

Especially when one essays to be a philanthropist, he should, at least, condescend to be correct.

Mr. Bowker asserts that the "American Society of Dental Surgeons" *unanimously* carried a resolution (in 1845) condemnatory of amalgam. That is wrong. Sixty-one of the one hundred and thirty-three members voted against it, and *the resolution was finally rescinded by the very majority who framed it.*

Mr. Bowker says; "The institution *with the imposing title* of 'Royal College of Dental Surgeons' encourages the use of amalgam, and that the same may be said of the 'Dental Association of Quebec;' and "that the Dental Societies of Canada, who put themselves forward as the guardians and representatives of the profession in the Dominion, not only advocate but vindicate its use." It is not surprising that your correspondent is ignorant of what has or has not really transpired in our dental societies, &c., as he is not a member of any; but as an illustration of the trouble he has taken to make himself acquainted with facts, I am qualified to assure you that neither college nor societies have once, directly or indirectly, discussed the subject, and that all clinics in "filling teeth" have invariably been done with gold. The sneering allusion, *en passant*, to the College, may pass for its full value, but I venture to say that the institution will survive any such disparagement. On its faculty it has some leading medical men of Ontario, such as Drs. Canniff, Sangster, Rolph, Bethune, Geikie, Berryman, &c., as well as leading dentists of the upper Province, and, moreover, it, with the societies and the progressive movements generally of the profession, have the hearty sympathy of all prominent medical men in Ontario.

Another assertion is that "the highest dental and medical authorities, European and American, have condemned the use of amalgam, in any form whatever, for filling teeth, as malpractice." Now, we must expect differences of opinion upon this whole subject of amalgam; but no reasonable man will say that opinions dictated when amalgams were composed of impure metals, and imperfectly understood, can continue to hold good against the superior improved article. The possibility of even a good amalgam being abused by the use of impure mercury, or "sixty-four parts of mercury to thirty-six of silver," is no more reasonable argument against the use of this material, than an argument that no preparation of arsenic, morphia, &c., should be used because they are infallible poisons. To-day there are some dental writers whose opinions of amalgam may be quoted as argument against its use; but Harris, Piggott and others wrote when amalgam was abused, and in the former work we find methods of "treatment" recommended for various dental