

1904.
NEW ZEALAND.

DENTISTS BILL COMMITTEE

(REPORT OF THE), TOGETHER WITH MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

(MR. W. H. HERRIES, CHAIRMAN.)

Brought up on Tuesday, the 30th August, 1904, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF REFERENCE.

Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF JULY, 1904.

Ordered, "That a Committee consisting of nine members be appointed to consider the Dentists Bill, and to report thereon to the House, with power to call for persons and papers; three to form a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. Baume, Mr. Buddo, Mr. Ell, Mr. Hanan, Mr. Herries, Mr. Jennings, Mr. McNab, Hon. Sir J. G. Ward, and the mover."—(MR. SIDNEY.)

REPORT.

I HAVE to report that the Dentists Bill Committee, to whom was referred the above-mentioned Bill, has duly considered the same and taken evidence thereon, and recommends that the Bill as amended be allowed to proceed; and that the evidence taken in connection therewith be printed.
30th August, 1904. W. H. HERRIES, Chairman.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

TUESDAY, 2ND AUGUST, 1904.

DEPUTATION, consisting of Messrs. A. HOBY, H. P. RAWSON, and R. BULKLEY, in attendance.

The Chairman: Do all you gentlemen propose to give evidence, or will one of you give evidence for the lot?

Mr. Rawson: I would suggest that Mr. Hoby speak for us.

The Chairman.] Very well, we will take Mr. Hoby first, and then, if either of you other gentlemen have anything to add you may do so.

ARTHUR HOBY examined. (No. 1.)

1. *The Chairman*.] You have come to give evidence with regard to the Dentists Bill, Mr. Hoby?—Yes.

2. Are you speaking for yourself or for the dentists in general?—I am speaking for the meeting of Wellington dentists which was held last Tuesday night.

3. *Mr. Ell*.] Just the Wellington dentists?—Yes.

4. *The Chairman*.] Will you make a statement as to what your ideas regarding the Bill are, and then the members of the Committee can ask you questions?—Yes. The meeting instructed us three to wait upon you and to give evidence. On the whole they heartily approved of the Bill. They indorsed the major portion of the Bill, but there are one or two things they would like to see altered.

5. I think the Committee would like to hear your suggestions?—The question of foreign dentists, which is dealt with in clauses 13 and 14 of the Bill, has been a difficult one. As one of the members of the Examining Board here, I am able to state that this matter has been constantly brought up. Dentists have been coming to the country and wanting to be registered—particularly American dentists—and we have had to examine them. They can claim examination within thirty days upon producing certificates showing that they were qualified to practise in the country from

which they came. Some of them have refused to sit for examination, and some have thought themselves very hardly dealt with because they have been compelled to sit for examination. I would like to point out to the Committee that these American dentists could not go into an adjoining State and practise without passing an examination. If a dentist had passed his examination in, say, Missouri, he could not go and practise in Michigan unless he passed another examination. In whichever State to which he went other than his own he would have to submit to examination. Therefore, we hold that it is no injustice to these American dentists that they should be compelled to sit for examination again on coming to New Zealand. The experience of the Board has been that a large percentage of them are absolutely unqualified to pass the examination. Some of them have passed it very well, but others again have been absolutely nowhere compared with our own New Zealand students. We would like it enacted that these foreign dentists should be compelled to pass the examination. It would be no injustice to them to exclude them altogether, because we could not go into their country and practise even if we passed their examination. They would absolutely exclude us from their country, and a certain amount of reciprocity seems to me but a fair thing. If I went to one of the Boards there and asked for examination I should be told, "You must begin the four-years course over again."

Mr. Rawson: It is the same with Canada. We could not practise in Canada, and Canadians cannot practise in the United States, nor, in fact, in any other part of Canada than that in which they have qualified.

Witness: Then, again, the men who have been practising illegally in this colony for many years are making a strong effort to get themselves put on the register on this occasion. We think this would be a very great injustice to those who have been through their course in New Zealand—the students who have paid their premiums, served their three years' apprenticeship, passed the examination, qualified themselves, and been allowed to practise. The unregistered men have been breaking the law all these years, and now they want to come in and practise. We think it would be a great hardship on those who have fulfilled the law and qualified themselves. If these men are to be admitted, it really would have been easier for those who have passed the examinations to have done the same thing—not to have qualified themselves—and then come in under this Act. Of course there is nothing in the Bill about that, but we know from side information that this is being attempted, and we wish to put you on your guard against that.

Mr. Rawson: It was enacted twenty-four years ago, when the original Act was passed, that any one who had practised up to that time should be allowed to register; and this Bill, we understand, is not intended to be a new Act—it is just an amendment.

Witness: That is so. That was provided for twenty-three years ago, when the Act was passed. All persons who had been practising dentistry—even only pulling out teeth—including a great many chemists, were registered at that time. The door was opened then, but we think that it has been closed since, and that it would be unfair for those who have been illegally practising within recent years to be admitted. Of course, if it were a matter of compromise, we might permit them to sit for examination, but we do not think even that would be fair. It would be really sweeping away all the Acts that have been passed and starting *de novo*. Then, with regard to the question of different branches, hitherto a man has been able to start a company or an association and have different branches. This is what is called "covering"—one man who was registered covering several who were not registered. There was a very severe Bill brought in some years ago in England with regard to dentists and doctors, which absolutely prohibited that in the Old Country, so that a man could not have several practices under one name. If a man has branches he must have qualified men in charge of those branches.

6. *Mr. EU.*] You are referring to dental companies?—Yes. A man may have his name up in half a dozen different places. Of course these so-called companies are not companies. I do not think there is one of them that I know of which is a company. They are all conducted by one or two individuals—some of them are not even dentists. Then, with regard to clause 11, and that part of it at the top of page 3 where it reads, "and has been continuously and wholly engaged during that period in studying the theory and practice of dentistry or dental surgery." I think this would be an unnecessary hardship upon some young men. For instance, one young man that I know of served two years and a half, and was then seized with the war fever and went to South Africa, and when he came back we could not examine him. He had broken his term. It was not continuous, and he had to take it over again. In all medical and dental work at Home, as long as a man serves the three years, it does not matter whether it is continuous. He must serve the whole period, but not necessarily continuously. We think that such an enactment here would be a measure of justice to students.

7. *Mr. Sidey.*] You said, Mr. Hoby, that you are representing the dentists. Were there any special resolutions passed at the meeting of which you spoke?—Yes. I have embodied their purport in my statement.

8. Was the meeting representative of the Wellington dentists?—There were over thirty dentists there.

9. Supposing a foreign dentist, who does not produce any evidence of having had any previous training or served an apprenticeship, applies for examination, do you not think it would be unfair that he should be allowed to enter the profession simply on account of his having passed an examination, though he does not show that he has had any previous training?—Unquestionably. We had a Belgian mountebank come here at one time, and he presented certain documents which proved to be nothing more than letters showing that he had been practising in Belgium. He was placed upon the register upon that, though absolutely unqualified in every way.

10. Do you not think that a man could pass an examination which you might set him by studying for, say, a year's time, though he had had no previous training at all?—I do not think it would be fair to the students who had passed the examination.

11. Do you not propose to permit that—could not that be done under the present law?—No. Such a matter would be referred to one of the Examining Boards—there are two of them—and they might examine or not as they thought fit. The Wellington Board has never refused examination. A Danish lady came here, and we offered to permit her to sit for examination, but she did not.

12. How about those coming from other colonies—do you think they should be placed on the same footing?—I think it is altogether a matter of reciprocity. If we can put our dental laws on such a footing as to obtain reciprocal treatment from another State, then I think that dentists who have qualified in that State should be admitted; but, as I say, I think it is a matter of reciprocal treatment.

13. Where you found that another State admitted our dentists you would grant reciprocity, and in other cases would give them examination?—Yes, or block them altogether. It would depend upon their qualification.

14. Have you any objection to the performing of extractions only being excluded—would you allow such people as chemists to perform simple extractions without being registered as dentists?—I think it need not be mentioned in the Act at all. These people would do extractions just the same as they do now. We see no objection to it. In fact, in many country places it is absolutely necessary. There may be a chemist there, and no one other than him who could possibly give relief. I think it would be wise to continue that.

15. It has been suggested that medical practitioners should be excluded. What is your opinion about that?—I do not think they should. They are not excluded in the Home-country. They have a right to practise there, and I think they should have it here. The day will come when they will not have that right. They cannot call themselves dentists in England, though they can practise.

16. You see no objection to their being allowed to register?—No.

17. *Hon. Sir J. G. Ward.*] Do you suggest, Mr. Hoby, that in this legislation those who are entitled to extract teeth only should be regarded as dentists, without there being any distinction between them and the dentists who practise every branch of the profession?—I think they should be left just as they are. I do not think they should have the right to call themselves dentists.

18. There is a number of people quite well known throughout the colony who are now extracting teeth. They put a signboard up and call themselves dentists, though they are not dentists at all?—They are acting in defiance of the law. I think that if this were the first Dental Act these people should be permitted to enter; but they have been practising in defiance of the law which has been in existence twenty-three years, and it seems hard that they should be allowed to enter now—in fact, so strong was the feeling at the meeting last Tuesday night that the dentists said that if these unregistered men were to be allowed to enter they would sooner the whole Act was dropped, because they thought it would be an act of unfairness to those who had gone through the curriculum.

