

RED AND WHITE

Published once a month throughout the University year by the Students of Saint Dunstan's University, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Authorized as second class mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa.

EDITOR: DANIEL O'HANLEY
BUSINESS MANAGER: WILLIAM A. DOLAN
ASST. EDITOR: FRANK FOWLER
NEWS EDITOR: ARTHUR O'SHEA
SPORTS EDITOR: LIONEL GAUDIN
FEATURE EDITOR: VIBERT ROSEMARY
CO-ED EDITOR: JEAN MacISAAC
CIRCULATION MANAGER: GERALD SHERRY

EDITORIAL

The election stir is with us again, and maybe a little more lively this year. Several candidates for the various executive positions have offered themselves, and undoubtedly there will be a "dark horse" or two after we have gone to press.

With the election promises, platforms and intensifying campaigning in the campus limelight, everyone finds himself wondering at one time or another, "Is this the right person for the job?" "How active has he, (or she) been in the numerous activities around the campus?" "Has he proved himself able and reliable?" "Has he initiative?" These are the important qualities we need in our student executive.

It is with the view of an affirmative answering of these questions that the candidate presents his platform. His platform suggests, (or asserts) that he possesses these qualities, pointing out instances and activities to substantiate his claims.

A fine exercise in democratic procedure, then, isn't it? It's simple, too. We weigh them, one against the other, and we vote. Very simple.

If this were only the case! In reality, we realize that there have arisen several unfortunate and unnecessary complications. An otherwise clear picture has been forced out of focus by several factors totally incondonable and abortive even to the most dulled sense of justice.

The first and most malicious of these is a bulletin boldly entitled "Who's Who and What's What." We can only hope that it has been accepted by the student body for what it is worth. If so, its effect will be negligible. This is a prime example of what should be avoided in an election. Far from treating election issues at stake this pitiable effort gravelled in the most trivial, unrelated and pathetic dribble imaginable. Just what is to be gained by this cheap name-calling and mud slinging is a little difficult to see, unless it is the thorough disgust of the student body.

The major factor tending towards a distortion of the election campaign picture seems to be an unfavorable attitude prevailing in some quarters towards the present student government. Even granting that the Student Council has its faults, we should be careful to distinguish in the campaigning between that criticism which is merely for the sake of criticism and that which is given with a view to a remedy. If we are to listen to, and agree with, criticism of the present Student Council, we should demand to hear how this will be overcome by the incoming executive. Only then should it carry any weight in an election campaign. It is all too easy to do a good job of tearing down, but more important and difficult is building up.

Everyone likes to think he or she is open-minded. Most, at least try to be. However, since there will always be those who will persist in encouraging the warping of opinion we should be on our guard. Unfortunately, in this election campaign there has been a little too much of this.

* * *

Remember, it is your right and your duty to vote, and to do so conscientiously. Whether or not St. Dunstan's is going to have an efficient student executive next year is up to you.

There is hardly a truer gauge of real college spirit than the interest shown in student government and affairs. Let's strive for a full turnout this year on election day. Vote for the candidate you think best, but VOTE!

Drink Peerless Beverages

J. T. MORRIS CO.

Distributors of COCA COLA

75 Water Street

Charlottetown.

H. M. SIMPSON LTD.

GREETING CARDS — SOCIAL STATIONERY
FOUNTAIN PENS — FINE LEATHER GOODS
OFFICE SUPPLIES — PORTABLE
TYPEWRITERS

138 Great George Street,
Charlottetown Phone 8577
"STRAIGHT IN FROM THE COLLEGE"

Letters To The Editor

APOLOGIA PRO WATCHDOG

Dear Sir:

With reference to the letter of Robert Q. Student which appeared in the last edition of RED and WHITE, there are a few observations which I would like to make.

First of all Sir, he states that the editor did not know what he was talking about in WATCHDOG. The purpose of the paper is concisely but accurately stated in Mr. Jim Morrison's letter which I would suggest that he humble himself to read.

Secondly, Sir, I recommend that he see Dr. O'Grady and have his concepts of constructive and destructive criticism clarified. Are we to take his letter as an example of constructive criticism?

Thirdly, Mr. Editor, Mr. Robert Q. Student implies that anything that a student does beyond his scholastic work is to his credit. (I could take a variety of meanings from that statement) I submit that any student who takes upon himself the honor of a position on the Student Council is obliged in conscience to give it his best attention. "Honor implies responsibility."

Fourthly, he states that the grammar used is indicative of the mentality of the writers. Are we to conclude from this that William Shakespeare or Robert Burns, among others, who used bad grammar at certain times to evoke a certain response, possessed low mentality? Or is the mentality of our friend so high? Of course I do not place myself on the level of those men, but I do reserve the right to imitate them.

The letter goes on to imply that people of low mentality can graduate from St. Dunstan's. This, Sir, is an atrocious insult not only to me but to every student (the Seniors in particular) at our university. Further, it is an implication that the level of education at St. Dunstan's is low, for if it were not, people of low mentality would not even be able to "pass through." It is atrocious that our institution should take such a slap in the face from an undergraduate. (Possibly Mr. Student feels that he should move on to a postgraduate school where the studies will provide sufficient challenge to this intellectual capacity).

