

1918

DENTISTRY

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props

Recommended Citation

DENTISTRY California Proposition 21 (1918).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/123

This Proposition is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.

This measure has been endorsed by the Illinois State Federation of Labor and Building Trades Council and by the State Board of Health. It is favored by many employers and leading physicians, including Dr. Alexander Leitch, Medical Director of the Red Cross in France, whose writings show that he favors the California system. Theodore Roosevelt and Secretary McAdoo have recently declared for it. Organized opposition in California comes from some physicians, from Christian Scientists, and from private commercial insurance companies.

Vote "Yes" on this amendment.
 WILLIAM KERR, State Senator First District.

AMENDMENT AGAINST SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NO. 26.

This amendment is wholly unnecessary, because the legislature already has power to establish a fair and reasonable system of health insurance. The amendment would allow class distinction now forbidden by the Constitution.

The plan is to insure only those wage earners (with their families and dependents) who are regularly employed at medium salaries, say \$500 a year or less, and to ignore everyone else. To ignore, for example, all self-employed persons such as shopkeepers, contractors, farmers, and, worst of all, to ignore all persons, with their children and dependents, who are not able, because of sickness or disability, to work regularly or at all.

To illustrate: Two families are next door neighbors; the breadwinner in one family has an employer and earns \$1,500 a year, or less; sickness overtakes him; the state would pay two-thirds of his wages and furnish medicine, surgery and dentistry to him and his family. His neighbor is out of employment and destitute, or is self-employed, or has an annual income of \$1,600 or over; when sickness overtakes him or any member of his family, the state utterly ignores the situation.

The Constitution forbids such injustice; the amendment would permit it. In fact the amendment destroys every constitutional guaranty of personal liberty so far as the insurance is concerned, and even abolishes the Initiative so that the people cannot remove the system once it is fastened upon them; only the Referendum remains.

Since the scheme ignores the sick and down-and-outs, and is political and not humanitarian, it will not relieve the state from maintaining charities and hospitals.

It is not the English system nor even the German. Both of them are fair and humane in comparison, though sickness and poverty have increased even under them. Lloyd George's popularity exists in spite of his part in social insurance, not because of it. Dr. Lambert may approve the principle of health insurance, but not the oppressive type planned for California.

The cost is to be met by forced contributions from employees, employers, and the state. The first estimate by the Social Insurance Commission was \$27,596,000 a year; others estimate \$50,000,000—about double the present annual cost of the state government. All this in face of the war expenses and the fact that industry is already staggering under its heavy load. Congress and several Eastern states have already rejected the system.

Do you want to take on this added annual expense of \$50,000,000? Do you want to drive fraternal insurance societies to the wall? Do you want compulsory physical examination, medicine and surgery? Do you want to abolish the law that every man's house is his castle so that the government agent may enter your home and interfere with the most sacred relations of life? Do you want to wreck the whole idea of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? Do you want to more than Germanize California?

Then vote "No" on this amendment.
 J. W. BALLARD, State Senator Thirty-eighth District.

DENTISTRY. Initiative Act amending dental law. Requires dentist, hereafter appointed member of Board of Dental Examiners, have degree of Doctor of Dental Surgery or Dental Medicine, and some other degree from recognized institution; limits member to one four-year term in six years; as exception to present requirements, declares any applicant of good moral character, with five years practice, and examined and licensed by any state dental board, shall receive license without examination upon paying twenty-five dollars; forbids administering anesthetic, in practicing dentistry, except when adult third person present; declares advertising or charging low fees not unprofessional conduct.

YES	
NO	

The doctors of the State of California present to the secretary of state this petition, and request that a proposed law, as hereinafter set forth, be submitted to the people of the State of California for their approval or rejection, at the next ensuing general election, or as provided by law. The proposed law is as follows:

Section 1. Amend an act entitled "An act to improve the better education of dental surgeons and to regulate the practice of dentistry in the State of California providing penalties for the violation hereof," approved May 31, 1915, by adding new sections thereto to be numbered and designated sections seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty and twenty-one, respectively.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

PROPOSED LAW.
 Proposed changes in provisions are printed in black-faced type.)

Section 1. A new section is hereby added to said act to read as follows:

Section seventeen. Any dentist hereafter appointed a member of the state board of dental examiners shall be of good moral character.

have received the degree of doctor of dental surgery or doctor of dental medicine, and in addition thereto shall have completed the required course and received a degree other than a dental degree from a recognized college or university legally empowered to confer the same; and provided, further, that no member of said board shall be appointed or hold office for more than one term of four years in any six years.

