

# Editorial

## An open letter to Jack Santarelli

Over 50 grievances have been filed against one of York's most essential departments, Security and Safety Services, in the past six months. Irregardless of the nature of these complaints, it is clear that management/employee relations within this department have become, to say the least, strained.

Staff morale is at an all time low, according to the Claude Williams, the Union's chief steward of Security. And if York Security staff, who often work up to 200 hours overtime each year, are feeling this strongly dissatisfied with the management, then the security of every member of the York community is quite possibly in jeopardy.

Over two weeks ago, after the October 21 Security Forum, *Excalibur* requested to meet with Jack Santarelli, the Director of Safety and Security, to discuss matters concerning his department. Over 12 phonecalls and numerous visits later, Santarelli has still, at presstime, claimed to be too busy to personally address the York community through *Excalibur*.

On Tuesday, Santarelli's secretary, Janet McArthur, finally arranged a meeting between *Excalibur* and Santarelli scheduled for next Wednesday. When asked if no sooner date was possible, McArthur said that Santarelli was "too busy planning his vacation."

Santarelli has every right to withhold comment from the press. Yet he is not merely reserving comment—he is instead refusing to even *listen* to *Excalibur's* queries. Santarelli returns, on average, only about one out of every five phonecalls made to his office by *Excalibur* and will not answer questions directly, referring all matters to his Assistant Director of Special Services, Eric Pond. While Pond is as helpful and obliging as possible, many of the issues *Excalibur* is addressing do not at all pertain to his office. These security issues are of the utmost importance to the York community and waiting yet another week to even have them heard by Santarelli is an affront to the University. Perhaps he will reply to this open letter.

Dear Mr. Santarelli:

The following matters have been brought to our attention and remain unconfirmed by your department.

1. Exactly how many grievances have been filed against your department in the past six months? What do you think are the reasons behind this large number of complaints?
2. On October 7, Security was called about an incident regarding a man with a gun threatening that he would "kill someone". Metro Police were not called to the scene and security officers who attended the scene were not previously informed that the man was armed. The Union claims that the lives of the unarmed Security Officers involved were endangered. How was such a potentially dangerous situation allowed to arise?
3. In a letter posted by you on October 14, you wrote of your "willingness to consider any new squad shift schedule that (Williams and Lloyd Scott, a Union trustee) proposed on behalf of the officers." *Excalibur* has been notified that many alternatives to the Timken work schedule were proposed to you, some with the written endorsement of up to 12 union members of Security. What has been your response to these proposals? Were they openly discussed with management and staff?
4. It is alleged that parking control officers must now walk from their kiosks (parking stations) to the East Office Building with up to \$450 on their person. Do you not feel that this is potentially dangerous for these officers (as they can be easily robbed), or at least an emotional strain on them?
5. At a July 2 meeting with Claude Williams and Lloyd Scott concerning PCO Rita Hendrickson's case, it is alleged that you promised that an apology from David Kurosky would be forwarded to Hendrickson. Is this true? Did you later reverse this decision? If so, why?
6. At last month's Security Forum, Catherine Lake, Director of Women's Affairs for CYSF requested that you forward a copy of the Forum's minutes, with any additional comments you might have, to *Excalibur*. At that time (October 21), you publicly agreed to send a report to us. No such document has yet been received. Why?

Hoping for a speedy reply.

Yours sincerely,

Lorne Manly Paulette Peirol

Lorne Manly  
Paulette Peirol  
EDITORS, EXCALIBUR

cc: 14,000 York community members

excalibur

MAILING ADDRESS:  
Room 111, Central Square  
York University  
4700 Keele Street  
Downsview M3J 1P3

EDITORIAL: 736-5239  
ADVERTISING: 736-5238  
TYPESETTING: 736-5240



ARMCHAIR VACATIONER JACK SANTARELLI SENDS HIS ELUSIVE BEST!

## Letters

### Reader applauds York Pension Fund's prudence

Editor:

With reference to the York Divestment Committee letter, *Excalibur* October 16, I take exception to a group of self-styled, media-hungry, student committee members having the audacity to stamp their precocious feet and claim that they speak for "all significant campus interests." For too long these self-righteous rhetoric-spitters have screeched, yowled and whined with boring repetition, against the York University Pension Fund. Students come and go. Pension Funds must remain consistent and unmoved by a bunch of sniveling hypocrites. A suggestion to set up a fund to assist underprivileged South African blacks was vehemently decried by Messers Dafiewhare, Grant and Stevenson as being an "insult."

Naturally they were unable to make any concrete suggestions of a responsible nature. Let us understand that Messers Dafiewhare, Grant and Stevenson are anxious to make their mark and do so by howling storms of hot air and by hurling grand idealism at *Excalibur* readers.

