

# NUS Pushes For Better Bargain on Student Aid

Student aid has been a subject given little public attention by the federal government. And with good reason. It seems a strong student aid consciousness on the part of students can cause problems.

The problems are arising as a result of strong activity on the part of NUS, the national union of students. NUS has been voicing strong criticism of current aid policy, and has drawn up a series of demands which are to be presented to parliament this fall. These demands have been stimulated by a lack of federal initiative in di-

rections seen a strong priority by students. It seems there is a communications gap inhibiting the formation of a satisfying student aid program.

Typically, policy has been decided in meetings which are not open to student inspection. Even when students have been given positions on advisory boards, they have been refused access to material outlying criterion determining the selection process.

The three demands NUS will present include: 1 student participation in student aid decisions,



2 Student aid criterion which are flexible and realistic, 3 removal of all financial barriers to education.

The first demand has arisen as a result of the fact that students have virtually NO say in decisions regarding student aid programs. The decisions are often made by policy boards with no real awareness of student problems. This can only be called irresponsible when you realize their decisions may determine the future course of a persons life.

The second demand was stimulated by an awareness that criterion for aid were quite severe in reference

to parental and summer saving contributions. This seemed unrealistic in the face of disparate earning power and an unstable economy.

The third item is the most radical. NUS feels that grants should replace loans as the basis of the student aid program. NUS says that loans deter people from low income areas.

It is imperative that students realize that student aid policy reflects the administrations attitude towards participatory democracy. This form of democracy is only valid as long as there is an informed populace. If

con't on page 3

# cadre

'Covers The Island Like The Tourists'

**UNIVERSITY OF  
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND**

students- free faculty- 10¢

vol. 7 no. 5 oct. 7, 1975

## Student Council Meeting Not Much Happened But At Least Done Well

The Student Council meeting held on Oct. 5th was remarkable for its brevity and for the ability of councillors to stick to the topic, to raise only germane points, and, what's more, to raise them only once.

However, in typical Council fashion, not less than four agenda items were dropped (one is tempted to say tabled but there was not even a motion to that effect).

The question of yearbook fees was the first one to be discussed at any length. It seems that the yearbook this year will cost approximately \$7.75 per--and as we all know fees only cover \$6.00 of that. As a consequence Woozy asked that council raise the fees two dollars.

Wade MacLaughlan immediately pointed out that fees are a very touchy subject with the student body. Consequently council should not raise them without there first being considerable discussion on campus. In the discussion which emerged from this, they came to

the conclusion that we had three choices--raise fees, abolish the yearbook, or give it over to a company which would publish it, probably in an inferior fashion, and with more advertising--but for nothing.

It was finally decided to table this notion to the general meeting, allowing a much more widespread viewpoint to emerge. Possibly the whole thing may go before a referendum in the end.

The other point on the agenda was a constitutional ammendment. It seems that in our constitution is an item over which the Student Union has no control. We have stated that the number of people on the Student Judiciary Council must be nine. However the University has control over the SJC, not the Student Union. So Woozy MacDonald moved that the number in the Constitution be changed from nine to five (since the University has already changed it) and further that it be a by-law not a constitutional paragraph.

However it was eventually decided that since the Student Union had no control over the number it was absurd to have it even as a by-law. So the final motion was that the reference to the number of students on the SJC be removed but the selection procedure remain, doctored up to fit five rather than nine. At present it states that there must be one from each year, each faculty, etc. If however, this is juggled so that it now fits five rather than nine, then we have not really gained anything.

If we say, as an example, that there must be one day-student, one residence student, one science student, one arts student and one education student then we have required that the Council consist of five people, even though we still have no control over the number, Council seems to have forgotten this point.

The final item on the agenda was the question of a telephone for the Radio Station. Last year Council pa-

ssed a motion that the phones for CIMN and the Cadre would be run through the University system because of an excess of unauthorized phone calls. Several were made on the Cadre phone, apparently by cleaning women, a problem which has since been cleared up. CIMN ran one huge bill ordering equipment and was accused of making unauthorized calls. Both of them were put through the university exchange. However this does not solve the problem, long distance calls can be made through that exchange--they are just more expensive!! There has been a move twice to give CIMN a new phone since the amount of requests which come in tends to overload the university exchange, especially after ten when there are only two lines. Council tabled this motion since it did not have enough information about the various alternatives.

Once again, I must congratulate council for their ability to conduct an intelligent meeting for once.