

diseases were all corrected and the patient instructed to learn the use of the disabled side; at the end of six months (except for the abrasion which is the result of using one side only for years) both sides of each arch are in an equally healthy and useful condition. We suggest to the busy dentist to take time to look for trouble, and the dentist who is not so busy can find no more useful and advantageous employment than to study the conditions which he will find if searched for, and which he must learn to recognize while looking for trouble. Both classes of operators will be more useful to the community.—*The Dental Review*.

DRUG TOLERATION.—During the past few years the writer has noticed that many mouths bear the mark of local drug toleration. This is more especially noticeable when for some reason the person habituated to the use of washes and lotions discontinues the habit. We will see then that the saliva and mucus is less copious than when the drug or combination of drugs is dispensed with. The more general use of mouth washes and liquid dentrifices does not date back much beyond the period of the introduction of antiseptic surgery. Formerly the washes and mouth lotions were gotten up to have an agreeable taste and a perfumery odor. Latterly the majority of them make a pretence at least of being powerfully antiseptic. In many cases such claims are preposterous, as the antiseptic and disinfectant is barely strong enough to destroy the most innocent microbe. In a state of health and normality of the mucous membrane, what need exists for the use of such substances? Would not warm water and then cold be even better than the artificial stimulation of the mucous membrane, which, after a time, craves such stimulation? Would it not be more beneficial to humanity if the pastes and lotions were only used to correct a disorder than to use them to keep up a disagreeable and hurtful habit? We do not decry the use of such substances when needed to assist nature to a return to health, but we protest against the whole population being told that it is a necessity—that such general use is beneficial, etc., etc. The normal mouth not contaminated with tobacco or chewing-gum is much better with water, hot and cold, and the sparing use of the tooth-brush—which is one of the abominations of civilization—than to be fed daily with sprays, lotions and pastes of uncertain constitution.—*Dental Review*.

[The editor of the *Review* is highly qualified to speak *ex cathedra* on these questions; yet he differs in opinion from other high authorities. Would he tell us—apart from the vulgarity of the habit—how chewing-gum can be placed on a par with tobacco as a contamination to the natural mouth. It is not long since it was recommended as a prophylactic preserver of the teeth. What does our friend suggest as a substitute for the tooth brush?—ED. D.D.J.].