

Dr. Fitch, a leading physician and dentist of New York, "pleaded guilty to the charge of early prejudice against amalgam. He was now however, disposed to give it its appropriate place, even at the risk of encouraging empiricism and cheap dentistry. He had yet to see the first case of ptyalism from its use."

Dr. Flagg, Professor of dental Pathology and Therap. in Philadelphia Dental College, and *the first man who wrote against amalgam in 1845*, says, "he is now entirely opposed to the statements made regarding the constitutional effects from amalgam fillings. He had again and again treated teeth suffering from periostitis, &c., attributed to amalgam, and had refilled them with amalgam, for the sole purpose of proving to his patients that the material used had nothing to do with the trouble existing."

Dr. Allen, formerly editor of the "Dental Recorder" has written folios to expose the fallacious arguments of the opponents of amalgam. He says: "I have seen over 1000 persons, each having from 1 to 10 amalgam fillings in their teeth, and I only saw one case of ptyalism, which I attributed to dead and ulcerated roots. As soon as the roots were removed the trouble gradually disappeared. I have been brought to see cases of supposed ptyalism from amalgam fillings and have found them to be nothing of the kind, but owing the origin of disease to salivary calculus, ulcerated roots, sponginess of the gums, &c."

Dr. Garretson, author of a late work of 700 pages on "Diseases and Surgery of the mouth, &c," describes the mode of using amalgam for filling teeth, and totally ignores the charges made against it.

I might continue thus to quote from men whose ability to investigate, opportunities to examine, and integrity to report conscientiously, cannot for a moment be doubted. The opinions cited above are founded upon thorough experiment and extensive experience; their authors have their attention confined to the mouth, and the opinions of such men cannot be ignored. The February number of the "American Journal of Dental Science" contains a review of this very article of Mr. Bowker, in which it says: We think Mr. Bowker has taken an extreme view of the case. *We think this compound may be used in teeth which are mere shells so far gone that no other metal can be safely introduced. When properly prepared and properly introduced, instead of amalgam containing 64 parts of mercury to 36 of silver as Mr. Bowker asserts, the proportions of mercury need not and should not be half so great.*" It proceeds to give "the best method for using this material." Is that a condemnation of amalgam?

I do not find one single argument in Mr. Bowker's paper that was not