

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.