Section 2. A new section is hereby added to said act hereby amended to be numbered eighteen, and to read as follows:

Section eighteen. It is hereby provided as an exception to the provisions of section 3 of this act and as a provision of any dental law or laws hereafter enacted, that, upon application to the secretary of the state board of dental examiners, a license shall by him be issued forthwith without examination to any person upon (1) paying a fee of twenty-five dollars; (2) showing that he is of good moral character; (3) is a graduate of a reputable dental college recognized by the National Board of Dental Faculties; (4) has been examined and approved by a board of dental examiners of any state in the United States; and (5) has practiced under the laws of any state of the United States for a period of five years next preceding the filing of his application in this state.

Section 1. A new section is hereby added to said act hereby amended to be numbered twenty and to read as follows:

Section nineteen. Any person shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable as at present provided in section 12 of this act, who shall in the practice of dentistry administer any anesthetic except in the presence of an adult third person.

Section 4. A new section is hereby added to said act hereby amended to be numbered twenty, and to read as follows:

Section twenty. Nothing in this act or in any dental law or laws hereafter enacted shall be construed to mean that it is unprofessional to advertise, nor shall the charging of low fees for dental work be deemed unprofessional conduct.

Section 5. A new section is hereby added to said act hereby amended to be numbered twenty-one, and to read as follows:

Section twenty-one. All acts and parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

EXISTING PROVISIONS.

(Provisions proposed to be repealed are printed in italics.)

Section two of the Dental Practice Act of 1915, prescribing qualifications for members of Board of Dental Examiners, will be amended by the proposed new section seventeen of the act, prescribing additional qualifications and limitations as to term of office; section two now reads as follows:

Sec. 2. A board of dental examiners to consist of seven practicing dentists is hereby created, to be known as the board of dental examiners of California, whose duty it shall be to carry out the purposes and enforce the provisions of this act. The members of this board shall be appointed by the governor of California, all of whom shall have been actively and legally engaged in the practice of dentistry in the State of California, for at least five years next preceding the date of their appointment, and none of whom shall be members of the faculty of any dental college or dental department of any medical college in the State of California, or shall have any financial interest in any such college. The term for which the members of said board shall hold office shall be four years and until their successors are duly appointed and qualified. Their terms of office shall be so classified that the terms of not more than two members shall expire in any one year. The present members of the board of dental examiners of California appointed under the provisions of the laws of this state, in force at the time that this law takes effect shall continue to serve and act as members of the said board, but under the provisions of this act, during their respective terms or until their successors are appointed and qualified. Vacancies occurring in the board of dental examiners shall be filled by appointment by the governor, within thirty days after such vacancy occurs. The governor shall have the power to remove from office at any time any member of the board for continued neglect of duty required by this act, or for incompetency, unprofessional or dishonorable conduct.

Section three of the act of 1915, to which reference is made in the proposed new section eighteen, reads as follows:

Sec. 3. It shall be the power and duty of said board to elect from its membership a president, vice-president and a secretary. The secretary shall receive such compensation as may be fixed by the board, which shall be in addition to his per diem as a member of the board, and all necessary traveling expenses incurred in connection with the performance of the duties of his office. The board shall meet regularly at least twice a year, at such time and place as the board may designate, for the purpose of transacting its business, and special meetings may be held

at such other times as the board may determine, or at the call of the president, or of the secretary. Written notice of the time, place and object of such special meeting shall be mailed by said secretary to all the members not parties to the call, at least fifteen days before the day of meeting. Meetings may be held at any time and place and without notice by unanimous consent evidenced either by writing or by the presence of any member whose consent is necessary. The said board shall examine all applicants for license to practice dentistry according to the provisions of this act and issue licenses to practice dentistry in this state to such applicants as successfully pass the examination of the board and other persons who comply with the provisions of this act, and apply all fees as directed by this act, and keep a book showing the names of all persons to whom licenses have been granted by said board to practice dentistry, and such other books as may be necessary to plainly show all the acts and proceedings of said board; to have and use a seal bearing the name "Board of Dental Examiners of California." The board shall make an annual report of its proceedings to the governor of California by the fifteenth day of December of each year, together with an account of all moneys received and disbursed by it, pursuant to this act. The board shall have power to adopt rules concerning its meetings and the holding of examinations and the manner of issuance and reissuance of licenses not inconsistent with the provisions of this act. Four members of said board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the board. Each member of the board shall, upon his qualification, file with the secretary his post office address, and thereafter any notice of any change thereof. Any notice mailed to the address so on file, shall be deemed to comply with the requirements of this act as to notice to such member of the board.

