

await the profession. Here the labors of Dr. Adams, of Toronto, in connection with the teeth of school children must not be overlooked, and it is lamentable that as the pioneer he has received such scant support from his fellow-practitioners.

The last thought upon which the writer can but briefly touch is the legal status of dentistry in Canada. One country under one flag should be under one law. Why should the provinces of Canada be under different regulations governing the practice of our profession? Does it require different knowledge to save a tooth in British Columbia from that necessary to perform the same operation in Cape Breton? Let us endeavor to do away with the narrow sectionalism that prompts interprovincial legislation. There is no scientific reason, no professional reason, no common-sense reason, and there should be no legal reason why a dentist in one province should not be fully entitled to practise in any other province. Is it not ridiculous that a properly qualified dentist in Ottawa immediately becomes a criminal if he performs the slightest operation in Hull, and *vice versa*? All the great talk about binding this great Dominion into one vast, glorious whole, is nonsense and waste of wind, while the various provinces, like medieval states, raise barriers against each other.

The province of Quebec is the worst offender in this regard. Poor Quebec! hindered as she is with the laws and theology of a century ago. The writer was called recently to give expert evidence in a Quebec court in a suit to recover fees for dental services. On entering the box someone, suspecting the witness of heterodoxy, challenged him on certain matters of belief to which Quebec civil law gives prominence.

The test to which one must subscribe, before being considered a truthful witness, was a little too dogmatic for the writer, so he refused assent and stepped down and out. After him came several illiterate French-Canadian men and women, and even a boy of about ten years of age. Following the lead, the other counsel put the test to these also. To them there was no difficulty—heaven, hell and the future were easy problems, particularly to the ten-year-old boy. The dentist lost his case. Imagine the condition of intelligence where such a legal disability can exist.

This is one difficulty we have to face in the unification of Canadian dental legislation. The other great difficulty is the fear of intruding competition, which is perhaps not very well founded, since all provinces fear alike. A realization of this bugbear would mean an exchange and not an increase of practitioners. Never can dentistry attain its highest position in Canada until the whole Dominion is under a standard of professional qualification.

These few thoughts are given for your consideration: First, Discrimination in the choice of students; second, professional train-