19. You are a member of the Dental Board of the colony?—Yes.

20. I would like you to give the Committee your opinion upon the general question of the admission of all dentists in the colony under this legislation, if it be passed, without their undergoing some further examination for the protection of the public. Is it within your knowledge that there are very inferior practitioners carrying on in the colony under the name of dentists?—Yes, there are a good many who have just scraped through, but those who have passed the examination of late years you could not possibly ask for anything else in my view. You might even now say that those who are now registering as students, or those registering within three months back from the passing of the Act, should be compelled to take the new course. I do not think that would be a hardship, and it would certainly be a benefit. What I mean is this: many now, knowing this Act is coming into force, will apprentice themselves straight away so as to get under cover of the old Act and not come under the more stringent regulations.

21. The public would be justified in assuming that, when this Act was put on the statute-book, those who conformed to the requirements of the law should be superior dentists to those now practising who have not undergone any examination?—Yes, if the Senate has charge of the examination and makes it a good one, and if there is a proper school for teaching, then they certainly will be very much superior.

22. At all events, there is no way that you can suggest by which both the profession and the public may be protected—other than a retrospective examination of those who have qualified—although some have got through very easily in the past?—I think that would be a hardship on those who have qualified under the law as it is. I have never heard of an Act of that kind.

23. With regard to the question of the admission of people from other countries, particularly from the Commonwealth. What about New-Zealanders who have gone to Australia and been students in the different States—there are some I understand who have gone there and got their certificates. Would it not be a hardship on New-Zealanders who have got certificates in Australia if we were to exclude them here? I mention the matter because it has been brought very prominently before me by a number of New-Zealanders over there, who declare that the Australian examinations are very stringent, compared with the New Zealand ones?—That is so. I think there would be no hardship inflicted if those who had passed the examinations in those places were permitted to come in. I would not advocate the admission of those who are simply registered over there, but I take it you did not mean that?

24. No?—For instance, there is the Victorian examination, which is almost on a par with the English examination; it is now recognised by England. I think it would be quite right to accept a person who had passed that examination, as a thoroughly qualified man.

25. What about Queensland?—They have not had an examination there yet, nor have they in New South Wales. South Australia I do not know about. The Victorian examination is the only one about which I am really informed.

26. A New-Zealander writing to me from Queensland under date of the 4th July (last month) makes this statement: "There are many young New-Zealanders over here in the Commonwealth studying their professions. The Dental Acts of New South Wales and Queensland are most stringent, and no one can get a certificate without stiff examination, and unless thoroughly competent. In justice to those Maorilanders who are studying over here, I should like to see a clause inserted in the Bill, if not there already, to the effect that 'certificates from Dental Boards of the Commonwealth will be recognised as a qualification without further examination in New Zealand.'" The suggestion I make is that such a provision should apply only to New-Zealanders who have undergone examination in Australia?—Yes.

27. If this Bill be passed, and if it come under the term "Dental Bill," will it not interfere with the chemists who are practising some branches of dentistry where there are no dentists at all? I should not have thought so. I do not think it ought to prevent them from extracting teeth and from doing little things that it might be desirable they should do, and which are very needful in country districts.

28. Do you think it is desirable that there should be provision made to enable chemists in sparsely settled districts to do such dental work, because I have a communication here from some chemists who state distinctly that they have been in the habit of carrying on dental work?—The only objection to that is that it gives them a legal status. It would be almost making them dentists, would it not?

29. If they were to be called upon to declare that they were practising the extraction of teeth only, would you have any objection to it from a dentist's point of view?—I do not think so.

30. What you dentists desire is to raise the status of the profession, primarily?—That is so, as far as I am aware.

31. Have you considered the suggestion that a dental hospital should be provided for the poor people?—Directly a school was established that would be the first thing to do. That would be the only way in which a student could get his teaching—to have a hospital where patients could come and where free work would be done under the superintendence of a senior dentist.

32. You think the profession as a profession does not look upon it in an unkindly way?—Oh, certainly not. Of course, such things are always abused. I have seen people in sealskin jackets come to have free work done. The benefit would be very great, and it is the only way in which students can learn—I do not see any other way.

33. *Mr. Baume.*] What lines do you propose shall be taken?—When dentistry is under the control of the Senate of the University?

34. Yes?—Of course what I would like to see—I am speaking personally now—would be apprenticeship to private individuals done away with and the whole course taken at the Dental school.

35. Compulsorily?—Yes. Of course, I am only giving you now what I think would be the ideal.

36. What sort of a scheme do you anticipate the Senate will put forward—one based on somewhat similar lines to the Victorian scheme?—Yes; but personally I would like to see the American model copied rather than the Victorian. The Victorian one follows almost exclusively the English lines.

37. What university, or what lines should be followed—I mean to say that in America there are differences?—Yes, but the same principle exists all through America.

38. Which is the typical university—which is the university that may be regarded as the one we should copy?—The Dental School of the University of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia. There are several schools in Philadelphia, but the one attached to the university is the one I refer to.

39. In what material points would their course differ from the course laid down by the Examining Board here at the present time?—The examiners know that a pupil has served three years' apprenticeship, and that is all they do know. In a school such as the University of Pennsylvania a man has to go through a certain course each year and perhaps pass an examination every year, and very branch of the work is taken.

40. Your idea would be to copy the American system rather than the English?—Yes.

41. Is the standard of the University of Pennsylvania a higher one than the Victorian standard?—They are both a four-years course. I think they are somewhat on an equality.

42. I hardly mean in length—I mean in regard to the nature of the work done?—I should think they are very similar. In the hospital in Victoria they take apprentices, but they allow them to apprentice themselves there or to private individuals—whichever they like—so that it is really a mixture of the two systems.

43. The result would be a hardening-up of the examination and the training altogether, would it not?—I think so.

44. And those who qualified under the scheme which you suggest, if it were taken up by the University, would be persons who had gone through a much more thorough training than is possible at present?—Yes. For instance, I receive a pupil, but I cannot teach him anything in extracting. The only way in which I can teach him is by letting him see what I do. I cannot say to him, "Extract that tooth." But in a hospital the man is told to extract the tooth, and the patient being a free one, he does it, and so he learns.

45. What happens at the present time? You say that you cannot tell a pupil of yours to extract a tooth. Do I understand that a person becomes a dentist and has a certificate who has never extracted a tooth in his life?—No, because he gets people—boys and acquaintances of his own—who want teeth extracted, and they come in for free extractions. It is the same with filling teeth. My pupils get their own friends to come in, and prepare the cavities under my supervision and fill them.

46. Do you know of the existence of any list which would be of assistance to the Senate in coming to a conclusion as to which institutions they could recognise as providing an examination

requiring a sufficient course of study?—I could give you a list of the affiliated schools of America. When these matters have been brought before us as a Dental Board they have been submitted to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council has always decided in this way—whether the man would be admitted in England.

47. I do not know that we can do that, because, taking the medical qualification, the English authorities do not view matters exactly as we do; and many of the German qualifications required in other branches are superior. So that we cannot be guided by that. Is there anything else that you can suggest at all?—I can give you an instance of an anomaly that occurred here. A dentist came from America with a very inferior medical degree and a first-class dental degree, but could not register as a dentist. He only wanted to practise dentistry. He registered under his medical qualification, and practised dentistry upon that. It was certainly a very second- or third-class medical degree that he had, but he was enabled to register under that.

48. Why should he not have registered under his dental degree—because he would require an examination?—Yes, he would have had to go up for examination again.

49. Do you intend to insist upon examination in the case of all Americans, or in the case of Americans who do not belong to the affiliated institutions? Which do you intend to insist upon?—Speaking as a member of the Examining Board, I think they ought all to be examined, because we find so many defective.

50. Do you think that a man, after having practised, say, five, or six, or even eight years, is able to pass an examination in the same way as a very much inferior student might pass it?—No, he has got rusty.

51. There is in all courses a lot of work which one gets up for an examination and which is really of not very much importance afterwards?—Yes.

52. Could not some examination be devised which would be sufficient for the case of a man who had obtained his qualification outside?—That could be done.

53. Take Mr. McNab and myself, who are lawyers. It is some time ago since we passed, and though I am an examiner in one subject of our University I should be very sorry at the present moment to go up and try to pass an examination in some branches of law?—Yes. You would not be allowed to practise in America without undergoing some examination.

54. By insisting upon a theoretical examination we might be depriving the community of the services of men who have a good practical knowledge of their work, but yet might not be able to pass in some minutiae which they had forgotten?—That might be.

55. You think the case would be met if something in the nature of a practical examination pure and simple were provided, apart altogether from the ordinary examination?—To my mind, if we open the door to all the American colleges, where they turn the graduates out by the thousand every year, the result would be that the American dentists would come in and flood the country to the detriment of our own students whom we are going to educate and examine.

56. I do not say without examination at all. I say, if these men show themselves by practical examination to be fit persons to be allowed to practise—and only in that case—should not some distinction be made between them and persons who have not passed an examination? I understood you to say it could be done?—It could be done, but I think it would be unfair unless reciprocal treatment was given to our students.

57. *Mr. McNab.*] If a student who had gone through the course in the Pennsylvania University were to apply for registration in this colony, would you make him sit for examination again, Mr. Hoby?—That has been the rule of the Wellington Board so far, and it has been so with the Dunedin Board.