Sections six and seven of the act of 1915 relate to the qualifications for applicants for examination and for the granting of licenses to successful applicants, as provided for by section three of the act. Exception will be made to these two sections and the provisions thereof will not apply in the case of certain applicants for license as provided by the proposed new section eighteen. Sections six and seven read as follows:

Sec. 6. Any person over twenty-one years of age shall be eligible to take an examination before the board of dental examiners of California, upon making application therefor, and upon (1) paying a fee of twenty-five dollars; (2) furnishing satisfactory testimonials of good moral character; and (3) furnishing satisfactory evidence of having graduated from a reputable dental college, which must have been approved by the board of dental examiners of California provided, that after August 1, 1918, he shall also file his diploma or certificate of graduation with recommendations from a high school accredited to the University of California or any other university of equal standing; or a certificate signed by a state superintendent of public instruction, or similar officer, to the effect that such applicant has had scholastic preparation equivalent in all respects to that demanded for graduation with recommendations from a high school giving a four year course of instruction in the state from which such certificate is issued; (4) in lieu of such diploma or certificate from an accredited high school, such applicant, after said date, may and with like effect furnish to said board of dental examiners a certificate from the board of dental examiners, or similar official body, of some other state in the United States showing that such applicant has been a duly licensed practitioner of dentistry in such other state for a period of at least five years; provided, however, that every person not otherwise engaged as an apprentice to a regularly licensed dentist who has practiced in the State of California for ten years or more shall be eligible for examination, if, within thirty (30) days after

the board of dentistry shall file with the secretary of the board an affidavit stating his name, the length of time for which he has been actually apprenticed and with whom; and when the time of his application for examination shall show to the satisfaction of the board that he has served an apprenticeship of at least five (5) years and is a graduate from a high school or similar institution of learning in this or some other state of the United States requiring a three (3) years' course of study; and provided, that no examination shall be given to an applicant claiming the right to take the same as an apprentice later than December 30, 1915.

Sec. 7. The examination by the board of applicants for license to practice dentistry in this state shall be sufficiently thorough to test the fitness of the applicant to practice dentistry. It shall include, written in the English language, questions on the following subjects: Anatomy, histology, physiology, anesthesia, materia medica, pathology, bacteriology, therapeutics, oral surgery, chemistry, metallurgy, operative dentistry, prosthetic dentistry and orthodontia; the answers to which shall be written in the English language. Said written examination may be supplemented by an oral examination. Demonstrations of the applicant's skill in operative and prosthetic dentistry must also be given. All persons successfully passing such examination shall be registered as licensed dentists on the board register, as provided in section three, and shall be granted by the board a license to practice dentistry in the State of California. When a candidate for a license shall have received a grade of eighty-five per cent or above in any given subject, he shall be exempt from re-examination on that subject in subsequent examinations before the said board held at the first or second meeting thereafter. Any member of the board may inquire of any applicant for examination concerning his character, qualifications or experience and may take testimony of any one in regard thereto, under oath, which he is hereby empowered to administer.

Section twelve of the act of 1915, referred to in the proposed new section nineteen, reads as follows:

Sec. 12. Any person, company or association shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished, by imprisonment in the county jail not less than ten (10) days nor more than one (1) year, or by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars nor more than one thousand five hundred dollars, or by both such fine and imprisonment, who (1) shall sell or barter or offer to sell or barter any dental degree or any certificate or transcript, made or purporting to be made, pursuant to the laws regulating the license and registration of dentists; or (2) shall purchase or procure by barter, any such diploma, certificate or transcript, with intent that the same shall be used as evidence of the holder's qualification to practice dentistry; or in fraud of the laws regulating such practice; or (3) shall with fraudulent intent, alter in a material regard any such diploma, certificate or transcript; or (4) shall use, attempt to use, or cause to be used any such diploma, certificate or transcript, which has been purchased, procured, issued, counterfeited, or otherwise altered, either as a license to practice dentistry; or in order to procure registration as a dentist; or (5) shall within ten days after demand made by the secretary of the board, fail to furnish to said board the name and address of all persons practicing or assisting in the practice of dentistry in the office of said person, company or association, at any time within sixty days prior to said notice, together with a sworn statement showing under and by what license or authority said person, company or association, and said employees are or have been practicing dentistry; but such affidavit shall not be used in any prosecution under this section, and any person shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable as in this section above provided who (1) shall assume the degree of Doctor of Dental Surgery, or the degree of Dental Medicine, or shall apply for such degree, or D.D.S. or D.M.D. to his

