

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.