In my final remarks, Mr. Editor, I wish to express regret that such a subjective view could come from the pen of an S.D.U. man. I even feel sympathy for this irresponsible wielder of words which are so void of positive ideas.

In conclusion Sir, I wish to express genuine regret at having to write this letter. However, I feel that such a series of insults towards me personally, the Senior Class, and at our beloved college could not be permitted to pass unanswered.

Thanking you for your valuable space,

I remain,
Yours truly,
Jim Mahoney
Editor-in-Chief
Watchdog Review

He Wasn't Swearing

Sir:

I was rather confused by the letter in your last publication written by Mr. Robert Q. Student. I found it difficult to determine whether Mr. Student was trying to prove a point or to demonstrate his command of the English language.

Mr. Student stated: "I have forgotten the name of the bovine thing." Could it not be possible that he has also forgotten the contents of the

"bovine thing." I wonder if Mr. Student read this "unconnected entanglement of nebulousity" (whatever that is) from an entirely objective point of view.

"A criticism to be acceptable should be constructive." This is a very fine statement, but it is one which the rest of Mr. Students' letter would seem to contradict. He did not offer any suggestion as to how the "Weekly" might be corrected or improved. In fact, he didn't even tell us what was wrong with it, although he certainly let us know he was opposed to it. Having done this, he proceeded to condemn the mentalities of "some of our Senior students." If this is constructive criticism, I'll eat my shirt — uncooked.

It is all very well for Mr. Student to hold his opinion; but let him not forget that it is merely an opinion. Every other student has a right to hold his or her own opinion. It is not for Mr. Student to tell others what their opinions should be. One can determine the value of The Watchdog only by reading it carefully and objectively. We cannot brand a work as good or bad merely because we know who wrote it. Neither can a few sheets of writing clearly reflect the mentality of the author.

For those who have not yet swallowed a dictionary, I would like to make it clear that Mr. Student wasn't swearing when he referred to The Watchdog as a "grammatical atrocity." I think he meant that the articles were written in poor English — a matter affecting only its "literary value." (And I feel certain that The Watchdog was not intended to be a "literary masterpiece." I did not write The Watchdog; nor did I have anything to do with it. But, if I had, I should certainly demand an explanation of the uncouth, uncalled-for, and ungrounded remarks made by Mr. Robert Q. Student.

With the addition of a bit of tact and diplomacy, such a publication as The Watchdog could be a very effective substitute for the opposition which is present in most democratic governments but which we lack in our student government.

Very sincerely yours,
Patrick E. Quinn

No Discretion

Dear Sir:

The evidence portrayed by the Editor in the last publication of the "Red and White" showed complete lack of discretion and as well as a blatant implication of anti-American sentiment. This statement concerning Pearl Harbor was wholly irrelevant to the subject only reason of inserting such a passage was to stir up dissension between the students.

J.K.



Terrorism At S. D. U.

Dear Sir:

On behalf of all the abused victims on this campus, who have had the misfortune of attending the skates here at the college rink, I would like to forward a complaint concerning the conductor of the boys who participate in the skate every evening.

Since the deterioration of the so-called "campus police", peaceful harmony and order have ceased to exist at our rink. Because of their inability to ward off the onslaughting attacks that the boys execute as they charge belligerently at one another, many girls find it impossible to venture safely onto the ice. Only the bravest of the brave have had the courage to face up to these terrorists, and they too have become bruised and lacerated. Almost any girl can present battle scars to prove this point. At the rink, the borish and infantile behavior of a large number of college and high school boys is disgraceful, callous, and degrading.

Surely the boys could contain themselves while at skating and show a little respect for the other people on the ice. Even the hockey coach could end some of the unruly horseplay if he put forth the effort. No one can deny the veracity of the complaint, and the sooner something is done to remedy the prevailing situation, the

The Boycott

On the front page of your last issue, there was an article entitled, Students Plan Boycott of City Cinema. And on the last page of the same issue, there appeared an advertisement of the Capitol's movies for March.

Might I remind you sir, that the students are receiving enough opposition from "The Guardian" and "The Evening Patriot." It's a pretty sad situation when our own College paper advertises movies for a theatre which we have placed under boycott.

If this was not intentional then it certainly was a terrible blunder.

I remain,
Very sincerely yours,
Patrick Eugene Quinn

Editor's Note:

The point is well taken, however, we are under contract to advertisers for every edition, and therefore could not refuse the theatre's advertisement.

better.

Because of the inability of the campus police to maintain order at the rink, it is imperative that immediate action be taken to dispose of the present C.P.'s and replace them by a more competent group of boys. At least this would bring us one step closer to the banishment of terrorism at the S.D.U. rink.

D. M. Morris

MILLER BROTHERS LTD.

"Prince Edward Island's Oldest Music House"

ESTABLISHED 1868

ASK FOR THE BEST . . .

ASK FOR ISLAND MADE

Perfection
ICE CREAM

"Available at your College Canteen"