feature of PRO on the I constituent *to* of the IP containing PRO. Likewise, the nominative Case carried by *we* is checked by the head I constituent *would* of the IP containing *we* (*We want that he would become a millionaire).* In both cases, "checking involves a spec-head relation-more specifically, a relation between the head I constituent of IP and its specifier." (A.Radford,1997: 85)

"The Case of a null PRO subject is checked in a different way from the Case of an objective subject." (A.Radford,1997: 86) That is," the null Case of a PRO subject is internally checked (from within IP) by the null Case infinitive particle *to* ;but the Case of an objective subject is externally checked (from outside IP) by an immediately preceding transitive verb or transitive complementizer. Since it is exceptional for a subject to have its Case externally checked from outside its containing IP, the relevant phenomenon is generally known as **exceptional Case-marking** (conventionally abbreviated to **ECM**). "(A.Radford,1997: 86) It follows that "an infinitive complement with an objective subject is referred to as an **ECM complement** ;and a verb which selects an infinitive complement with an objective subject is referred to as an **ECM verb."** (A.Radford,1997: 86)

This has led to the assumption that " the different ways in which the Case properties of null and objective subjects are checked are reflected in systematic asymmetries between control infinitives with PRO subjects and ECM infinitives objective subjects." (A.Radford,1997: 86) One such asymmetry relates to the behavior of the relevant complements in active and passive structures. For example, when a verb such as *decide* is used as a control verb ,it allows an infinitival IP complement with a PRO subject :

(3)
(i) *They decided [**PRO** to postpone the meeting]*
(ii) *It had been decided [**PRO** to postpone the meeting]*