

# Blood and Thunder

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Rm. 35, Student Union Building, UNB Campus  
DEADLINE: 5 p.m. Tuesday

### Burgess sets it straight

Dear Students

As your V.P. Finance, I feel compelled to set the record straight in regards to some allegations which are being made about my performance.

In the March 8th issue of the *Brunswickan* both the editorial (p. 6) and the letter from Grad Class (p. 8) seem to imply that I have not been fair.

Is this the same Grad Class that presented a budget and events schedule that failed to include the prom dance? Was it deliberately left out because of the huge profit that it is intended to produce?

Is this the same Grad Class that reappeared to the Finance Commission (after we requested a budget that included all revenues and expenses) with again events missing? Should I trust a group that fails to include "Ooze Cruise" in its complete list of events?

Is this the same Grad Class that between budget No. 1 and budget No. 2 "discovered" extra expenses increasing their losses from \$4,365.00 to \$5,902.00?

Should we fund an alcohol loss at an Extravaganza when bar revenue is estimated at \$3,000 and bar expenses total \$4,194.00 creating, in effect, \$1,194.00 worth of free drinks for Grads.

Do we really feel obligated to provide a free lunch to the 400 Grads expected at the barbecue at a cost of \$1,800 from the Student Union?

Am I expected to give away \$1,050.00 worth of free mugs to the Grads and then try to justify this to the remainder of the students?

Should I violate the financial policy and allow a rental car for the Grad Class executive to cruise around Fredericton during Grad Week?

Or maybe I should ignore the alcohol loss of \$143.00 at the Awards Banquet.

Is it not reasonable to ask that the liquor price be set high enough to cover costs saving the students of UNB \$1,337.00?

Should the barbecue not charge an admission high enough to cover the food cost (as the financial policy says it must) and save the \$1,800.00 expense?

I cannot and will not attempt to justify \$1,050.00 worth of give-away mugs.

And I do not believe that this year's UNB students should fund a scholarship for the glorification of this Grad Class executive.

The above alterations put the Grad Class budget into a

"no need" category.

As for the ridiculous assertion that I gave \$1,000.00 to the Amateur Radio Club with 10 members, I would like to point out that the Valedictorian and the Grad Class Treasurer did that last year. Aubrey Kirkpatrick (Comptroller '84) and Marie Moore (Comptroller '84) are responsible for that as well as the \$1,050.00 to the Chinese Graduate Students Association, with only 21 members or \$50.00 per capita.

And I would reject the charge that SRC does nothing for Grads when in fact the Yearbook usually receives \$8.00 per Grad in subsidy.

Grad Class is being treated the same as other groups because in fact Winter Carnival (6800 students) and Orientation (over 1500 students) are also expected to break even.

Doug Burgess does not apologize to anyone for attempting to be fair to all students when handling the SRC finances.

I did not create the current financial state of the Student Union, but I must try to manage the situation as best as I can. I find my job made more difficult by the C.S.L. disaster, the Yearbook fiasco, the police investigation and now the grumblings of Aubrey Kirkpatrick who could have prevented most of these problems.

I would appeal to students to judge the facts and direct their fury at those responsible for our current mess. I make no claim to perfection in spite of my arrogant manner and I hope that my mistakes are seen with the same good intentions with which they are made.

Sincerely,  
Doug Burgess  
V.P. Finance

### Student politics trivial

Last week's issue of the *Brunswickan* contained a lengthy series of provocative but impelling articles on the recent activities of the SRC: "Commentary on SRC," (Jeff Fryer), "Put Away Mudslinging," (Allan MacDonald), "Larry Go, and Curly Schmoie," (Helena Rojas). Amongst the quagmire of teeth gnashing, there was a note of hope, of perhaps sanctity towards student politics; "Student Government Can Do More" (Andrew Grant). Well, it certainly couldn't be doing much less. Student politics at UNB may not be apathetic, but it is trivial. Mr. Grant's comments of the irrelevance of the

SRC's politicking is the point I'd like to concentrate on.

As a former CUSO cooperant (Nigeria, 1978-80) chairperson of the Fredericton CUSO Local Committee (1983), and current member of Science for Peace at UNB, I have a keen appreciation and interest in international and/or political issues. It does strike me as unfortunate that the SRC at university, which supposedly represents a forum for academia, does not take full advantage of the facilities available to it, and concerns itself with more respectful issues. To bring home such issues to a level which can be absorbed or acted upon by the general student body is a problem. Should the student government, and it if should, could it, promote or encourage concerns which are, shall I say, less fortuitous in nature? Before dropping off, I'd like to brief upon the activities of the G.S.A., and in so doing, to bring more light into the question of campus politics.

