

3. It is better to co-operate from separate centres than not at all and if Joint Board methods really have failed then the other alternative must be tried. But to assert such failure, just when a modified system of joint action that has not yet been tested is about to be tried, is at least, premature. The new scheme must, I think, be given a chance.

4. The reconstructed Board might ~~wrk~~ work reasonably well provided that:-

i. Real responsibility for the efficient conduct of the examination is placed upon it, and the responsibility is genuinely accepted and exercised. A Board that is not empowered to make crucial decisions or that shirks the responsibility of making them, can only increase confusion.

ii. There is good will and a real desire to meet all the ~~inte~~ interests concerned. No adjustment of numerical representation on the Board can compensate for the lack of these. Thus I should hesitate to conclude that because McGill has only two ~~directr~~ representatives on the new Board, only two members of it are prepared to give full consideration to McGill's interests.

iii. The Board acts and continues to act as a whole. There can be no effective action if the Board or any section of it is continually referring beyond itself for authority to act. All parties represented must face and fairly accept the risks involved in guaranteeing the relative independence of the Board. Effective confidence always implies such risks and if confidence proves misplaced, the remedy is a better Board, not a nullification of its authority.