence.

We have no panacea with which to remedy this evil. We are not even able to suggest a remedy. All in our power we have done; but the task needs stronger hands

than ours. But a cure must be found if *Red and White* is to uphold the position so arduously earned by the managements of the past. And if future managements are able to unearth one they will have done for *Red and White* their greatest service.

Besides the awards conferred on the senior members of the Staff in recognition of their faithful labors, we have awarded four Literary pins to:

John N. Kenny for the best Short Story, "Just Another Good Samaritan."

Charles McQuaid for the best Poem, "Gift of God."

H. Frank McInnis for the best Essay, "Sir Thomas More."

John A. Macdonald for meritorious service.

NOTE—According to the rules laid down, members of the Staff and winners of previous awards are ineligible. Students only may compete for awards.

The Little Entente

The pre-eminence in Europe of the three great Western Powers has been emphasised to such an extent that one is inclined to focus all attention on London, Paris and Rome as the only centres of European influence. In central Europe, however, another trio holds the pivotal position. Although the Little Entente between Belgrade, Bucharest and Prague has been less prominent in actual negotiations, it constitutes a source of influence equal to any one of the Great Powers.

The Little Entente was formed in the year 1920 in order to assure the execution of the Allied peace-treaties with Austria and Hungary, and since that time its position has been unequivocal. It vehemently upholds the Treaty of Versailles as the fundamental charter of European order and it condemns all unilateral derogations from that treaty as movements which shake the system to which the allied nations of the World War owe their freedom and extended boundaries. Any negotiation, therefore, which is made according to the strict letter of the Versailles settlements, regardless of circumstances, receives the united support of Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Jugoslavia.

That three of Europe's smaller countries should adopt such a vigorous policy is due to two facts. In the first place, they owe their existence to the Versailles Treaty, and consequently any attempt at a revision of that treaty may lead to their re-absorption by other countries. Secondly, the inhabitants are still influenced by the same spirit of stupid nationalism and desire for aggrandizement which led to fratricidal wars in the past.

These three relatively unimportant states wield so enormous an influence chiefly because of their geographical position. Situated as they are in the centre of Europe, they link the borders of countries which are already hostile, and in many cases their alliance with either side would decide the balance of power. Fully conscious of their important position, the three countries take advantage of it in securing their demands.

This influential position and uncompromising attitude of the Little Entente has been the cause of a number of the important events which have brought Europe to its present status.

The Marseilles assassinations enabled it to demonstrate its unity and vigour, and a threatening catastrophe was averted only because of pressure exerted by the great powers. Even under this pressure, the continuous war threats of the three Little Entente delegates necessitated a settlement in their favor. The Franco-Italian rapprochement was effected on condition that Italy refrain from supporting the revisionist enemies of the Little Entente. The cordial relations existing between the Soviet Union and the Little Entente were brought about only after the former had given formal assurance that its claims to the disputed Roumanian province of Bassaria would be surrendered.

The unanimous declarations of the larger European powers against German rearmament naturally received the united and vigorous support of the Little Entente. This unanimity, in direct conformity with the basic principle of the Little Entente, encouraged its members to such an extent that they immediately associated themselves with the Balkan Pact—an agreement heretofore considered very improbable. This latest union has for its purpose the organization of a series of Danubian treaties for the independence and political integrity of Austria, and for mutual defence.

As long as the major European Powers adhere to the clauses of the Versailles Treaty, no immediate danger seems likely. But should these powers ignore that important treaty to such an extent as to antagonize the Little Entente, such action might easily lead to war. This danger, however, is becoming more remote especially in view of the recent opposition to German rearmament.

Maritime Union

Among the more important questions of the day is that of Maritime Union. Every member of the three eastern provinces which constitute that group known as the Maritimes is again vitally interested. We say again because the scheme was discussed before and dropped either because it seemed impossible of fulfilment or because the debaters lacked interest in the resolution. But the past summer with its unprecedented interest in economic and political commissions has caused the spotlight to be once more focused on the seaside provinces. Nova Scotia has had its Jones inquiry; New Brunswick its labor survey; and the Maritime Confederation League has strongly urged a revision of the British North America Act so that a reassurance of activity would result. The combination of these three factors has made the Maritimes the target of Canadian economic guns. So far no direct hits have been reported, but the general trend of opinion seems to suggest that a union under one government would be most desirable. The plea advanced is that of economy. Yet it seems that their zeal for economy has blinded them to the many bramble-bushes which beset the path of Maritime Union.

The Maritime provinces represent three distinct economic units—one purely agricultural, Prince Edward Island; a second dependent on mixed farming and lumbering, New Brunswick; and the final one, the most diversified of the three, concerned with fishing, mining, and fruit raising. At the present time these differences pass unnoticed. But in a union they would become very pronounced. Sectional interests would arise and make themselves felt, and weaknesses which are now apparent in the Federal House would creep into this new government. Each province would support its own claims, vote for its own interests, and a conflict of ideas and general confusion would result. Why scrap a system which is devoid of such a weakness? Traditions cannot be shelved

in a matter of hours. Nor can customs—either business, social, or political—be satisfactorily remolded or substituted for in the space of years.

The major argument offered is that union under one government would mean the substitution of one department where three now exist. But the same territory and the same needs would still have to be tended to. This would necessitate a large number of deputies and instead of decreasing the number of officials, as contended, would at the best leave them about equal to the present number. In addition the number of opportunities for graft would be greatly increased.

May it be assumed that the supporters of the proposed union are senile enough to suppose that they, mere humans, could obliterate these frailties of human nature? Incompetent governments breed graft, and graft makes for incompetent governments. And just as long as man is man and governments are human, graft and pecuniary corruption will exist. The present system reeks of it. Yet it is so constructed that the grafters work in a limited field. Broaden these limits and golden opportunities for grandiose manipulation by dishonest officials present themselves.

To continue along economic lines, we point out the expenditure that such an outlay would call for. Our ardent unionists possibly overlooked the fact that a central governmental seat would be necessary. New buildings would have to be erected at the cost of many thousands of dollars. The old ones would be practically idle or at the least would earn only sufficient to pay for their upkeep. Yet the Union is to be more economical. Moreover a choice of a seat would cause ill-will and make for much dispute. Present amicable relations would be threatened and general disharmony would result.

Maritime Union seems a practical impossibility. There is no urgent need for it. That in itself is a strong argument against it when present conditions are considered. What is needed is Maritime support. The House of Commons at Ottawa is decorated with the bones of many provincial claims from the seaboard provinces. They lacked pressure and were either laughed to death or discarded to rot unheard and unseen. Co-operation is what is needed. Unity of thought would assure success. Unity in claims would bring results.