58. Is that your desire, speaking for yourself?—Yes; I think they should be subjected to examination.

59. And the Pennsylvania University Dental School is one of the best in the world?—Yes. Of course, it is a foreign country—it is not an English country.

60. If a student was registered as having passed the examination in one of the British colonies, say, Victoria, would you let him in without examination?—I think it would be advisable in that case; it is a British country.

61. Then you would allow a man to work at dentistry in this country, not on account of the value of his training, but because he hailed from a British country?—Yes, preferential treatment.

62. Which is more likely to be the better to qualify a man for dentistry—preferential treatment or skilled scientific training?—You would get the skilled scientific training at the Victorian University.

63. Is it not nonsense to base a qualification for dentistry on a political issue like reciprocity, and not upon skilled training—is it not a wrong way of proceeding about a thing?—The point, to my mind, is whether we should admit all foreign dentists or not, including Americans. We do not admit them as lawyers. It seems to me that you might as well do away with our examination altogether and permit the American dentist to take the field.

64. Do you not think that the soundest basis to proceed upon is to see that the applicant is qualified?—Unquestionably. There is no question that the University of Pennsylvania does qualify a man.

65. And all other matters are insignificant compared with that?—That is so, from that point of view. It is absolutely correct from that point of view.

66. *Mr. Ell.*] You said that you were not quite certain as to the exact procedure in the training in the American colleges?—I did not mean to say that. The whole training is done in the college rather than with the private individual, as we have it here and as is the case in England. The system in England is very much abused. Sometimes a young man goes and does nothing at all during his three years. He has got to put them in somewhere, and he gets very little good out of it. Then he does two years at the college, which is where all his training should be done, as I think.

67. Practical as well as theoretical?—Yes, the whole thing should be done at the college. That is the American principle.

68. That is why you disapprove of apprentices altogether?—Yes; I would like to see the college take the whole of the tuition out of the hands of private individuals.

69. You think there would be more efficient instruction—that is your own personal view?—Yes, I have held that for years; but it, of course, is against my own interests. In my own interests I would sooner keep the pupils.

70. But in the interests of the public the tuition should be taken out of the hands of private individuals and placed in the hands of the university?—Yes.

71. With regard to the limitation of the number of apprentices, do you think it is desirable to limit the number to two?—Yes, I think it is a good thing. A question was raised as to whether a man should not be allowed another apprentice in a case where he had one or two mechanics who were not qualified for dentistry at all. That was a suggestion from Auckland—that a man should be allowed to take one more for every such mechanic whom he employed.

72. Another apprentice?—Yes, another apprentice beyond the two.

73. What is the dentists' reason for limiting the number to two? Is it that the dentists may be able to devote more attention to two than perhaps to four?—That provision was not inserted by us at all.

Mr. Sidey: The reason why that provision was inserted was that many dentists are simply running their business with apprentices.

74. *Mr. Ell.]* Do you approve of that as a reason why the provision should go in?—That would be a good reason.

75. What practical training do apprentices get under existing conditions? I think you told us that you would not allow an apprentice to make experiments?—I would not upon a patient of mine.

76. He might practise on perhaps his personal friends?—Yes, anybody he could get to come in.

77. If he did not happen to bring in personal friends, &c., how would he get his practical training in extracting teeth and filling cavities?—There is no difficulty about getting friends to come in for fillings. I have never had any difficulty with my pupils about that. The only difficulty I have had has been with extractions.

78. Under the present system, then, there is no guarantee that practical training is given, which is really essential?—Yes, that is quite correct.

79. Now with regard to the premium paid. I have heard of £200 being asked, but the usual thing, I understand, is £100?—That is about the average. It varies from £50.

80. What is your opinion as to the amount of the premium being limited in the Bill?—I have never thought of that. One dentist of a certain standing can only command a comparatively small amount, while another man can command a much higher premium. I do not see why he should not get the higher premium if his standing is such that he can command it.

81. Of course, that places restrictions on people who have not got means?—Yes.

82. But if there was a school where dental students could be trained that difficulty would be removed, assuming, of course, that the Government would not insist upon a high premium?—I would like to say in this connection that if my idea of having a school like those in America were carried out, and the school for training students was placed under the control of the University, the money which now goes to the dentists would go to the school; whereas if we had the apprenticeship system in conjunction with the school, it would be a question whether the burden of keeping up the school would not fall upon the country. If the training of the students was in the hands of the University altogether, there would be ample funds forthcoming from the pupils themselves.

83. What is your opinion of this suggestion: That for practical work a thoroughly qualified dentist should be placed in each of the four centres in connection with the hospitals, so that any poor persons who chose to get free treatment there could do so. The qualified man would supervise the work and would train the students in practical work. The theoretical work, of course, would have to be done at the dental school. Do you think it would be desirable to have such an institution as that in each of the four centres for practical work?—You could not have a good one in each centre. I think it would be very nice for the poor people in each of the large towns to have that, but I do not think it would be a thorough way of teaching, because you want a much more thorough school than can be provided at each of the four centres.

84. I understand that. I do not want a school, but a place where the student can become proficient in extracting teeth, filling cavities, and so forth. A practical dentist could be placed in each hospital?—To give his whole time to it.

85. Yes, and in this institution the students could get practical experience?—But how much time would they spend at the University? The course is for, say, four years. Would they be three years there and one year at the hospital?

86. Possibly so, to get the practical experience?—I think the plan is feasible, but you would not get the best results. I like the idea, because of the scattered nature of our population; but, as I say, I do not think the best results would be obtained.

87. *The Chairman.]* Do you consider the Senate a better Examining Board than the present Board of Examiners, putting aside the question of the school?—Yes, the Senate has it in its power to make it so.

88. The Senate was once the Examining Board. Can you tell me the reason why this arrangement was discontinued?—It was much against the will of the bulk of the dentists of the colony, and was greatly to our surprise. Mr. Rawson and I came down here lobbying and trying to prevent it, but we were too late.

89. Was not the reason this: that complaints were made that the Senate examined in only one place, and that it was very hard on students from different parts of the colony to go to that

place?—We thought so, and we accused the Auckland dentists of being the cause of the alteration being made, but a good many of them denied it. It was done at the instance of an Auckland man, I think.

90. Do you think that if a school were established in one place in the colony it would be satisfactory, having regard to the general configuration of the country? Would it not be a hardship on the students of other centres to have to come to this centre to study, and might it not possibly prevent young men whose parents were not in good circumstances from becoming dentists?—Unquestionably it would. If the school could be established here—and I do not see how it could, for it must be where the medical school is—*i.e.*, Dunedin—but if it could be established in such a central place as Wellington, then I do not think it would be such a hardship.

91. I suppose there would be no objection on the part of the dentists to the putting-in of a clause providing that until such a school were established the Senate should hold examinations at the different centres?—No, I should think there would not.

92. *Mr. Sidey.*] There is power given to the Senate to grant certificates as well as degrees, and you could, if you wished, provide that the Senate should hold examinations for these certificates in each of the four centres. Do you see any objection to that?—No.

HERBERT P. RAWSON examined. (No. 2.)

93. *The Chairman.*] You appear for the dentists of Wellington?—Yes.

94. *Mr. Sidey.*] You are a member of the Wellington Board of Examiners?—Yes.

95. Is it in the interests of the Board that this legislation should be passed?—No, it is against their personal interests very much.

96. You are, as it were, looking at matters not from a selfish point of view, but for the benefit of the profession of dentistry?—Yes, decidedly.

97. With regard to the question of the admission of foreign and colonial dentists: under the Bill, as drawn, the power of admitting colonial and foreign dentists is placed practically in the hands of the Senate?—Yes.

98. But no provision is made for the Senate examining them. Do you think that the powers given in the Bill are not sufficient?—I think it would be rather unfair on the foreign man that the Senate could refuse him and the matter be done with. Looking at the question from the point of view of a foreigner, I think he has a right to say, "I know my work; will you examine me if you cannot admit me without examination." I think he ought to be examined, even if they refused him.

99. Do you think he should have the right to be examined, even though he could not show that he had had any previous training?—I think that he should show that he had had previous training, and when he had shown that he could be examined. I would leave it to the Senate to refuse him if they thought he had had no training. To refuse the foreigner without giving him a chance would be a great injustice to him, I think. It would suit us if the Senate refused him altogether, but that would not be fair to him.

100. Do you concur in what Mr. Hoby said when he compared the British and Victorian systems with the Pennsylvanian system, the distinction being that in Pennsylvania there is no apprenticeship at all, but at Home and in Victoria they apprentice pupils to private dentists?—I think the English method is better in a way. Under it, I believe, they allow three years' apprenticeship with a dentist for the student to learn the mechanical work, and then he has two years at a hospital. That makes it much cheaper for a poor man than under the Pennsylvanian system, and the student gets two years at hospital work.

101. What is your opinion of the apprenticeship system, as compared with the system of having all the work done at the University College?—I do not believe in the apprenticeship system at all as we have it in New Zealand; but the method of part hospital training and part apprenticeship I like better than the system of all hospital training.

102. *Mr. Baume.*] The examination that you suggest would not be an examination that should be difficult with regard to theory at all—it would be more practical?—Yes; I believe more in the practical examination.

103. I understand that in your examination questions are asked as to the dental anatomy of other beings than man—for instance, a dog or a cat?—I am proud to say that our Boards never ask those questions.

