

in regard to the proposed measures of any department, but the committees should merely recommend corrections and make criticisms, and they should do this quite as a customary procedure. If points remain in dispute, they should be a subject of investigation by a special committee appointed to arbitrate the matter. If the matter is grave enough for a department to reject the recommendations of the executive committee, or vice versa, it is grave enough to require full investigation by some specially chosen group thoroughly conversant with the points in question. This should not entail unnecessary outbursts of more committee work, because it should be safe to assume that on only rare occasions would departments and the committees fail to agree. If this assumption is wrong, there must be something radically amiss with the personnel involved in the dispute.

A statement in the calendar calling attention to the official policies in the Graduate School along the lines previously suggested would be valuable; and in it some definite mention should be made <sup>that one</sup> of the guiding principles here is ~~to be~~ "independent development for the departments," limited only by regulations absolutely essential to the protection of the reputation of the work of the University.

(7) No reference at the last Faculty meeting was made to the opinion shared by many, that the Dean of a Faculty, of as high a status as the Graduate Faculty, could be appropriately chosen by the Graduate Faculty itself, or at least as a result of formal recommendations from them.

Obviously this question rests with the Governors, but