

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