104. They have been asked?—Not by our Board.

105. They have been in Dunedin. Do you agree with that sort of thing at all?—No, I think it is a waste of study.

106. Then your examination is really based upon the practical dental anatomy of the human being?—Yes.

107. And is a practical examination altogether in that way?—We have tried to make it as much so as we could.

108. *Mr. EU.*] What proof do you insist upon?—That is the unfortunate part. We make the candidates stop several teeth with gold in our presence, but not on live subjects. A plaster head is used, and a tooth is put into it; and to stop that tooth is, of course, much easier than stopping one in a human head. The mechanical work is verified by the master dentist, as to its having been done by the pupil; but, unfortunately, we have found out since that, once or twice, those declarations have not been true. That is where we think we are so weak. We should be able to call upon a candidate to make a gold plate and a vulcanite set before us, but as we have no dental school we cannot do that. So we have to take the candidates' word and their masters'. That should be sufficient, but it is not. That is the practical part.

109. Your examination in the practical part is weak?—Yes, very defective. We have always felt that to be the weak point. I am sure we have let through some men who have passed the

theoretical examination but have been bad at practical work, because the work shown was not done by them.

110. You lay great stress on a knowledge of the practical work?—Yes; we require much higher marks for that than the theoretical work. If a man cannot stop a tooth, well, he will stand a very good chance of being “plucked” on that alone.

111. From your experience, do you think it would be wise for the Government to do something in connection with looking to the teeth of the children at our public schools?—Decidedly so. This trouble with the teeth has a far greater effect than the decreasing birth-rate. It is of the most vital importance that the poor children at the public schools should have something done to keep their teeth in order. There are millions of teeth lost every year that could be saved if a very little were done at the right time. To go slightly off the subject: there are teeth which are called the six-year-old molars, and there is not one mother in twenty who understands that these teeth belong to the second set. These teeth are consequently allowed to decay, because they are considered to be the first teeth. When a dentist sees the patient these teeth are irretrievably lost. That gives an idea of the ignorance regarding dental anatomy, and what a serious loss children are incurring for want of a little knowledge on the part of their parents.

112. I would like to ask Mr. Hoby if he indorses what you say as to the seriousness to the rising generation in New Zealand of the want of attention at an early age?

Mr. Hoby: Yes. I would like to see introduced here what is done by the London School Board—that is, to have dentists appointed to look after the children's teeth—not only the poor children's, but the better-class children's.

113. *Mr. Ell.*] You say that authoritatively—after years of practice?

Mr. Hoby: Yes. As to the seriousness of the matter, I do not necessarily indorse Mr. Rawson's reference to the declining birth-rate question. The thing is to have the children's teeth examined at school.

Mr. Rawson: The parents do not bring the children to see a dentist till it is too late. When you see a child the time to do good has passed.

RICHARD BULKLEY examined. (No. 3.)

114. *The Chairman.*] You appear as a member of the Dental Board, Mr. Bulkley?—Yes, and as having been sent by the meeting of dentists.

115. Have you any suggestions to make?—I would like to say that I most cordially agree with Mr. Hoby and Mr. Rawson about pupils—that is, that the present system of indenturing should cease. I feel quite certain that we shall never get a really first-class system of dentistry until such time as the matter is taken out of our hands. We have long been willing that it should be taken out of our hands—we have asked the Government to relieve us and to reappoint the Senate, because we have believed that our pupils were not getting justice done to them—I mean the pupils at large throughout the colony. I made a memorandum while the subject of premiums was under discussion. Mr. McNab, I think it was he, said that a poor man's son was placed at a disadvantage, and suggested that the premiums should be of one amount.

116. *Mr. Ell.*] I suggested that some limitation should be placed on the amount?—Well, I know of one case here in Wellington where, within the last six months, a pupil was taken without any premium being paid. The indentures come before the Board, and show that the amount of premium for apprentices is from £50 to £100—mostly £100. On the other hand, I know of a dentist who refused £250 within the last fortnight. If you were to put us all on the same footing some dentists would get all the apprentices, if they could take them. Regarding reciprocity with Canada and the United States, I may say that I have lately come from Canada. While there I spoke to a man on the subject, and he told me that he had got his diploma in Toronto, but that he could not go to Halifax or Vancouver, or anywhere else and practise, without submitting himself to examination.

117. *Mr. Sidey.*] I understand, Mr. Bulkley, that you cordially approve of the abolition of the apprenticeship system?—I do, heartily.

118. As regards these recognised certificates; do you indorse what has been said?—Yes.

119. *Mr. Ell.*] Concerning the question of attention to the teeth of children while they are of school age, do you indorse what Mr. Hoby and Mr. Rawson have said?—Entirely. My class of practice brings me into closer contact with the matter than those gentlemen's practice brings them—theirs is more conservative than mine—and I can tell you that I have to extract permanent teeth from the mouths of children of six, seven, and eight years of age—teeth that should have been saved. As to the reference to the birth-rate, I do not want to put myself up as an authority on that, but it is certainly very important that the children's teeth should be attended to.

E. C. EVANS examined. (No. 4.)

120. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you appear for, Mr. Evans?—The unregistered dentists practising in the colony.

121. Where do you come from?—I come from England.

122. Where are you living in New Zealand?—Fitzherbert Terrace, Wellington. I have written down my views regarding Mr. Sidey's Bill, so far as it affects myself, and will read them. I am an unregistered practitioner. I have never sat for examination. Have had seven years' experience with some of the best dentists in England, Australia, and New Zealand. I served three years' apprenticeship with a registered dentist in England, where I was engaged in the business of dentistry for four years. My employer in England taught me my business as quickly as I was able to learn it, consequently I was able to make rapid progress in my profession. I have practised in the colonies for the past three years. A few months ago I commenced practice on my own account in Wellington, and, if necessary, I could refer you to my past patients for testimony

as to the excellence of my work. I consider myself to be as capable as any man in New Zealand in my own line of business. I have spent £200 in fitting up my establishment, and have all the best and latest appliances known to the profession. The premises I occupy have been leased to me for a period of years, without the right to sublet. Therefore, if Mr. Sidey's Bill is placed on the statute-book in its present form, I shall not only be ousted from the profession and my means of livelihood be gone from me, but I shall also be absolutely ruined. I maintain that it would be contrary to the principle of British law to turn myself, and others similarly situated, into the streets without being given a chance of demonstrating by means of a practical examination our ability to practise dentistry and dental surgery. I certainly think that, in justice to those unregistered men who are practising dentistry in the colony, a clause should be inserted in the Bill providing that those who have been engaged in dentistry for the past five years, either within or without the colony, and can produce a certificate or certificates to that effect, shall be registered without examination; or should it be deemed advisable to examine them, then let them be registered on passing an examination in practical dentistry—that is, surgery work and the making and repairing of artificial teeth, crown and bridge work, fillings, &c. They should not be called upon to pass a theoretical examination, to write about the teeth of animals and other subjects which are really of no practical value to them. A man who possesses a thorough practical knowledge of dentistry and dental surgery is of far more importance to a person who is to be operated upon than a man who has little more than mere theoretical knowledge. I think that the honourable gentlemen of this Committee will agree with me when I say that an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory. I have known several registered dentists who had little more than a theoretical knowledge of their profession, and their patients suffered in consequence—in fact, their work was a disgrace to the profession. I consider that any board of examiners should attach far more importance to the practical side of dentistry than the theoretical. If they did this there would be fewer inferior dentists on the register, and the dental profession would be elevated in consequence. In conclusion, I trust that the Bill will not be allowed to become law without the insertion of some such clause as I have suggested.

123. *The Chairman.*] Have you anything to add to that?—No.

124. *Mr. Sidey.*] I would like to know whether Mr. Evans was practising before he started on his own account?—I was for three years with a registered dentist at Harrowgate, in Yorkshire.

125. I mean in this colony?—I was with Dr. Merrel, of Melbourne, Mr. Collins, of Dunedin, and Mr. Armstrong, of Dunedin, and I practised for a while on my own account in Dunedin. I have also been with a dentist in Auckland. I was with him until I started on my own account here a few months ago.

126. What was the name of the Auckland dentist?—Mr. Emmanuel.

127. What sort of work did you do when with Mr. Armstrong?—I am capable of practising what is considered the highest branch of the profession—that is, crown and bridge work. I have in my own mouth a bridge made by myself, and I think that if the dentists present were to examine it they would agree with me that it was really good work. I know for a fact that there are any number of men who have passed and who are not capable of doing that kind of work.

128. What I want to know is whether Mr. Armstrong insisted upon your being registered—did you have any difficulty in getting into his establishment?—I had no difficulty whatever. When a dentist engages an assistant he attaches far more importance to his practical knowledge than the diploma which he might have for theoretical knowledge.

129. When you applied did Mr. Armstrong ask you whether you were registered?—Yes; but so long as I could do the work which he engaged me to do it was all right.

130. Was it for a special job that he engaged you?—No—well, he engaged me as a mechanical and surgical assistant.

131. How long were you with him?—About three months. During the three years I have been in the colonies I have spent my time with Dr. Merrel, of Melbourne, Mr. Collins and Mr. Armstrong, of Dunedin, and Mr. Emmanuel, of Auckland.

132. How long were you with Mr. Collins?—For nearly twelve months.

133. Did not Mr. Collins go to America recently?—Yes.

134. Were you with him then?—No; I was with him before I went to Australia.

135. Did not Mr. Collins ask for a certificate of registration?—No, he just asked me for my testimonials from other dentists that I had worked for—testimonials stating that I was able to do the practical work. That was all.