or her name not having duly conferred upon him or her, by diploma from a recognized dental college or school legally empowered to confer the same, the right to assume said title; or shall assume any title, or append any letters to his or her name, with the intent to represent falsely that he or she has received a dental degree or license; or (2) shall in an affidavit, required of an applicant for examination, license or registration, under this act, willfully make a false statement in a material regard; or (3) shall engage in the practice of dentistry without causing to be displayed in a conspicuous manner and in a conspicuous place in his or her office the name of each and every person employed in the practice of dentistry therein, together with the word mechanic after the name of each unlicensed person employed; or (4) is practicing dentistry in the state without a license, or whose license has been revoked or suspended; or (5) shall under any false, assumed or fictitious name, either as an individual, firm, corporation or otherwise or any name other than the name under which he is licensed, practice, advertise or in any other manner indicate that he is practicing or will practice dentistry. Nothing in this section contained shall be held to prohibit the conferring of degrees and the bestowing of diplomas, by reputable dental colleges of this state, which have been indorsed by the board of dental examiners of California.

Unprofessional conduct, referred to in the proposed new section twenty, is defined in section thirteen of the act of 1915, which reads as follows:

Sec. 13. Any dentist may have his license revoked or suspended by the board of dental examiners for any of the following causes:

(1) His conviction of a felony or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, in which case the record of conviction or a certified copy thereof, certified by the clerk of the court, or by the judge in whose court the conviction is had, shall be conclusive evidence.

(2) The rendition of a final judgment against any such dentist in a court of competent jurisdiction upon a cause of action alleging grossly unskillful or negligent dental practice.

(3) For unprofessional conduct or for gross ignorance or inefficiency in his profession. Unprofessional conduct is hereby defined to be: The employment of persons known as cappers or steersmen, to obtain business; the obtaining of any fee by fraud or misrepresentation; willfully betraying professional secrets, employing directly or indirectly any student or any suspended or unlicensed dentist to perform operations of any kind, or to treat lesions of the human teeth or jaws, or correct malimposed formations thereof, aiding or abetting any unlicensed person to practice dentistry unlawfully; habitual intemperance; gross immorality; the use of any false, assumed or fictitious name, either as an individual, firm, corporation or otherwise or any name other than the name under which he is licensed, practice, advertise or in any other manner indicate that he is practicing or will practice dentistry.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF AMENDMENT TO DENTAL LAW.

This is the first time the people have been given an opportunity to make their dental laws. If dental laws are enacted for the benefit of the people it is not a bad idea to allow the people to have something to say regarding their provisions. If it is true that the layman knows little about dentistry and is not qualified to make laws, then our legislators are equally incompetent to pass upon dental measures. Not being dentists they have no knowledge of this subject superior to that possessed by the average voter. Any general lack of knowledge on this subject of vital importance must be attributed directly to the fact that this information has been willfully withheld by dentists who proclaim themselves the protectors of the people's welfare.

The dental associations through their publicity, have kept the people from knowing

understanding of dentistry. This board tells the legislators that, as they have no knowledge of dentistry, the laws should be enacted as prepared by their dental lobby. This has resulted in laws being made for the benefit of a dental combine and not for the people.

The proposed new section 17 will raise the present low standard required for members of the State Board of Dental Examiners, making it equal to that of other states. It insures a board with higher qualifications than those required of dentists applying for license.

The proposed new section 18 requires that all applicants to practice dentistry must be examined by the Board of Dental Examiners, except dental graduates having unquestionable proof of both the very highest qualifications and experience. It gives to dentists the same right now accorded by law to physicians, surgeons and lawyers. It guards against prejudice on the part of the Board of Examiners. No good dentist will come here now to wait six months for examination, so the people are deprived of his superior services.

