

ITS HISTORY

In the fall of 1971, a work committee was set up make recommendations to Cabinet on possible bursary programs, through the Department of Education.

The Chairman of the committee was David MacPherson, Student Aid Officer (Dept. of Education), and other members were Robert LeClair - Financial Aid Chairman of UPEI, Howard Jamieson of the Secretariat, and two members whose names are unavailable at this time.

The committee met twice, and decided to submit three plans for consideration. These submissions were:

- A. a plan in which the Student Loan/bursary ratio would be 75/25, starting at zero dollars.
- B. a plan in which the student loan would run to \$1,400, and after that the student would be eligible to receive bursary money.
- C. a plan in which the Student Loan/bursary ratio would be 80/20 from zero dollars.

The Department of Student Services of UPEI sent a letter to the Chairman of the committee in support of plan A, and informed the Student Union of the matter for the first time. The UPEI Student Council considered the matter, and decided it was completely in favor of Plan A. A letter to this effect was sent to Mr. MacPherson and Lorne Moase, Deputy Minister of Education.

The Department of Student Services then became aware of the displeasure of the Department of Education at the information being released to the students.

The decision was then made by Cabinet and was announced by Education Minister Bennett on April 4th. The decision was to adopt plan B. No mention of plans A or C was made, and no reasons for their refusal were given. Mr. LeClair has stated "I don't think the government even considered the other two plans."

(See "Negative Aspects")

Le Clair Dismayed

April 7, 1972

I am writing this as the Financial Aids Officer, U.P.E.I. and what I am writing does not necessarily reflect the view of the University community. The recent decision by Government to change the bursary policy for university students causes me, as an individual, grave concern. In order to obtain any bursary consideration the individual student must show need of more than \$1,400.00.

This, I suggest, is a blatant encouragement for a student to prove need of more than he in reality needs in order to be considered for any of the free money doled out beyond the \$1,400.00 level. This new policy also tends to discourage initiative in a young man or woman who if they get a summer job or part-time work their need is being diminished and hence they will not qualify for any bursary consideration. For example, John Doe a student at X High School. If he has initiative and drive he can get summer employment and earn about \$700.00. Having earned this amount he will have trouble qualifying for any bursary money.

Peter Blue on the other hand realizes that if he works he will hardly qualify for any bursary money. He doesn't look for a job. Come September he shows need of \$2,100.00. So he gets \$1,400.00 loan and \$700.00 bursary thus having the same amount, \$700.00, as John Doe who worked all summer. Thus the individual who works gets nothing and the fellow who loafed gets \$700.00 for having done nothing all summer. Incentives to regard initiative and drive should have been introduced as were suggested by a plan which originated in my office and presented to the Student Aid Officer in the provincial Department of Education.

R.J. LeClair,
Financial Aids Officer
University of P.E.I.

This fact sheet is a publication of the University of Prince Edward Island Student Union as a supplement of the regular weekly student newspaper.