136. Is Mr. Emmanuel a registered dentist?—He is registered in New South Wales, but not in New Zealand.

137. Has any objection ever been raised to your practising in the colony though being unregistered here?—No, none whatever.

138. Do you advertise yourself as a dentist?—No. I advertise as “The Imperial Dental Company.” I think that a company is looked upon as of more importance than a private practitioner.

139. You are aware, of course, that really you are practising illegally?—There have been several cases brought against the unregistered men, who have always won them.

Mr. Rawson. No.

Witness. I think they have in most cases.

140. *Mr. Sidey.*] You are aware that a good number of men were admitted without examination at the time the present law was passed?—Yes.

141. And that the intention of the present law is that no one should practise dentistry other than those who are registered? I suppose you recognise that that is the intention of the present law?—Yes.

142. You see nothing unfair to the dentists who have been examined in allowing unregistered men to practise?—Not so long as the unregistered men can pass a practical examination. That is

all I consider is necessary. I think it would be very unfair to turn men out of practice who are really capable men.

143. How about those who have simply set up for themselves, as compared with those who have had to go through the training required—who have paid a premium and apprenticed themselves?—I had to go through all that in England.

144. But others may not be similarly circumstanced to yourself. It would have been better, would it not, for those wanting to get into the profession not to have gone to the expense of paying a premium or of apprenticing themselves at all, but to have started up and practised on their own account and trusted to get it in this way? Do you not think that to allow unregistered men to practise would be unfair to those who have had to go through the training and to pay premiums?—I think that so long as a man has served a certain time at dentistry he should be entitled to demand a practical examination. I have not the time to study theory, and at present, like the members of the Dental Board, who have just admitted that they would not like to be called upon to go up for an examination at present, I am not prepared to go up for a theoretical examination, but I can guarantee that I could satisfy the Board I was fit to practise if they would give me a practical examination.

145. *Mr. EU.*] Were the two dentists by whom you were engaged in Dunedin registered men?—Yes; Mr. Collins is on the Dental Board in Dunedin now.

146. As an examiner?—Yes.

147. He occupies the same position as these gentlemen here in that respect?—Yes.

148. Is Mr. Armstrong a registered man?—Yes. I have also been with men who have passed their examination in America. Dr. Merrel, of Melbourne, was an American-qualified man. I have also been with an English-qualified man.

149. What was the nature of your work with the latter?—I did extracting, gave gas and local anæsthetics, did fillings and crown and bridge work, made gold plates, and did all sorts of plate-work.

150. On the patients?—Yes.

151. You did extractions for the patients?—Yes.

152. And fillings?—Yes. During my time I have taken out thousands of teeth, have fitted in hundreds of plates, and have made any number of bridges. When I landed in New Zealand, a little over three years ago, bridge-work was hardly practised in the colony.

153. *The Chairman.*] You come before us, I understand, to make objections to this Bill?—Yes; to protest against men being turned into the streets without being given an opportunity of showing they are capable men.

154. Will you point out to the Committee in what way this Bill differs from the present law with regard to your case—you have read the Bill?—Yes; it says in the Bill that all men who are not registered shall be prosecuted—or something to that effect—if they attempt to practise.

155. Is that not the present law?—I really could not say. A good many unregistered dentists have been practising in the colony and have been had up before the Magistrate, and have won their cases. That is what led me to spend all my money in setting up on my own account.

156. I would like you to point out to the Committee what difference there is between the provisions of the present Act and the Bill introduced by Mr. Sidey. Perhaps the Bill would make it worse for you than the present Act?—I think it throws us out altogether, without any chance at all being given us of proving that we are able to practise.

157. But does not the present Act do that?—Not that I know of. I do not think so, because, as I have said, I have read of men having been brought up and having won their cases. So that proved there was nothing in the old Act to stop a man from practising.

158. How is it that you do not call yourself a dentist?—That is the only thing in the Act that we cannot do. It says that a man shall not call himself a dentist unless he has passed an examination—unless he is registered.

159. Can you recover fees under the old Act?—Not that I know of.

160. Does not the Act provide for those two things just the same?—I really could not say.

161. *Mr. EU.*] Will you please read clause 21 of the Bill and tell us what the effect would be?—I do not think it says in the old Act that the words “dental company” should not be used.

162. *The Chairman.*] The old Act does not go into it so minutely?—No, it does not. Then I see it says in the old Act that a man can demand an examination so long as he can show testimonials from a foreign dentist.

163. Did you ever demand an examination?—No, I have never demanded one. On one occasion I went to see Mr. Hoby about a billet as an assistant, and he told me that I had no right to demand an examination. That was nearly three years ago.

Mr. Hoby: I said that you could not unless you served another three years' apprenticeship. If you had served three years' apprenticeship in England, you could.

Witness: You did not tell me that at the time, Mr. Hoby.

164. *The Chairman.*] Are you speaking on behalf of other unregistered dentists?—For myself and the other unregistered men practising in the colony.

165. Have you got authority to speak for them?—No.

166. *Mr. Sidey.*] I want to know whether you attempted to qualify in the Old Country, Mr. Evans? Did you apprentice yourself in the Old Country?—Yes, I was an apprentice, but I was not bound. The reason why I did not go up for examination was because it would have been such an expense going to the dental school for two years. I should have had to go to the dental school for two years and keep myself during that time. A lot of men in England go to a dentist and spend a few hours a day doing practical work in order to study about four hours a day at the college, and then they go up for examination after two years; but I was not able to do that.

ERNEST C. FOUNTAIN examined. (No. 5.)

167. *The Chairman.*] Where do you come from?—Christchurch
168. Are you a dentist by profession?—I am not a dentist, but am practising dentistry.
169. You are not registered?—No.
170. Are you speaking on behalf of the unregistered men in Christchurch, or on your own behalf?—On behalf of the unregistered men.
171. You have been authorised by them to come up here and give evidence?—Yes.
172. Will you make a statement?—I have a few notes here and will read them. The present Act allows unregistered persons to practise dentistry, but not to call themselves dentists. The dentists have encouraged the unregistered persons to practise. The New Zealand Consolidated Dental Company, which is carried on by the shareholders—the shareholders being the dentists of New Zealand—have allowed the unregistered persons to purchase their stock from the company, and, furthermore, they have issued shares to the unregistered persons. For eleven years nearly every doctor in Christchurch was only too pleased to, and did, administer an anæsthetic for an unregistered person until June, 1903, when the dentists wrote to the Medical Association asking them to desist from so doing. The Medical Association held a conference and brought the matter up for discussion, and decided not to continue to administer an anæsthetic for unregistered persons. There was much controversy about the matter, and some of the medical profession would not abide by the decision, two very prominent medicos—both being Fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons, England—and three of Christchurch's oldest and most prominent doctors being among the number who would not abide by the association's decision. One of the doctors wrote to the Medical Association stating that it was a shame to try and boycott these men, who were good operators and who had been practising so many years, and that he understood the dentists were framing a Bill which they would shortly present to the House of Representatives, and in which they would include a clause whereby these unregistered persons might be registered, meaning the Bill Mr. Sidey has presented. Now, this present Bill before the House excludes the unregistered persons and thereby prevents them from carrying on their practice as hitherto. Some of these unregistered men have wives and families, and if the Bill is carried as it stands these men will be great losers, and will be thrown out of employment.
173. Have you anything to add to that?—No.
174. *Mr. Sidey.*] You told us, Mr. Fountain, that you were authorised by other unregistered dentists to come here?—Yes. I saw a good many of them, and told them I was coming up, and they said they were very pleased I was.
175. How many are there in Christchurch?—Practising on their own account?
176. I am referring to unregistered dentists?—Do you mean the ones who are practising for themselves, or those who are working for a dentist?
177. I take it that those who are practising on their own account are doing so contrary to the spirit of the Act?—The only men practising contrary to the Act would be those who were practising on their own account. Any dentist could employ any man to work in his workshop, or even do extracting.
178. How many are there practising on their own account?—I know of only four in Christchurch.
179. Have you any idea how many there are all over the colony?—I have not the slightest idea.
180. What suggestion do you make as regards the admission of these unregistered dentists?—Simply that a clause be put in whereby these unregistered men who have been practising for many years should be registered.
181. How many years' practice would you say?—I would leave that to yourselves. I have been practising on my own account for seven years, and my brother for twelve years. Some men, I think, have been practising two years. It would not be fair for me to say it should be five years—I would not be speaking for other men.
182. Do you think it is a fair thing?—I do.
183. Is it not unfair to those who have had to spend money in qualifying themselves?—No. I admit that a man who has passed an examination and is registered deserves more credit than a man who has not passed an examination, but I say that the Act as it stands now allows an unregistered man to practise, and if it allows him to practise why should he not do so.
184. Was it not the intention of the Act that every one who practised dentistry in this country should be registered?—I could not say. I should think that if it were so the House of Representatives would have brought it up in that way. Even at Home in England unregistered persons can practise so long as they do not imply that they are dentists.
185. Supposing all those who had been practising dentistry for five years in this colony and were unregistered were permitted to register, how many would it admit, taking the colony as a whole?—It might admit three or four.
186. I thought there were a good many more in your own place?—There are only two there who would be admitted under that. My brother has been practising for twelve years, as I have said, and I have been practising for seven. Then there is a man named Sayers, I think, who has been practising for only about two or perhaps three years. Then there is a new company called "The Painless Dental Company." It has been carrying on for only a very short time—perhaps not a year.
187. Supposing it were made three years, how many would that admit throughout the colony, so far as your knowledge goes? Are you aware of other conditions than those prevailing in your own town?—There is a London Dental Company; I do not know how long they have been in existence, and I do not know whether there are any unregistered men running the company. I

always understood the company was run by a qualified dentist, but that they employed men who were not registered to carry on the work in different branches.

