

Any publication of the student's work with the approval of the university should be permitted only on the recommendation of both examiners.

(f) If the candidate were proposing to take a major and a minor subject, the board should decide as to whether these were sufficiently related to one another; they might well, except under very special circumstances, refuse to allow minor subjects to be chosen outside the group ^{as a Board} they represented. Personally I think the whole system of major and minor subjects quite unsound. In graduate work a man should be old enough to specialise on one subject - if cognate studies are necessary he should take them, but ~~if~~ beyond that he should not go. Under the present system there is far too much dispersal of energy and miscellaneous browsing in order to provide him with the required units of lecture attendance.

(g) The boards should consider the courses of graduate study offered by their members, and recommend them to the Graduate Faculty.

(h) To the boards matters of general policy or regulation should be submitted by the Faculty of Graduate Studies for consideration and report. On such report the Graduate Faculty might well find it desirable to make different regulations for different ~~groups~~ ~~of~~ groups of subjects in accordance with their special needs, while maintaining a general parity of standard.

(i) The boards should be a means of greater coordination and cooperation between the different departments represented. At present in graduate work such cooperation seems very slight.

One other point arises ~~in my mind~~ ^{the} out of ~~Prof. Shaw's~~ comment on the necessity for increasing the staff to cope with the flood of graduate work. This is no doubt necessary, but it seemed to me to be based on an unsound conception that runs through much of the graduate regulations at McGill. It is not sufficiently