Put your money where your mouths are, gentlemen. Action, not vitriol. And rather than decry the efforts of the York Pension Fund, let us applaud their prudence and care in reviewing the situation and refusing to be swayed by hysterical hyperbole, irresponsible gabbling and fact-manipulation by *Excalibur* contributors.

—H. English

### 'Hopefully there's only 1 Chatterton'

Editor:

If B. Chatterton is one student who is ashamed of the "pie in the sky philosophy" that existed back in the '60s, I hope to God that he/she is the only one. I personally found myself aghast to see such a vacuous, narrow-minded point of view stated by a member of the university community; I ask Mr., Mrs., or Miss Chatterton this: what the hell is wrong with a bit of idealism? Were the ecologists of the '60s just a non-sensical bunch of dreamers for insisting on a clean earth? Or how about the followers of the Rev. King? Would you dismiss them similarly for insisting on a desegregated world? These are products of the decade you loathe, Mr./Miss Chatterton.

Furthermore, I would like to know what particular qualifications

give B. Chatterton the right to adopt such a self-righteous attitude. I feel sorry for Chatterton in that, no matter how she/he may disagree, we are the product of history, and although an entire decade of growth and experimentation appears to have offended him/her, we would not exist as we do today without it. B. Chatterton, I offer you my deepest sympathy.

—Jan Mitchell

### Chat's theory of deviancy is appalling: reader

Editor:

In response to B. Chatterton's letter (*Excalibur*, Oct. 30), that condemns the student idealism of the '60s as intellectual trash and then through his own preppie demeanor and rose coloured Vuarnets cites as 'respectable deviants' groups such as the International Socialists.

'Respectable Deviancy,' I like that. It sounds so pragmatically in tune with the current times. It somehow must concur with being together enough to sport a nice tablecloth at your display table in Central Square along with a pair of socks with your sandals but definitely no natural fibres or beads cause that's yucky.

Respectable Deviancy is going to an orgy and complaining about the grapes.

Respectable Deviancy is crossing against the light or holding a subway door open for a friend. Puhleeze.

Idealism is an embrace of the alternatives of what can be, of imagination.

The B. Chatterton straight line approach to reality purges and makes hush and complacent our creative intuitions, our desire to question, to find the surreal in every real.

To merely push something aside because it is too idealistic or deviant is to negate a multiplicity of challenges and possibilities and instead propulgate a visionary boredom, a safe teflon reality with heroes of its own. Need I mention who?

—Randy Terada

### York University is private property, reader tells JFJ

Editor:

I am writing in response to a letter that appeared in the October 30 issue of *Excalibur*, entitled "Let Jews for Jesus speak on campus." The authors of this letter stated that "arrogant paternalistic students" are depriving the York campus from hearing another point of view. Perish the thought! You are quite right,

everybody is entitled to voice their opinion, whether they be "Jews for Jesus," "Vegetarians for Meat," "Christians for Mohammed" or "Pacifists for War." However, does the right to "Freedom of Speech" require you to permit Moammar Khaddafi to speak in your home? Obviously not! Your house is private property. Well, guess what? The York administration recognizes York campus as private property. Non-student based groups must (horror of horrors!) ask permission to come onto the York campus. The "Jews for Jesus" group, however, did not feel compelled to follow this university requirement.

Perhaps before becoming so "appalled," you should have researched the matter more thoroughly.

—Ronda Drash

### Flagal ignores staff participation

Editor:

Regarding "But did we try hard enough?" in the October 23 issue (page 6), Mr. Flagal states that approximately 5,000 students attended the rally at Convocation Hall and 350 students participated in the event at Burton Auditorium. Given that Mr. Flagal also shares the by-line for the front page article in that *Excalibur* issue, I find it particularly disconcerting that he failed to recall that the two events were attended not only by students, but also by staff, part-time and full-time faculty, and some administrators.

—Celia Harte

President, York University Staff Association

### Director clarifies CYSF budget

Editor:

With respect to the page 4 article "CYSF Newsbeat," I would like to bring to your attention an inaccuracy within the article.

While it is true that I said that the CYSF Annual Budget contained estimates of Council expenditures for the 1986-87 year because the Council operating grant fluctuated with "differing student enrolment," at York; I never said that changes in student enrolment had an effect on provincial funding in this context.

The CYSF operating grant is based on an entitlement per full time equivalent student (FTE). As student enrolment differs at York, so will CYSF's and other student governments' operating grants. Provincial funding of universities has no effect on the operating grants York student governments receive.

—Nadine Changfoot  
Director of Finance, CYSF