188. How many would be admitted all over the colony if the term were made three years?—I have not the slightest idea.

189. Would it be twenty?—I could not say.

190. *Mr. Ell.*] Have you been practising dentistry in every department of the profession—extracting, filling, and so forth?—Yes.

191. For a period of five years?—I have been practising seven years.

192. And your brother in the same way?—My brother has been practising for twelve years.

193. You say that the medical profession in Christchurch will administer anæsthetics for you, notwithstanding the decision of the Medical Association to the contrary?—Yes; some of them will not abide by the decision—prominent doctors too.

194. You said in your statement, “the New Zealand Consolidated Dental Company, which is carried on by the shareholders—the shareholders being the dentists of New Zealand.” What is the company? Is it a supply company?—It supplies us with goods and material.

195. With the requisites for the business?—Yes.

196. You say that the company has unregistered men as members of it?—Yes; my brother has five shares.

197. What registered men are in it?—I do not all of them, but there are a number.

198. There are registered men in the company and they admit unregistered men?—Yes, as shareholders.

199. Were you apprenticed to any dentist at all?—I was apprenticed to Mr. Biggs.

200. How long were you with him?—Three years.

201. Do you know whether your brother was apprenticed to any man?—He, too, was apprenticed to Mr. Biggs. He was apprenticed in the first place to a man named Chatfield, in Auckland, but was dismissed before his time was up.

202. Was Mr. Chatfield a registered qualified dentist?—Yes, one of the oldest dentists in Auckland.

203. Did you pay any premium?—I paid £30.

204. Do you know what your brother paid?—I think he paid Mr. Chatfield either £50 or £70, but I am not sure. He did not pay Mr. Biggs anything.

205. You want to be permitted to go on practising as you have done hitherto?—Yes.

206. *The Chairman.*] You have read the Bill?—Yes.

207. What different position does it place you in from the old Act?—We have been allowed to put up “dentistry,” “dental surgery,” “London Dental Company,” or anything like that, but under clause 21 we shall not be able to. If the clause were passed we should practically have to shut up altogether.

208. But does not the old Act provide for that too? Will you read it, please? [Act handed to witness.] Is there any difference between the old Act and this Bill with regard to your practising?—Yes, there is.

209. I would like you to point it out to the Committee? Do you not think it is this way: that under the old Act steps were not taken to enforce the law, and that therefore you were allowed to practise dentistry?—Do you mean that we should be thrown out?

210. What I want to know is, why you think you would be thrown out under this Bill when the conditions are just the same under the old Act?—Since reading the clause in the old Act and clause 21 of the Bill just now I must admit that I have read the Act wrongly heretofore. The Bill makes it harder for us to practise, but it does not, as far as I can see, altogether exclude us from practising. Still, it makes it very much harder.

211. Under the old Act you could not sue for fees?—No.

212. And this Bill would keep you in the same position in that respect?—Yes.

213. *Mr. Ell.*] You cannot sue for fees now—you recognise that?—That is so.

214. *The Chairman.*] As far as that is concerned there is no alteration?—No.

215. The only alteration is with regard to your calling yourselves dentists?—Yes; under the Bill we could not put up anything at all to say that we were practising.

216. Do you reckon that would destroy your practice?—It would help to do so to a certain extent. People might pass by the door and not know that we were there.

217. It would not take away any of your old patients?—No; but we have to look for new patients. We put in, say, a set of teeth, and the patient does not want any more teeth when he has got a set. We have to look to new patients.

218. As far as the Bill is concerned it is only a question of degree—it does not destroy the business of the unregistered men?—Not wholly and solely.

THURSDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1904.

Dr. WILLIAM ERNEST LOWE examined. (No. 6.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I understand, doctor, that you are practising dentistry in Wellington?—Yes.

2. You are a registered dentist?—Yes.

3. Are you acquainted with the Bill before us?—Yes.

4. If you will give us your views upon it we shall be glad to hear them, and members of the Committee can then ask you questions?—Yes. I might say, gentlemen, that in the main I think the Bill is a step in the direction in which a want has been felt for a very great while. It places dental education on a footing which is likely to be of great value to the public and to the profes-

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

Bill has, I believe, been questioned a good deal. Two gentlemen whose names I heard read out just now—a Mr. Evans and a Mr. Fountain—have for some time been infringing the Act in this colony. I cannot say if those gentlemen have, but a Mr. Hunter, of Taranaki, has, often been convicted under the Act of 1880. It however seems to be loosely worded, so that a penalty cannot be enforced beyond a merely nominal amount. It seems to me that it would be very unjust to those students who have spent a good deal of time and money on studying—and many of them that I know personally are very worthy and would be an ornament to the profession and do good work; but rather than do what is considered a somewhat underhand thing—to infringe the spirit of the law but not the letter—they have gone on plugging away for years so that they may be able to take an honourable position—it would be rather an injustice to them, I say, if you passed legislation which would admit those who had defied the law for so long and give them an advantage over those who had kept within its limits. Then, clause 22 limits dentists to only two apprentices. I think, if I may say so, that clause might be left out, for two reasons. In the first place, it would tend to monopoly by restricting the number of practitioners. We look to the population of this country increasing, consequently the number of practitioners should increase in proportion; and since the population of the country cannot be limited, I think that the number of practitioners should not be limited either. Furthermore, I might say, with regard to the system of apprenticeship, that in great part it is vastly abused. I know of one case in which a young man who showed great ability was kept for eighteen months answering the door and keeping the books—in fact, acting as a page-boy. I can give you another instance. I might mention that I get to know of these cases because I take an interest in the young men's education and have a class, and they come to me for advice on a great many matters. This young man complained that his master had been in the habit of sending him out to get domestic articles and to take them to his wife. One day the young man had to take a fish to his master's place, and he objected to this—he thought it hardly came under the heading of “dental education.” These are not merely isolated instances; the system is very often abused.

5. *Mr. Jennings.*] Were premiums imposed in each of those cases?—In the latter case the premium was £150; in the former, as far as I remember, it was only £75.

6. I understood it was £100—I know the case?—Well, I cannot be sure, but as far as I know it was £75. I may say that I studied first in England—at Guy's Hospital—having my qualification from the Royal College of Surgeons, England. That institution stands very high; in fact, I think it is recognised as standing the highest in the world. When I went over to the University of Pennsylvania to study there I received very great concessions on account of my former work; but Dr. Kirk said to me, “We can never recognise your system of apprenticeship; we can only recognise the work which is certified to by a recognised body. We cannot accept the education given by an irresponsible practitioner, because, though in one case it may be very good, in another case it may be very poor; and how can we put the stamp of an authorised body on the work of an irresponsible individual?” I need not multiply instances showing how the apprenticeship system is abused, both on the part of the master and of the pupil. I almost think that the abuse is equal on both sides. If the education of dental students is entirely in the hands of the Senate, they will set up a school, and this school will teach all apprentices. If the mechanic be included with the operative, the cost of education to the Senate will be reduced tremendously. It is a fairly substantial premium which is asked from pupils, and if the premiums are paid to the Senate that will be a very great help. Again, the work now done by the pupils is of very great service to the masters; that work can be done by journeymen, and thus work can be given to a class of which there are at present very few, simply because the work is done by the apprentices. I know of an establishment where one man is paid from £3 10s. to £4 a week, while at another the man is paid from 15s. to £1. This employer's fees are exactly the same as the fees of nearly all other dentists; and I say that if one man can afford to pay the rate named, another man ought to be able to do so. Then, with regard to the expense of education, if the whole course be done at the University, the cost of education is tremendously lessened. At the University of Pennsylvania, where the whole course is taken by the University, the fee is \$100 per annum, which is about £20.

7. *Mr. EU.*] Of what length is the course?—That is the rate per annum. The course is three or four years—at present it is four years—at the University of Pennsylvania, but when the course was three years the yearly fee was the same. Of course, the fees have to pay for the professors and certain upkeep. I do not think it makes much difference whether the course is three or four years—the expense per annum and the fee are proportionate. In cases where the master appropriates a very fine fee and has no outlay connected with it, and the final years are served at an institution, the fee is fifty guineas per annum, making the cost of the whole education in the latter case two hundred guineas, whereas in the former it would be £60 or £80. You see the difference there. The difference of £130, or £150 might just as well go to the Senate and provide a better education.

8. *Mr. Jennings.*] Are those universities endowed by some rich citizens for special purposes?—Yes. The University of Pennsylvania is considerably endowed, but the Dental Board there not only pays all its own expenses, but provides a good deal of revenue for other departments. On the department where such subjects as philosophy and theology are taught there is a debit, whereas the Dental Department shows a credit. I might also mention that when the work is done at these schools there is a small fee—a minimum fee. For instance, dentures are charged for at a trifling amount, which is very little to the patients, but, of course, this keeps down the expense a good deal. I think that is all I have to say, gentlemen.

