

## Clark at ease as York's guest lecturer

By JONATHAN GOODMAN

It had been a long time since Joe Clark last taught university students in Alberta in 1966. While the setting might have been a bit unfamiliar for the former Prime Minister of Canada and federal Conservative leader, he seemed right at home as a guest lecturer at York Monday afternoon.

In the first of a series of lectures and discussions he's been chairing all this week, Clark spoke to graduate business students in the Faculty of Administrative Studies about his views on parliamentary reform.

In the first portion of the lecture he called for a change in the basis of voting in the House of Commons which would result in a higher percentage of government measures being decided through free, rather than party, voting. Later he tackled student queries.

In a pre-lecture press conference, Clark explained how the talk provided him with a chance "to test some views about what I think is going on in the country with people who are not so involved in the government itself, but who are involved in theory."

While Clark regarded the lecture as a testing ground, the students seemed enthusiastic listening to Clark talking about the link between business and government.

"Whenever business makes policy it must take the government into account," said Chris Maziarz, a 23-year-old first-year MBA student. "It is important to learn about what is happening in the public sector—to know where to go to, who to get information from, and how to anticipate public policy—and Clark is one of the best to learn this from."

Clark discussed the importance of instituting more free votes in the House of Commons as a way of making it more effective. (In a free vote, MPs vote according to their own conscience rather than along party lines.) "This change is far more important than any other change in our electoral system," Clark said.

By having 60-70 percent government measures decided through free voting, Clark maintains that parliament could assume a more active and responsible role in the electoral process and that it would allow the

government to "focus its intentions on what is important—what is essential to the mandate of the government." Furthermore, the public service would have to work more closely with parliament instead of regarding it as something that should merely be tolerated. Clark said this would lead to "much more involvement of people who are in touch with the country."

Questions were raised about how the proposal would be introduced, who would decide which government measures would be put to a free vote, what criteria would be used to decide, and whether MPs would actually accept such a system. Clark said the proposal could only be introduced in the early days of a newly-formed government and that it would be very hard to legislate. In the beginning, the Prime Minister would make the distinction between free vote and party vote measures, he said. However, Clark was unable to affirm what criteria might be used.

On the subject of the MPs acceptance of his proposal, Clark explained that although there would be some who were content to their role

as critics with little responsibility, the majority would welcome it. "Most people go there (to the House of Commons) because they have some illusions that they can change the system," he said.

Clark displayed a quick wit throughout the afternoon, bantering with the press about the difference between the students and the House of Commons: "you get more exciting questions here than in the House." Later, in reaction to a statement from Professor James Gillies (Director of the Faculty's Public Management Area, former candidate for the Conservative leadership and, later, Prime Ministerial Aide to Clark), that Clark could speak for himself, Clark said "It's about all I can do these days."

Sharon Zibitski, a 21-year-old first-year student in the combined MBA-LL.B program, said "As a speaker he was fine, but he didn't go into enough depth."

"I was quite pleased with the good exchange of ideas and with the questions of my assumptions," said Clark at the end of the lecture.



Photo: MARIO SCATTOLONI

**They marched for peace.** People from all walks of life made up the more than 18,000 disarmament who marched the streets of Toronto last Saturday. Simultaneous marches took place across the world, making the October 22 march a success. For story and picture, see page 6.

## University bans essay services

### York threatens trespassing charge in eradication campaign

By BERNARDO CIOPPA  
and PAUL O'DONNELL

The University has billed an essay writing service \$200 after spending that amount removing an advertising sticker the service placed on York grounds.

Quality Research and Term Papers, along with two other essay services; Custom Essay Service and Essay Service, have also been told to keep their advertisements off the campus. All three have received letters from Vice-President (Student Relations) John Becker, saying the services "are prohibited from using University property for any purpose."

The letters, dated October 19, also warn "should any of your agents be observed on York University property in the future, you will be charged with trespass and removed from the campus by police."

In the letter to Quality Research and Term

Papers, Becker said the sticker was damaging to school property and it posed a "litter problem," so an invoice for \$200 was sent to them. The letter says the University plans to enforce collection through the courts if necessary.

Representatives from Quality Research, Custom, and Essay Services could not be reached for comment.

The use of essay services by students is prohibited at York. When contacted, Becker said students be warned of possible penalties if they're caught plagiarizing—suspension and/or loss of an academic year.

Becker said he's had difficulties in the past contacting these agencies. He said when he phoned those services that included a phone number in their advertisement, a company spokesman would "clam up."

He said by posing as a student he was able to get their address and a manager's name.

In another letter, addressed to *Excalibur* and University officials, Becker proposed police assistance in identifying services which didn't indicate a manager's name or address.

The letter also suggested "weightier court action to stop them from coming on campus," and to "take other steps to drive them out of business."

## Former York employee, York reach settlement out of court

By CHRIS WARREN

A former York employee who was fired in 1981 after nine years of service, received \$14,000 in an out-of-court settlement from the University last week.

The settlement, reached between York and Mary Lambert, a former budget officer, amounted to approximately 9½ months' pay. Lambert had originally demanded a full year's pay with additional expenses, according to her lawyer Kaisree Charterpaul.

Charterpaul said in addition Lambert received about \$7,000 in 1981 for a 3½-month period because of an early dismissal. Lambert has remained jobless since the termination of her employment at York. Lambert would not comment but was "satisfied" with the settlement, according to her lawyer.

Despite the two years that elapsed between Lambert's dismissal and the settlement, vice-president of Finance and Employee Relations William Farr maintains that it was "one of the shortest settlements ever."

Lambert was promoted to a senior position in her department in 1972. Problems arose following the appointment

of a new supervisor, Hugh Wareham, to the finance department in early 1981.

Charterpaul said business disagreements led to personal discord which resulted in a verbal confrontation in September 1981 in which Wareham allegedly made a disparaging remark about Lambert's mental incompetence. When contacted, Wareham would not comment on the incident. Farr also had no comment at time of press.

On September 18, 1981 Lambert was told by Farr and Don Mitchell, head of personnel, that "in the absence of viable transfer opportunities we accept your resignation."

"There was absolutely no evidence of an intent on her part to resign," said Charterpaul. "She was a scapegoat of a superior's incompetence."

Charterpaul did not press for Lambert's reinstatement, but this, he said, was a result of the then presiding judge's admitted reluctance to grant reinstatements in such disputes.

"In a way, York University won," Charterpaul said, "and in a way they lost." But he adds that the court decision proves "that an employee need not accept arbitrary dismissal."