

stitution was similarly burdened. Moreover, the determination as to whether the requirements of Section (3) (b) of the statute are met must be made primarily in examination of the activities of the Center for Research Libraries which itself was not a party to the proceedings.

Further, as a matter of policy the formation of the multi-university corporation is effective insurance of permanent, long-term collaboration. The position adopted by the Section was to penalize this precise activity in contrast to a much looser and often informal collaborative arrangement.

VI

It would appear that Section 1004 of HR 15067 would meet this problem and should now authorize the Office of Education to deal with the Center for Research Libraries as "a private, nonprofit agency, organization or institution designated or created by a group of institutions of higher education for the purpose of carrying out a common objective on their behalf." Previous experience, however, leads me to inquire as to whether the making of some legislative history would not be appropriate in this matter. Membership of the two Canadian universities and the Crerar Library is very much in the interest of not only the Center, but of each of its members. Moreover, in years to come it is altogether likely that major public libraries may desire to participate. I am concerned that, lacking legislative history, the question of eligibility of the Center might again be raised. I hope that you will forgive the length of this note. We are, as always, most grateful to you for your leadership and interest.

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN H. LEVI.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
Coral Gables, Fla., February 26, 1968.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: Thank you for your letter of February 17, 1968. As I stated to you in my letter of February 6, 1968, I would advise you of the actions taken on the resolutions which were presented to the Florida Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (FASFAA) and to the Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (SASFAA).

Enclosed are copies of the resolutions presented and the resulting action taken by the two respective organizations is noted in red at the top of each resolution.

As I was responsible for the preparation and presentation of the resolutions to both organizations I would like to comment briefly on each.

(1) *NDEA—Teacher Cancellation Provisions—Section 205(b3)*

This resolution was passed by a large majority vote by both organizations, and there were no vocal comments or objections presented.

(2) *NDEA—Terms of Loans—Section 205(a)*

This resolution was passed by a large majority by both organizations, and there were no vocal comments or objections presented.

(3) *NDEA—Loyalty Oath—Section 1001(f1) and 1001(f3)*

This resolution was rejected by F.A.S.F.A.A. and was not presented to S.A.S.F.A.A. It should be understood however that in the Southeast there is at present a lot of misunderstanding and irrational acceptance of the validity and purpose of the loyalty oath.

I personally feel that the loyalty oath is a meaningless gesture on the part of the federal government.

(4) *CWSP—Federal-Institutional Matching Ratios—Section 124(f)*

This resolution passed unanimously by both the F.A.S.F.A.A. and S.A.S.F.A.A. organizations.

(5) *CWSP—Anniversary dates re Matching Ratios*

This resolution passed unanimously by both the F.A.S.F.A.A. and S.A.S.F.A.A. organizations.

(6) *Proliferation and Duplication of Student Financial Aid Programs*

This resolution passed by a substantial majority in the F.A.S.F.A.A. meeting but was referred to Committee for further study by S.A.S.F.A.A. The primary