9. *Mr. Sidey.*] I understand, doctor, that you attended a hospital in London?—Yes.

10. Did you take the L.D.S. there?—Yes.

11. Were you apprenticed to a private practitioner?—Yes.

12. And you afterwards went across to Pennsylvania and took the D.D.S. there?—Yes.

13. You have raised an objection to companies. Is there not an additional objection to the use of the word "company" in that it has been used by persons who are unregistered, and who have in that way managed to evade the present law? Is not that the case—that unregistered persons are practising dentistry under the name of a company?—I could not answer that now—I should have to think of instances. I might mention, with regard to companies, that I suppose most people have heard of Mr. Goodman, of Ludgate Hill, who had absurd advertisements about "complete dentures for half a guinea." He so grossly misrepresented himself that he got a term of imprisonment for it.

14. You referred to foreign practitioners, doctor, and appeared to be under the impression that foreign practitioners were to be treated in a different manner from those coming from the other British colonies. Are you aware that the provisions of the Bill practically leave the question of the admission of foreign dentists in the hands of the University Senate?—Yes, I understand that; but the Bill says that they may be entitled to registration without examination.

15. Only if they have a recognised certificate. Under the Bill no foreign practitioner can be registered in this colony unless the Senate approves of his certificate. Do you think that anything more is wanted?—I have heard of a case which occurred some years ago when these matters were in the hands of the University, in which the Senate admitted certain persons, who were most undesirable, because they had some Belgian certificate which is recognised in that country.

16. Were they medical practitioners?—No, dentists.

17. The Senate has not had power to recognise any dentists heretofore; it has been in the hands of a Board. At any rate, you think that in the event of the Senate declining to give a certificate of recognition some examination should be allowed to a foreign practitioner?—I think that would be very fair.

18. Do you think medical practitioners should be excluded or included?—Most certainly they should be included. I think that if a man takes a degree entitling him to practise in the whole subject he is entitled to practise in a part.

19. That is to say, you approve of medical practitioners being included?—Yes. I do not see that there is any alternative; but I do not see that it matters very much, because there are very few medical practitioners who want to practise dentistry. Those who are keenest on it take a qualification in both branches.

20. You are entirely opposed to the apprenticeship system?—Entirely.

21. How about permitting extractions—and extractions only—to be made by persons who are not registered as dentists: do you see any objection to that?—No objection whatever; but such a person should not be allowed to say he was a dentist, and so mislead the public.

22. You have objected to the word "consecutive" in clause 11, subsection (b). Do you understand that that clause refers only to students who have already entered upon their course or who have previously completed it? It will affect those who are at present engaged?—Yes.

23. The object is to put them in exactly the same position as they are in at the present time?—Yes; but I think the position they are in at the present time is not quite right. I might give an instance—the case of a young man whom this will affect at the present time. This young man was indentured to a brother of the Mr. Fountain whom you have seen; his articles were drawn out to him. These two brothers were in partnership in Christchurch. The younger brother was qualified and the elder one was not. They dissolved the partnership about a year ago—perhaps less—and the younger one went to Auckland, the pupil remaining in Christchurch under the tuition of the unregistered man. Consequently this young man's service is not consecutive. He was unaware of this fact. I have spoken to a member of the Board about this, and he says that he cannot help it. I think that is manifestly unjust. I am not in the least interested in the young man. Although he was quite prepared to go up and complete the term with the man in Auckland, his term is broken; it will not be consecutive.

24. You understand that in asking us to do what you suggested you are asking us to pass retrospective legislation: do you understand that?—Oh, yes; I put it to your integrity to consider it, because I think the three years' *continuous* study is not quite right.

25. You are entirely opposed to the admission of those who are now practising but are unregistered?—Yes. I think that those who have infringed the law in the past, rather than be allowed any grace, ought to be punished.

26. Do you not think that some means might be provided under which they might be given an examination?—Because a man has been thieving my chickens for a long time is no reason why I should say, "He has stolen them now for many years; we will say no more about it"; or why he should be given a position so that he can defend himself.

27. A suggested amendment to clause 10 has been sent to me. It is as follows: "Every person who has been actually engaged in the general practice of dentistry in an established place or places of business, and has been the owner of a plant of sufficient character to carry on the practice of dentistry in all its branches, and has pursued no other vocation as a means of livelihood for three years prior to the passage of this Act, shall, upon making such proof and the payment of the fees be entitled to registration. Such proof shall be made by affidavit of the applicant, accompanied by the affidavit of two or more competent witnesses filed with the Registrar-General."?—And yet you would exclude the man whose three years had not been consecutive.

28. You are opposed to such a clause being inserted?—I think that if you restrict a man who is in a legal position you cannot admit a man who is in an illegal position.

29. You would not allow these people even an examination?—I think that only those who can show that they have served an apprenticeship ought to be admitted. If you will not allow an apprentice an examination because there is some technical flaw, how can you allow a man who has been infringing the Act? I mean to say, they must be on the same footing; you must not put the man who is in the legal position at a disadvantage.

30. *Mr. Buddo.*] With regard to chemists in country districts undertaking certain work—extraction; and, I believe, also filling: what is your opinion with regard to admitting them to a status of any nature, without raising the question of their being called dentists?—I think in this way: If dental education is required at all—and it has come to be generally accepted that dental education is required—it is required for a definite thing—that is to say, for the preservation and protection of the teeth. Regarding filling, I could quote you cases where a tooth has been improperly filled, and that improper filling has resulted in the person's death. And I should say that it would be much better to loose a tooth than to allow a man to meddle in a profession to which he has not been admitted. Better to do away with examination altogether until we are in a position to teach all those people. You referred to country places. Take such a place as an example: A farmer, far away from a proper dentist, may go to, say, a chemist. The tooth may appear to be perfectly sound comparatively speaking, there being only a small hole in it. The chemist fills the tooth, but probably is not acquainted with what may happen. The farmer goes away to his work, and in two or three days an abscess come up. An abscess, you know, is a serious thing. It means that there is a formation of pus there. That pus is taken into the body, and the man may be dead before he is able to get relief. Therefore I say that if you are going to allow a chemist who has never studied dentistry, to do such work as filling you must allow anybody. It is not generally known, but it is largely the practice to go in for wholesale extractions—dead men tell no tales. If you are going to do work in which you risk your reputation you must have education on these matters. The general public's opinion is that filling is very little: you just scoop out a little hole and put some stuff in. But there is a good deal more than that. I have had experience over a good many years, and have studied in a good many schools, and I have come to the conclusion year by year that there is a great deal more in it than I had ever thought. I trust that is sufficient answer.

31. You are emphatically against any recognition of other people than dentists with regard to mechanical work. What is your opinion as to giving country chemists—and chemists only—any status regarding the extraction of teeth?—I should think that perfectly legitimate, but I do not think that you should let them appropriate the name “dentist,” and thereby mislead the public. A patient may suffer on that account; many cases of tetanus have arisen—in fact, I could multiply instances of cases which have had fatal results through an imperfect dental operation.

32. *Mr. Jennings.*] I understand that in my absence Mr. Sidey has read to you an amendment that I intend to move to section 10 of the Bill as a new subsection, and that you do not approve of it?—I answer in this way: If you include subclause (b) of clause 11, which will exclude a pupil who had served part of his time with such a man as would be admitted under the clause which you propose to add, how can you accept the master?”

33. It says “prior to the passing of this Act.” You would not go in for any retrospective legislation, would you? I have no hesitation in giving the name of the man I have in mind—Mr. Hunter, of Stratford. He has branches at New Plymouth, Inglewood, Eltham, Patea, and other places, and has given general satisfaction. This Bill, if passed, would prevent his carrying on the very extensive business which he has built up. He has qualified dental surgeons in his establishments, but this Bill would interfere with him, and would be retrospective in that way. That is what I complain about?—The law should have interfered with him in the first place—you will admit that. You say that because the law is a little faulty on the point and has allowed him to get a footing, then we must recognise him.

34. That is my contention. There cannot be many cases like this?—It seems to me that if a man has been guilty of an offence time does not make any reparation.

35. But many people hold the view that this is not an offence?—If you allow such a man to come in I do not see where you are going to draw the line at all. I could give you many cases of a very similar description. If you permit that, any man who has been a sufficient time in practice, whether he has been an apprentice or not—he may be only a mechanic, but if he has given satisfaction he can claim admission.

36. Is it not a fact that when the Pharmacy Act was passed many persons were admitted who had not undergone the necessary examination?—Most truly; but there was not an Act, and they were not infringing the law.

37. The case that I cite is on all-fours with that?—This Bill is but an improvement on the present Act. You are seeking to justify an offender, whereas before the Pharmacy Act was passed there were no offenders.

38. I do not like the word “offender.” It is rather offensive, perhaps, in regard to one who has given satisfaction to many people. My contention is that if this Bill is made retroactive it will impose a very serious loss on persons who are engaged in the profession at the present time, and who have given general satisfaction throughout the country districts. We up there are situated so dissimilarly from you?—I quite understand that; but why should not that person submit himself for examination? The law does not preclude him at all; it only says that he must come in in the legal way. It is merely providing that there shall be no by-paths—that the men shall come in at the door. Take the case of Mr. Fountain. His articles have been recognised, and it has been intimated to him that he has only got to sit for his examination. Mr. Hunter could have been indentured to one of his own registered men some years back, and could have sat for examination.

