

"affect their interests prejudicially," petitioned Parliament to repeal that portion of the Act, compelling all dentists who had not had an established office practice for the five years, to submit to an examination, and really there seemed, for a short time, to be great danger, of our losing one of the best provisions of the Bill. Upon more mature consideration of the question, however, on the part of the promoters of the "Repeal," they consented to withdraw all opposition to the Act as originally passed, and came forward in January, and passed the required examination.

Now, that so large a majority of the members of the Profession have become interested in maintaining the Law, it is not at all probable that any attempts will be made to induce Parliament to amend the Act, by making it less stringent, in its provisions than it now is.

Undoubtedly the Act is badly drawn up, and ambiguous in some of its parts, and decidedly defective in others. We think that the *number* of the members of the board should be reduced. Surely, seven members are enough to do all the business. By reducing the number to seven a great saving of expenses could be made.

Again the times fixed by the Act for the meeting of the Board, is, in our opinion, injudicious. The Board *must* meet the third Tuesday in January, and pass all who have made application before that time. Now, suppose, that the members of the Board should decide to open a Dental College, as it is most probable they will, it will be impossible for them to pass those attending, as there will not be time to give a course of Lectures, ending at that season of the year, more particularly, as we understand that it is intended to ask one or both Medical schools in Toronto to allow the students in Dentistry to attend the Lectures in Anatomy, Physiology, Chemistry, etc, in those Institutions.

Then, the time for holding the elections for subsequent Boards is fixed for the first Tuesday in June, thus compelling all who wish to vote, to go to Toronto for that express purpose. We think that such change should be made as would allow the Dentists of the country to elect subsequent Boards, while attending the meetings of the Association. These are some of the more important changes which we think ought to be made in the Act, but, we question very much, whether it would be advisable to ask for any amendments in it, until we have carefully tested its working for a few years.

It could hardly be expected that *we* should get an act that would