

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.