

organization of the National Association of Dental Faculties, as compared with the present condition. And yet it has done but a small proportion of its manifest duty. Its accomplishments have been elementary.

It is not too much to say that our professional reputation must be what our colleges make it. We are the educators of those who are to be the leaders in the professional matters of the future. The next generation of dentists will be what we shall make it. Legislators may pass laws to regulate and restrict dental practice, but the stream can rise no higher than the fountain-head, and the practitioner of to-morrow must get his training and derive his professional knowledge from the school to-day. He must enter the profession by submitting himself to our guidance. The colleges are the fountain-head, and the stream will be limpid or foul according to whether we purify or contaminate it.

This should be a proud position. It certainly is a responsible one, and woe betide the college professor who does not realize his accountability. The man who accepts the honor which may appertain to this distinguished station, without striving his utmost to be in every way worthy of it, to fulfill every duty with an eye single to the best interest of student and profession, is unworthy a place in our ranks. He who assumes to arm the young men of our country for the battle of life, to fit them and equip them for an honorable career simply that he may minister to his own good, who takes the teacher's place and ascends the instructor's rostrum from selfish motives, is a worse hypocrite than the preacher whose every-day life belies his own sermons.

I believe that we are all sincere in desiring to make our schools, and through them the profession, all that they should be. To secure this it is not enough that we look solely to the preliminary qualifications of those whom we accept as candidates for a confidential position in American families. We need to make our instruction as perfect as possible. This cannot be done unless there is a generally accepted standard, and some uniformity in system. At present one of our greatest sources of weakness lies in the fact that there is no common comprehension of a standard of methods. One school begins instruction with the alphabet, proceeds to the construction of simple words, and by regular gradations to the building up of sentences. Another commences by an analysis of the sentence into its component words, and then studies the elementary symbols constituting the words.

That is, one teacher is synthetical, and the other strictly analytical. A student takes his first and second year in one school, and then circumstances or inclination cause him to finish his course at another. He commences under analytical teachers, and closes with a school that only arrives at the stage of analysis in the clos-