

ATTEND TO YOUR BOOKS.

Dentists, like physicians, are notoriously poor men of business. In this respect, the quacks are ahead of the best men in the profession. The quack is wise enough to know that if he does not get cash when his "work" is done, he will not be likely to get it at all. The honest dentist is generally fool enough to let people fool him, and would rather lose a fee than sue a patient. It is as wonderful how a large practice may have small financial results, as a small practice may have comparatively large results. It is all a matter of book-keeping and collecting. Once upon a time the credit system among dentists in Ontario was the rare exception; now it is nearly as bad as in Quebec. Once upon a time dentistry was what it should be, a lucrative profession; now it is chiefly so to those who have an established practice and who keep up with the times—and to the quacks. No one makes as much money in dentistry as your patent-leathered, fur-lined, diamond-decked humbug, whom every dentist knows to be an ignoramus of the first water, but whom the public judge solely by his diamonds and his veneer. The honest men might take at least one lesson from the charlatans. They should attend more carefully to their books and collections.

A POINT OF LAW.

Last June a complaint was presented to the Board of Directors of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario that a license had been granted to an applicant who had declared in the regular way that he had been in continuous office practice for five years previous to March, 1868, and was therefore legally entitled to it without examination. As the law did not place any limit as to when such applications should be invalid, the Board had only to accept the signed application and statutory declaration of the party concerned, which was duly made before a notary-public, which was further sworn to by responsible residents as within their knowledge, and grant the license. The question of veracity seems to turn chiefly upon the age of the applicant at the time he claimed to have been in practice—sixteen; and also as to the fact of his attendance for three months two years afterwards at a public school, and the absence, about a year before the five years expired, of the party with whom he claimed to be practising.

Irregularities of this sort frequently occurred at the time of the organization of the profession both in Ontario and Quebec, and