

by name—against the common editorial courtesies of journalists—is equally shared in by all the fathers and founders of the dental reform movement in Canada. Somebody had to begin the reform movement here. Instead of imitating the example which prevailed in the United States, of “graduating” students after ten months’ college study, or in one session where they declared they had five years’ practice, we started out by exacting four full years indentureship, the best we could do under the circumstances. No one dare defend the old system in the United States. The editor of the *Advertiser* is perfectly correct in the statement that such education “hung too low.” But, he should have had the honesty to state that we wrote nothing but approbation of the new system. When he sneers at those of us who founded the early movement, he overlooks the fact that all Canada had only a population of five millions, and that we were, at least, doing our best. Not only did we create the systems we enjoy, but the leaders made many sacrifices for the elevation of the status of the profession, which received the kindly sympathy of our sister journals over the border.

If open and fair criticism of the faults in the past or present of dental education in the United States is “jeering,” then the editor of the *Advertiser* had better reserve his arrogance for his own country. For one Britisher who has adversely criticized American education, we can quote a hundred Americans. Canadian dentists—and this journal especially—have always entertained sincere respect for our hospitable cousins over the border. As we have enjoyed their hospitality we have endeavored to reciprocate it, so far as we were privileged, by the visits to Canada of individual dentists, and of such welcome meetings as that to Montreal some years ago of the Connecticut Valley Dental Society. The editor of the *Advertiser* has, perhaps, received as much of this Canadian hospitality as any member of the profession. When he has fully relieved himself of the bile induced by the fact that the proper man, *in his estimation*—and everybody knows whom he means—was not chosen for the Presidency of the Congress, he may discover his absurdity as well as his arrogance.

In an early number we will show our readers what Americans have said about American dental education, and it will perhaps astonish no one more than the editor of the *Advertiser* to find himself condemned out of his own lips. If it is unfair to criticize what he has so severely and so often criticized, it will be unfair ever to hold an opinion, professional, personal or political, that is not first approved of by the editor of the *Advertiser*. We do not believe the leaders of American dentistry are so thin-skinned as to sympathize with such puerility. The editor of the *Advertiser* will have an opportunity to rise and explain the inconsistency of his position. If it is only Congress Bile, he need not explain. It is quite clear.