

candidates will be "pretty smart fellows if they pass me," the examiner should be personally impeached and prosecuted, and a writ of mandamus issued by a rejected candidate against the Board as a body. If members of Boards have a responsibility to themselves, they have also one to the profession, and they have one to the public. If malice and persecution of educated candidates can be established, while favoritism has been shown to candidates of inferior opportunities and ability, the matter should be taken into the courts, in the interest of the honorable members of the profession as well as in that of the public we serve.

I would be disposed to doubt the practicability of examining the examiners. But having known instances of premeditated "foul play" towards well-educated men, who had unfortunately obtained the personal ill-will of one or two examiners, I would favor a test case in the courts, and compel examiners to produce the answers of a candidate who felt convinced that he was unfairly and unjustly dealt with. An examiner who would let his personal prejudices affect his decision ought not only to be shunned and despised by his brethren, but impeached in the courts. The examiners are elected to act with fair play. I am sure the majority of them invariably do so, and are incapable, as honorable men, of doing otherwise, and would be only too anxious to protect their own honor from the dangerous duplicity, intrigue or malice, even of one of their own number.

Yours, etc.,

LICENTIATE.

---

*To the Editor of the DOMINION DENTAL JOURNAL :*

SIR,—In the January issue you made a very wise and proper suggestion, that there should be some way of assuring us that examiners are qualified to examine, and I wish respectfully to contribute my mite towards the arguments that may be suggested to show that it is not only wise but just.

I am in possession of all the questions asked in an examination, and copies of replies given by three candidates who were rejected; and I submit them to your judgment, and ask you if you believe that fair play was shown, or if you believe that there was justification for rejection. Two of the examiners openly told the students that certain answers were altogether wrong, and put their opinions against those of the very highest authorities on questions about which there is no controversy! One examiner, for instance, told a student that arsenic is not a tonic! Dr. T. Lauder Brunton, in his text-book of Pharmacology (the greatest authority in England), places arsenic at the head of his list of those tonics which act on