

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