

subject of research on the ground (a) that it was a subject unworthy of serious work, or (b) that its possibilities had already been exhausted, or (c) that there was not adequate facilities at the student's disposal for serious work to be done in it; this last ground is worthy of more consideration than it is sometimes given^{at} McGill. And they should have a free hand to lay down what courses, if any, the student should be compelled to take: for instance, I could well imagine that they might suggest that a studentⁿ in the department of classics proposing to work on the subject of Roman legal institutions should be compelled to attend the relevant lectures of the Professor of Roman Law.

(d) They might also lay down the minimum time in which, under the special circumstances of each student, he should be permitted to take his degree.

(e) They should certainly appoint the examiners who are to read the student's thesis, and possibly to examine ~~to examine~~ him by other methods as well. One of these examiners would obviously be the person who is directing the student's work, the other should be someone from outside the university, but if this is not possible, he should be appointed solely on the grounds of his competence in the student's special field of research. The casual way in which the second examiner is at present appointed and the casual way in which he often takes his duties - at any rate in the Faculty of Arts - seems to me an insult to any student who has submitted really serious work. The second examiner should be paid a fee - voluntary work is usually worthless work and if a man is paid, he has some sense of responsibility and is more likely to do his job properly and punctually. The arrangement at present in vogue is, if taken seriously, an unwarrantable levy on the time of the staff. I regard this question of the second examiner as vital to the maintenance of a decent standard of work.