hardly be given it by those engaged in its teaching, or that too much time and labor could be employed on it by those engaged in its study. If we are to draw our conclusions from the evidence at our disposal, we should conclude that certain of the colleges, supposedly reputable, either make their teachings of it of a very meagre and superficial nature, or they admit to their classes students of insufficient mental calibre to receive and digest such instruction as is imparted. Possibly the error may lie in both directions.

To be more explicit: Were matters otherwise, we would hardly expect a graduate of a "recognized" dental college, who had obtained his degree but a few weeks before, to define "*an element*" as "*the smallest part of matter*," or that another who had also been able to write D.D.S. after his name but a month or so, but from a different college, to define it as, "*that part of a substance in a true or pure state.*"

While to the casual observer Chemistry does not appear to occupy the same prominent position in our daily practice that is accorded other branches of dental science, to the initiated it is of equal importance, in that it is more or less directly connected with them, and in that it forms to a greater or less extent the foundation upon which each of the others is erected. And it is extremely difficult to understand how a college examiner could consistently recommend any student for graduation in Materia Medica, Dental Pathology, Metallurgy or Operative Dentistry, whose knowledge of the very rudiments of chemical science was utterly lacking as in such cases as the above mentioned.

It would make a paper of this nature entirely too cumbersome to attempt to indicate wherein Chemistry has a practical relationship to all the various branches of dental science, even if time permitted, consequently I will confine my remarks to its relation to that particular branch, without which the dental profession could never have begun its existence, namely, its relation to dental caries and to the methods of its prevention and arrest.

Apart from its scientific value, it forms an interesting chapter of historical study to trace the advent of chemical science into the causes furnished by the various writers at different dates for dental caries.

One need revert only about one century into dental history to learn that at that time caries was considered as being the direct result of inflammation, and as bearing a striking resemblance to necrosis of bone, or mortification of soft tissues. It is also of interest to learn that at this period writers were a unit in supposing that the initial stages of caries took place in the *dentine*, and from there the inflammation extended, causing death to all the adjacent parts.

The first divergence from this view was when certain writers