

the public being sacrificed to those of the colleges. With us in Ontario the law requires that the candidate for graduation in dentistry shall, in addition to attendance at college for three sessions, be articled to a practitioner for a term of three and a half years including the time spent at college. This we consider an advantage over all private tuition or all college instruction.

Few men who are engaged in practice, having the cares of an office, and especially if to that be added the cares of a family, can keep themselves sufficiently posted upon what we usually term the theoretical subjects, as chemistry, physiology, anatomy, materia medica, etc., with their changes by development and discovery, to thoroughly instruct a student upon these subjects. And supposing they were capable, how many could take the time to instruct one student upon the many subjects necessary for a thorough dental education? This can better be done by congregating students, and dividing subjects to be taught among a number of men, who may be paid to devote sufficient time to keep themselves acquainted with all new discoveries and developments in connection with their subjects, and to impart a knowledge of those subjects to their classes.

On the other hand, there is much in a dental education which can better be taught in a private office than in a college. A dental student recently stated in my hearing that he regarded one year in an office better than five years at college. This may be an exaggerated statement, but there is no doubt but in a well regulated office there is much that may be learned of private practice which it is impossible to teach in a crowded college. However, leaving this argument out of the question, the fact remains, that in order to enter the ranks of our profession in Ontario the candidate must pass through the hands of a preceptor, and it is with this individual that this paper is calculated to deal.

No practitioner is under obligation to take a student into his office, and many refuse to do so, for various reasons. Some consider that after taking the college sessions out of the term of pupillage, the balance of time, even though a tuition fee be charged, is not sufficient to warrant his turning out a possible competitor. Others shrink from assuming the responsibility of allowing a student to operate upon their patients.

I recently read a discussion which took place at a dental convention upon the subject of education. One gentleman stated he would not take a student into his office for \$1,000.

There are three classes of practitioners who should never assume the responsibilities of a preceptor: Those who have no work for students to do, those who have work but will not allow students to do it, and those who allow students to operate indiscriminately. The two former classes do not do justice to their students, and the latter does an injustice to the public.