

sion in this country, since it deals primarily, from the professional point of view, with putting dental education under the auspices of the University. In the main that is to the advantage of the profession, but it is indirectly greatly to the advantage of the public. I think it will be better if I devote what I have to say mainly to how the Bill will affect the public, rather than the profession, because I think that is the point you wish to consider most. Since the Bill suppresses companies and anything of a purely commercial spirit, I think that great benefit may be looked for in that direction. I might say, with regard to companies, that it is understood that companies must be a commercial success. That is the only thing which is required of a company. But commercial success and the health and benefit of the community are not one and the same thing—in fact, they clash. I will have here to go into a little technical detail to explain myself. It is well known that the preservation of the teeth—what is called the conservative treatment of the teeth—is the great point which practitioners must keep in view. Artificial appliances are very good, but they are only subsidiary—they are only to supply what nature would do in a more proper way. Since it is well known that the insertion of dentures and the use of artificial appliances are the most remunerative, and that companies require remuneration above all things, it stands to reason that the conservative treatment of the teeth amongst companies must go. They cannot afford to do it. Again, since a company must be a financial success, their operators must be men who do not want very high salaries. Now, the man who is going to take a low salary is not the man who has spent a great deal of time and money on his education; and it is only one who has spent money and time on study who is competent in any way to go in for conservative dentistry. Therefore we see on the face of it that companies cannot do the best for the public. You can see how absurd it would be if, say, the medical profession advertised “Operations for appendicitis cheap to-day.” People say, “Give us the companies, because they will do cheap work.” They do do cheap work, because they do not treat the thing at its fountain-head. In all right treatment of disease it is not the effect which must be considered, but the cause. It has been well established in the *Lancet* for years that numerous ailments of our race are due to disordered oral secretion and the digestive organs, the teeth playing the primary part in this. Therefore, I say that we must attend to the mouth in the proper way, and that can only be done with time and care. Another point which I would like to go into is with regard to clause 11. Subclause (b) says that a dental student must have been for three consecutive years a *bonâ fide* apprentice or pupil in order to be entitled to be examined. Two instances have come under my personal notice where students have been debarred examination because something has interfered with their three years’ apprenticeship. One young man, after serving two and a half years and being ignorant of such a clause in the old Act, went to the South African War. On returning he served the balance of the three years and presented himself for examination, but was refused because he had not served three consecutive years. The result was that he had to give up, as he could not afford to go through the three-years term again. There are other instances like that, but I need not go into them. Dental education ought to be carried on on the lines of medical education, since they are really one and the same thing, the dental being but a branch of the medical. In the medical course a period of consecutive service is not required, for many reasons. Sometimes a student has to leave his work. I was at Guy’s Hospital during the South African War, and many men were invited to go out to the front, and special arrangements were made so that any man having passed the intermediate examination of any university could get an appointment in a different capacity, and could go to the front without being necessarily engaged wholly and solely in surgical work. Of course, they stated that that should be the case. I would ask that you should favourably consider altering that clause. I should say that if a student had to break his apprenticeship when there was only the fraction of a year remaining to be served he should, if necessary, do a whole year. Take, for instance, the case of the young man who served two years and a half: instead of doing only the other six months, perhaps it would be wise if he had to serve a whole year. With regard to clause 13, dealing with foreign dentists: one gentleman on the Committee spoke to me about this, and asked me how the clause would affect American dentists. It ought to affect them as it affects all others. I think, since an American dentist, if he goes from one State to another, has to undergo what is called the State Board Examination, that it is only reasonable to ask the American dentists to submit themselves to the same conditions in another country as those they would have to submit to in their own country. If we show favour to any, I think it ought to be those in this country, and we should not give those from another country an advantage over our own people. I think that that would appeal to anybody. In this connection I can bring forward my own case. I am the holder of the degree of the University of Pennsylvania, but that college is somewhat exceptional. I could practise in the State of Ohio if I wished without undergoing any State Board Examination, but I could practise in no other State—not even in the State of Pennsylvania—without undergoing the State Board Examination. Therefore I say that in any case it is very reasonable to ask an American to submit to the conditions to which he would have to submit in his own country. I might tell you, regarding this point, that Dr. Kirk, who is recognised as one of the authorities on dental education, said to me, with a laugh, when I was chaffing him about the numerous degrees which were granted—some of very inferior quality, especially in the western colleges—“Oh, we only make those for foreign exportation.” Is it reasonable that this country should be the dumping-ground for holders of such degrees? Is it not reasonable that we should ask all those who wish to come and practise here to submit to the conditions that they are accustomed to, and not to take advantage of our country? Of course, there are the affiliated dental colleges, and they are granted a certain status. The affiliation came about out of necessity, because they had to protect themselves; and the degrees of certain colleges are accepted in any State, though even then the holders have to undergo the State Board Examination. The reason for that is that they recognise that even in America itself so many of the qualifications are spurious that they will not even admit the holders of them to State Board examinations. Clause 21 of the