The G.S.A. executive is at the moment occupied with as many concerns as it can comfortably handle:

1. revision of the G.S.A. constitution,
2. investigating the possibility of setting up an emergency loan fund for graduating students in need,
3. review of UNB's current residence and housing policy towards graduate students,
4. examining the possibility of forming a graduate student union.

The above points have top priority, as they are, I feel, important. I would like to use the G.S.A. executive getting involved with other members. It should be made clear, however, that the executive needs some more help, more input; and more participation from the students. I am perfectly willing and open to receive new ideas or suggestions which any group might have, provided people are willing to assist in carrying them out.

It appears that if our student governments can't do more, at least perhaps they're being representative. In the case of the G.S.A., if the above items all the students want, that is all they're going to get. As for the SRC, if continued futility is tolerated by the general student body, then that is all they're going to see. As an aside, it does become increasingly apparent that the differences between the G.S.A. and the S.R.C., in their problems and in their approaches

to resolve these problems, seems to warrant autonomous G.S.A./S.R.C. executive bodies. I do hope that the views of graduate students will be voiced, informally at the upcoming G.S.A. Wine and Cheese Party (March 28, 9:00 p.m., University Club, Old Arts Building) and more formally at a General Meeting, early April (time and place, T.B.A.). See you there.

Sincerely,  
David Wallace  
G.S.A. President

### Shocked at disrespect

Editor:

I was shocked to read Miss Rojas' letter concerning our Student Union Executive in last week's *Brunswickan*. I find the sarcasm and contempt displayed in her letter highly unfitting of an Editor-in-Chief for Up the Hill Yearbook. Such petty nicknames as "our little president" and "curly," to name just two, show immaturity on her part and certainly no respect for the president and his executive.

In her campaign letter (also in the *Brunswickan*) Miss Rojas claims to be a strong voice and wishes to use is as Arts Rep. Unfortunately, a voice such as hers, strong probably meaning loud, is one people politely listen to then turn back to whatever business is at hand. If "the keys for a good council are cooperation and communication" as she says, well, it is my opinion that Miss Rojas cannot initiate the first if, as appears from her letter, she intends war in council. As for the second, the premise for communication is respect which is evidently lacking on her part towards the executive and which is she ever had it, she has most certainly lost from the executive.

In conclusion, has Miss Rojas not revealed herself in her second letter I might have voted for her. Fortunately she did, and I thank her for making that campaign error.

Jessica Kinahan (ARTS)

### Learning from the Good Book II

Dear Brunswickan:

This letter is in retort to the caustic sarcasm written by an anonymous individual in your Feb. 15th issue. The whole issue upon which the proceedings were based was the running by your paper of an advertisement of the local Gays and Lesbians Associa-

tion. Apparently this individual read the article some "conscientious reader" had written against this particular ad and was quite upset that the article used the Bible as the foundational authority for condemning homosexuality. To be frank, the arguments that the anonymous person submitted were both appalling and totally deceitful. You have a right to know the truth. It has disturbed me that such an article of obvious untruth could be written and may be accepted by those fooled by dogmatic rhetoric.

He/she stated that the book of Leviticus's validity on the subject of homosexuality is unfounded because Christians, generally, don't practice some of the other rules, such as dietary restrictions, or laws concerning punishment for adultery. Allow me to explain: Leviticus is part of the Pentateuch (first 5 books of the Bible) or the Law. The law of God is divided into three subdivisions: moral, ceremonial and Judicial law. Jesus Christ fulfilled, in His priesthood, the ceremonial law (Ephesians 2:15). He placed the application of the Judicial law in the hands of our Justice systems, but the moral law code remained. The "other laws" he/she mentioned come under either ceremonial or Judicial codes, but homosexuality was dealt with as a moral offence.

Another appalling statement regarded the allegations that "David and Jonathan," "Mary and Martha" and "Jesus and John" were homosexual couples! This is absolutely false and misinterpreted — the writer cannot distinguish between the natural (normal) friendship or closeness of two individuals and homosexuality. He also purported that God placed His approval upon the incestuous relationship between Lot and his daughters, adding that Lot was in the patriarchal line. Firstly, Lot was not a patriarch but a nephew to patriarch Abraham, and secondly God never placed His approval on the act — nor ever shall He.

I would like to challenge this person, or anyone else, for that matter, to find or discover a truly, unexplainable discrepancy in the Bible. I have searched, but I am forced to believe it for its inerrancy and because of the personal way it has touched my life. I challenge you — it may change your whole life!

Sincerely,  
Sheldon Smith

More letters on