39. I understand that Mr. Hunter has some American qualifications, which would not be recognised by the law that has been passed?—Well, then, I think he should come in in the same way that American dentists do in their own country. If I understand rightly—I may be in error—Mr. Hunter claims to be a descendant of some North American Indian and an Indian doctor.

40. He has a *nom-de-plume*, “Kakapo”?—Yes, that has to do with his birth or tribe. We might have a Maori *tohunga* who was recognised amongst the Maoris.

41. But Mr. Hunter is an educated man?—I have never met him; but a man of education might easily have seen the Act and have observed how readily he might get into a legal position under it by submitting himself, just the same as all others have had to do. Why should you make an exception in favour of this man. A great number have had to sit for examination in all the years gone by, when apparently—if you are going to accept this man—there was no need for it.

42. But there cannot be many similar cases that one could cite. My answer to that is, “Why should this man, who now has large vested interests, which have been built up, be practically ruined and have his means of livelihood taken away from him?—Because he has neglected the means to secure a legal standing.

43. Quite so; but I have already cited the precedent of the passing of the Pharmacy Act, when many who had not the necessary qualification were allowed, owing to their official positions, to be registered under the Act. Therefore, why should there in one or two cases such as Mr. Hunter's be any great bar?—I will support the Bill with all my power if you will not impose such a hardship as would be imposed in these cases?—Where would the hardship be.

44. This man has got his money invested in it?—I know of cases of young men who have money which they want to invest in the business, but they have not passed the examination, and so they have to refrain. Why should not this man pass the examination?

45. It may not be possible for him?—If it be possible for young men, it ought to be possible for a man of education.

46. There was no examination set prior to the passing of the Pharmacy Act?—Quite so; because there was no legislation to restrict.

47. The ultimate objects were undoubtedly restrictive in the first Pharmacy Act that was passed. It was passed with an intention similar to that of the Bill before us; but owing to the feeling manifested in Parliament, that no legislation should be retroactive, the concessions to which I have referred were granted, and, in my opinion, the profession has been greatly improved by that legislation?—Yes, but you want to admit this man. You are going to give him grace, whereas many others, who have been to a great deal of expense and trouble, have not been able to practise because they have not passed the examination.

48. Mr. Hunter has in his employ at the present time some of your qualified dentists, and his operations are so extensive that I am told there are about a thousand or more cases of what you might term uncompleted contracts on his hands?—As he has registered men, why should not they continue doing them?

49. He is the mainspring, as it were, of the whole show, and these unfulfilled contracts are on his books?—But why should not the men who are doing the work at present complete the contracts?

50. It would, perhaps, be to his detriment if he were thrown out. It is his money that is in the concern?—I understand from you that he is an operator himself, and he employs others as well?

51. Yes?—Then I cannot see why his employees should not go on—they that are on the legal footing. I believe that that very man has made out indentures to one of his men, and that he had intended in the course of a year or two to present himself for examination. I should think it would be wise to encourage him to continue in that path.

52. *Mr. EU.*] Regarding the Examining Boards: from your experience in England and America do you think that the present system of appointing Examining Boards is satisfactory?—I am quite in the dark as to how and by whom the Boards have been appointed. The Act says that they must be appointed by the Governor in Council. I understand it is generally understood that the Boards are appointed on the voting of the dentists now, who recommend the men chosen to the Governor in Council. But how the Board in Wellington and the Board in Dunedin were appointed I do not know. I think it would be a wise step to have the Dental Board purged from year to year, because, to take the case of the present Board in Wellington, their appointment I think was gazetted as far back as 1880. They had one meeting, and were not unanimous, and that was the end of it. Their appointment was for three years. The term expired, and they went out of office. Many years after that—in 1896—there was some movement, and the members of the old Board said they were willing to stand, and they were reappointed. It seems to me that men who have been appointed for so many years are rather likely to be a little out of date. I might mention also, regarding what Mr. Jennings has said, that I feel very much with him in the matter of the admission of men who were unregistered when the legislation was first introduced and who were thereby admitted. I feel that he has a good deal of reason to wish for a measure of injustice—though I do not go with him in that—since two of the present members of the Board were admitted on those lines of clemency.

53. Members of the Examining Board?—Yes; and therefore I feel that the Examining Board ought in all cases to consist of men who have qualifications and who have been through the curriculum.

54. You think it a matter of importance that the members of the Dental Board should be men who had gone through a special course of training at a university or training college?—They ought to have had tuition in some way to fit them for their offices.

55. Is it desirable to have the *personnel* of the Board changed from time to time?—I should think it most certainly necessary for new blood to be infused. That is the case in almost every instance that I know of. On the Examining Board of the College of Surgeons a new member is admitted annually. I think that there is a change in the Senate every two years.

56. *The Chairman.*] You hold, doctor, that the examination of students should be conducted by the Senate of the University rather than under the present system?—I take it that there will be a Board of Examiners appointed from among the dentists. I mean to say the examiners must be men in practice, who have been educated in the subject.

57. The Bill proposes that the Senate shall undertake examinations. Do you think that will be a better system than the present one?—I think it will, undoubtedly.

58. Supposing that a College of Dentistry was established at, say, Dunedin in connection with the University. Do you not think it would be a hardship to Auckland students to have to go to and live in Dunedin, as opposed to the present system, under which the students can learn in their native town?—I hardly think so, since you find such large numbers going very much further than to Dunedin—namely, to America and England. They feel that their education here is so scant that they must go to considerable expense to get it completed.

59. You do not think it would tend to diminish the number of students?—I hardly think it would. Perhaps it would be more central if the school were in Wellington, but the Medical School is already at Dunedin and the Dental School ought to be there, because in many ways it would be advantageous to do work in conjunction with the Medical School. We are getting enough medical practitioners, and medical students do not let a few or even a few hundred miles or more stand in the way if they are keen enough. There are scholarships, and, of course, if the dental profession were under the University, scholarships could be provided; and thus the very poorest, if they were students of ability, would have opportunities provided for them.

60. Have the dentists generally made any proposal or urged that a college of dentistry should be established?—It is generally felt that it will take a long while. They cannot believe that the good time is as near as many of us hope. It would be very much appreciated.

61. Have any practical steps been taken in that direction, to your knowledge?—I have had during the last year or two a good number of pupils who think nothing of coming a good way and staying in Wellington for the sake of getting education. At present I have eight pupils, one of whom comes from Feilding, another from New Plymouth, another from Christchurch, and I have had many from the West Coast and Napier. They do not think much of coming to Wellington and boarding here in order to get the tuition.

62. That is private tuition?—Yes; and, of course, how much more would it be so if the tuition were given by the University.

63. They are not apprentices?—No. They are those who have served their three years. I give to those who require it theoretical work mainly, in order to prepare them for their examination; but the majority ask for practical work as well. As you can see, it becomes a greater task on one man and the outlay is considerable, consequently I have to charge a fee which is double what it could be done for if it were a State concern, where there would be greater numbers.

64. With regard to the unregistered people, have you any knowledge of the number who are really practising on their own account?—No. I have knowledge of a good number in Wellington who would seek registration if they could register.

65. Do you know how many would come in in Wellington if some such clause as Mr. Jennings proposes were put in—do you think there would be twenty or thirty?—I should not think as many as that. I should think you would have students who had not been successful at examinations and are going on. I suppose there would be half a dozen of those. I should not like to say who else would like to be admitted.

66. The registered dentists are totally opposed to it, are they not?—Certainly. Since Magistrates have entered convictions, how can we very well admit that legislation should allow of these men coming in?

67. *Mr. Sidey.*] I would like to ask the doctor, with regard to clause 22, whether he does not think that some dentists are simply running their business with apprentices, and whether he thinks it fair that they should be allowed to do so?—That is said to be the case, but I could not give you an instance to my own knowledge. That sort of thing gets about among the students to a certain degree. They know to a certain extent which man is doing most business, and consequently if a man who is not doing much business tries to take too many pupils they object and grumble, and it gets about in that way. The pupils have a certain amount of protection.

68. Do you think it fair to the public that there should be too many apprentices in an establishment?—I do not think there ought to be any. I do not think that work which the public are going to pay for ought to be done by a pupil. The public pay to have proper work done, and it ought to be done by a skilled man.

69. Is it fair to the dentists who have passed that work should be done by the apprentices in the establishments?—They like it—they get the fees.

70. But is it fair to a dentist who wants employment?—Certainly, it hits him very hard. Once the young men get through they have greater difficulty in getting work.

71. Would you like to see taken away the right of dentists to have even two apprentices—is that your chief objection to clause 22?—I would wish the Bill framed in such a way that apprenticeship could not be recognised by the Senate as part of the professional course. Many dentists would like to have a boy as an apprentice, and it may be a great advantage to a boy to go as an apprentice for a while so that he can see if he likes dentistry or is likely to get on at it. They have that in America, where no apprenticeship is recognised. Many go to a practitioner and get an idea of the routine, but it must not count as part of the course. In some cases the system is good; in others it is worthless.

72. *Mr. Ell.*] The Chairman put a question to you as to whether the dentists as a body had made any definite proposal—had definitely urged on the Government the advisability of establishing a dental college. I did not understand your answer clearly?—I think that about a year ago there was a petition went round asking for such a thing, and we all signed it.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (1,425 copies), £10 11s.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1904.

Price 6d.]