

paper. It may be here stated that every practical argument he (?) offers is at least a quarter of a century old. Yet he sends it to a respectable journal as something new.

Mr. Bowker says, and mark the imposing personal pronoun: "I know of many patients who have been treated by their physicians for certain diseases caused by amalgam plugs in the mouth, *when neither the physician nor the patient suspects the cause. Many cases of what are called "spontaneous salivation" have been produced, and are the legitimate results of the presence of amalgam plugs in the teeth, &c."*

Dr. Watt says, (page 149) "Many cases occur in which there is severe mercurial disease, *while neither physician nor patient suspects the cause. Many cases that pass for "spontaneous salivation" are the legitimate results of the presence of amalgam plugs in the mouth, &c."* Mr. B's effort to palm off the above as original is contemptible. Having deliberately altered the wording of Watt's writing, he cannot make any excuse of omission of inverted commas, as is frequently the case when plagiarism is detected.

Mr. B's intimation that he does not use amalgam, and the dogmatic assertion that all who do—and almost all dentists in Canada do, he says,—are ignorant, unskilful or dishonest, is remarkable, considering that we, in common with others, can give proof at any time, that the superlative expositor has used it, and even in many cases where the patients were able and willing to pay for gold. As Mr. Beecher says, a man should not "pray cream, and live skim milk;" and allowing that he may have recently given it up, Mr. B. should remember that "no roads are so rough as those which have just been mended, and no sinners more intolerant than those who have just turned saints." We will await further developments from Mr. B. before giving most unmistakable proof that Mr. B. cannot safely afford to assume to be "the expositor of the abuses of dentistry."

The attempt to make capital for himself and to injure his competitors by accusing our only dental educational institutions of a practice which he asserts to be ignorant and dishonest, is most contemptible. We mistake the intelligence and courtesy of the profession at large, if he finds one apologizer for his unjust attacks. Let us differ as we may, and as we do, upon points of practice; but a man who makes his own rule of conduct the square and line by which to judge all others, and who is contemptuous of those who are not of his dogma or way of thinking, had better turn his quills into tooth-picks, and