

shortness of the term and the period of study—two years of four months each “year.” “Many dental schools accept five years of practice as a dentist, instead of one year of study of dentistry, thus still further reducing the already small amount of intellectual training required for the degree. If a man can bring evidence that he has practised dentistry five years—no matter how ignorantly—he can obtain the degree of one of these schools by attending a single winter session. Is not the public right in regarding the American dental diploma as small of general culture? Is it always good evidence even of thorough acquaintance with dentistry?”

The Doctor touched upon the relations between the degree of doctor of medicine and doctor of dental surgery, and said: “Many eminent dentists have regretted the institution of a special dental degree, and have maintained that every dentist should be a doctor of medicine. Let it be granted at once, as a fact beyond dispute, that the full training of a physician and surgeon would be useful to a dentist. He who should follow the three years’ course for the doctorate in medicine, and should then give eighteen months or two years to the peculiar studies of dentistry, would be a much better trained man than he who has given but three years in all to professional study.”

The editor of the *International*, referring to the time of which Prof. Elliott spoke, says, in the March number, “The status of dental education at that period was about as bad as it possibly could be. The large majority of the schools were acting under a nominal two years, with courses of from four to five months. The so-called rule of “five years’ practice,” admitting students to the senior year who could present evidence of having had five years’ practical experience, was in full force in the large majority of colleges. The results that had followed the adoption of this rule had become a professional scandal, as it was a notorious fact that a very large proportion thus admitted never had had the practice required.”

It is certainly gratifying at this late day to have this unsolicited testimony to the “scandalous” breach of the “requirements for graduation,” which provoked the Dental Board of Quebec, twenty years ago, to cut off from the list of recognized colleges two offenders. The storm of defiance and the threats of litigation against the public action of the Board evaporated like smoke in face of the proofs of gross violation, such as the editor of the *International* points out.

It is our conviction that, twenty years hence, the best minds among our cousins over the border will be as much ashamed of the present low standard of matriculation as they are of the past fraudulent “five years’ practice.”