The proposed new section 19 requires the presence of a third person when an anesthetic is administered, which works no hardship or expense, and its wisdom is so apparent that it needs no explanation.

The Dental Board now has arbitrary power to take away a dentist's license for "unprofessional conduct." Advertising and charging below an excessive fixed price for dentistry is held "unprofessional" by an association of which the Dental Examiners are members.

The proposed new section 20 permits a dentist to advertise and charge reasonable fees, enlighten the people, and place dentistry within reach of all, without fear of losing his license, which is his means of making a living.

These are corrections that will be made by the proposed amendment which you are asked to vote for.

PAINLESS PARKER.

ARGUMENT AGAINST AMENDMENT TO DENTAL LAW.

This measure is a shameful misuse of the power of the initiative and has for its object the degrading of the dental profession in California.

It has been condemned by the presidents of our universities, by the president of practically every reputable college in the state, by the medical profession, and by the dental profession.

It is recommended that the legislature should employ these men cheaply and reap increased dividends personally.

It should be noted that this attempt to degrade the profession is made at a time when the young dentists of the state have joined the United States Army and Navy and are serving abroad without opportunity to aid the defense of their profession.

The standard of qualifications for the practice of dentistry in California today is the highest in the United States and is so recognized. The measure proposes to abolish the standard and put California on a basis with the most backward state in the Union.

The incompetents and delinquents of other states, of course, are anxious to avoid examination in California, and this measure proposes that they shall be admitted to practice here without examination. At the same time it requires that the graduates of our own universities shall be required to stand an examination before the State Dental Board before being permitted to practice.

If these men from other states are competent why should they be afraid of examination? Why should they not submit to the same examination that graduates of our California colleges are required to pass? Why should they be permitted to tamper with the public health?

This measure contains a transparent trick in its assertion regarding low fees. The inevitable result of the amendment would be the increasing of the cost of dentistry because of the provision requiring the presence of a dental nurse even during the pulling of a tooth if a local anesthetic is given.

This measure contains nothing of good to recommend it. It represents an abuse of the great power of the initiative, reserved to the people to protect their political liberty. It represents the desire of a greedy man to smirch an honorable profession, and to coin increase profits out of the fact that hundreds of California's reputable dentists have answered the nation's call and are not here to protect their profession.

Every citizen should vote an emphatic "No" on this vicious measure.

GUY S. MILLBERRY, D.D.S.,
Dean, College of Dentistry,
University of California.

PROHIBITION. Initiative Act. Declares that every person, firm or corporation, which manufactures, imports or sells intoxicating liquors after December 31, 1918, except denatured alcohol, shall be guilty of misdemeanor punishable by twenty-five dollars fine and twenty-five days imprisonment for first offense, and by fifty dollars fine and fifty days imprisonment for second offense, and by one hundred dollars fine and one hundred days imprisonment for each subsequent offense.

YES

NO

The electors of the State of California present to the secretary of state this petition, and request that a proposed law, as hereinafter set forth, be submitted to the people of the State of California, for their approval or rejection, at the next ensuing general election, or as provided by law. The proposed law is as follows:

PROPOSED LAW.

An act prohibiting the manufacture, importation or sale of intoxicating liquors after December 31st, 1918, except denatured alcohol, and prescribing penalties for violation thereof.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1. Every person, firm or corporation, which manufactures, imports or sells intoxicating liquors after the 31st day of December, 1918, except denatured alcohol, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished for the first offense by a fine of twenty-five dollars and imprisonment for twenty-five days; and for a second offense by a fine of

fifty dollars and imprisonment for fifty days and for each subsequent offense by a fine of one hundred dollars and imprisonment for one hundred days.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROHIBITION INITIATIVE ACT.

This act was initiated by the people of California as a protest against the waste of products, transportation, fuel and man power by the breweries and wineries that are the aids of the Kaiser in America and the greatest obstacle to the winning of the war.

The duty of the patriotic American is plain. We must drive the Hun from our gates. The destroyer of food and purveyor of poison is not only a public menace and a public nuisance, he is a traitor to this country in time of war.

The issue is plain. Either the Boninger act with ballot title "Liquor Regulation," or the bone dry act, with ballot title "Prohibition," will be endorsed by the people at the polls. The first will be supported by the solid liquor forces. The "Associated Wine and Beer Industries" have raised a fund to "put it over." This fund will