

It will not escape observation that of the nineteen members added to the Board *two only* reside in Toronto where the proceedings of the Board are transacted. Another significant fact is also observable, i. e. that these two gentlemen are both members of the Toronto School of Medicine, originated by the Honorable Dr. Rolph. It must be in the recollection of our readers that not many months ago four members were added to the Board, two of whom were also attached to this School, viz: Dr. Rolph and Dr. Workman; the other two being Drs. Hodder and Bovell, who are members of the Medical Faculty of Trinity College.

The working members of the Board previously had been the Hon. C. Wilwer, M. D.; Drs. King, Herrick, Gwynne, Nichol and Beaumont, attached to the Toronto University, and Dr. Telfer. At whose instigation the first addition was made we are at a loss to conceive. It was, however, a fair and judicious selection. To Dr. Rolph, as being now in the Executive Government from which these appointments emanate, and who would, therefore, be very naturally consulted on the subject, we must attribute the selection of the last batch of Examiners, and hence we learn to appreciate the preference given to his own school and pupils. We are little disposed to cavil at any act which evinces a due regard for the Profession on the part of the Government of the country, but we must deprecate any measure which bears the character of favoritism and inexpediency.

There are several questions which suggest themselves to the mind in reflecting on this subject. What occasion was there for increasing the number of members of the Board? By what criterion or rule were the newly-appointed members selected? At whose instigation was the addition made, and what were the grounds of application to the government? Is the measure not an arbitrary exercise of political patronage?

These suggestive queries require to be considered at greater length than our present space will permit, but we promise ourselves the task of replying to them in our next issue. In the meantime we solicit from the Board, as it is constituted, some public announcement of their proceedings. Month after month glides away and the only evidence which the Profession gains of the labours of this cosmopolitan body, is the gazette notice of those who obtain a license to practice. We are confident it would be more satisfactory to the Profession to know who attended each meeting of the Board—how long it was in session—who were the accepted candidates and how many were rejected—who were the examiners each day and their respective subjects.