

two interpretations or applications of the law, and that quackery will not be left a leg to stand on.

W. G. B.

THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ONTARIO DENTAL LAW.

We have received a large number of letters from dentists in the different parts of the Province, in regard to the working of the Dental Law, nearly all of which contain grievous complaints about its inefficiency. We publish one in this number from Mr. S. T. Clements, of Napanee, which is a fair sample.

Some ask why the Board does not protect them from those who are practicing without license, some say the law is a humbug and should be repealed, as they receive no benefit from it, and some ask why no action has been taken to have it amended. We wish to give all the information in our power to our correspondents, but, as we have not time to reply to each separately, we will do the best we can by giving our opinion of the law and its working through the columns of the Journal.

As we have said before, we consider the Ontario Act far superior to any law regulating the practice of dentistry in existence. The Acts in England and the different States are not to be compared with it in efficiency. It certainly is not perfect, and will require to be amended in some respects after a few years. But, gentlemen, let us carry this law out *faithfully* as it now stands till we see in what respects it can be improved before we again ask the Legislature to come to our relief. There are good and wholesome laws on the statute book against murder and robbery, which are constantly being broken, and we think that it is just as unreasonable for any one to ask to have them amended because people murder and rob, as it is to ask to have the Dental Act changed because some practice in violation of its provisions. It provides a way for the fining of all who practice without a proper certificate from the Board, and we have the authority of the police magistrate of this city for saying that all fines are like taxes, and can be collected if the person fined have *any property* whatever. Surely he must be a very pauper of a dentist who has not twenty dollars worth of instruments.

We do not think that the Board ought to be expected to look after delinquents, any more than any other twelve dentists of the Province, as they are no better protected than the others, and the Act