Setting aside the "Sales" advantages of the matter, I do feel that these Faculty objections can be met on their own ground. In the first place, my suggestion is not to throw open the Master of Science degree - which is a graduate school degree the world over; but to revive the Master of Applied Science degree, and only to our own Bachelors of Science. As the name implies, it will be a Master degree for outside and practical work, the qualifications being the product of extramural study, experience and research. The standards of qualifications, therefore, can be equally high as the graduate school standards, but it should be recognized that they will, in some degree, be different. The degree would be awarded for engineering and work done in applied science, physics, chemistry and metallurgy, for instance, as met with in the field. As to standards of the proposed Master of Science degree, the Faculty, of course, would establish their own standards of thesis and examination. I do not think it will be questioned that much valuable work, at least of Master degree calibre, is being done extramurally. A graduate does not stop thinking and studying when he graduates. Usually his work becomes more intensive. The average rating of such work can easily be ascertained by examining the transactions of the different societies and institutes of engineering, mining, chemistry and the other branches of practical science. I question if extramural work is becoming obsolete. Most of the large universities today are encouraging extramural work, and the results are often accepted (by Columbia, for instance) as part qualifications for a degree. This seems to be the answer to the question of the value of extramural study.

It is important, therefore, that this matter must be looked at from different points of view, from the standpoint of the general advantage to the University, and from the equally important standpoint