

which they came. Some of them have refused to sit for examination, and some have thought themselves very hardly dealt with because they have been compelled to sit for examination. I would like to point out to the Committee that these American dentists could not go into an adjoining State and practise without passing an examination. If a dentist had passed his examination in, say, Missouri, he could not go and practise in Michigan unless he passed another examination. In whichever State to which he went other than his own he would have to submit to examination. Therefore, we hold that it is no injustice to these American dentists that they should be compelled to sit for examination again on coming to New Zealand. The experience of the Board has been that a large percentage of them are absolutely unqualified to pass the examination. Some of them have passed it very well, but others again have been absolutely nowhere compared with our own New Zealand students. We would like it enacted that these foreign dentists should be compelled to pass the examination. It would be no injustice to them to exclude them altogether, because we could not go into their country and practise even if we passed their examination. They would absolutely exclude us from their country, and a certain amount of reciprocity seems to me but a fair thing. If I went to one of the Boards there and asked for examination I should be told, "You must begin the four-years course over again."

*Mr. Rawson:* It is the same with Canada. We could not practise in Canada, and Canadians cannot practise in the United States, nor, in fact, in any other part of Canada than that in which they have qualified.

*Witness:* Then, again, the men who have been practising illegally in this colony for many years are making a strong effort to get themselves put on the register on this occasion. We think this would be a very great injustice to those who have been through their course in New Zealand—the students who have paid their premiums, served their three years' apprenticeship, passed the examination, qualified themselves, and been allowed to practise. The unregistered men have been breaking the law all these years, and now they want to come in and practise. We think it would be a great hardship on those who have fulfilled the law and qualified themselves. If these men are to be admitted, it really would have been easier for those who have passed the examinations to have done the same thing—not to have qualified themselves—and then come in under this Act. Of course there is nothing in the Bill about that, but we know from side information that this is being attempted, and we wish to put you on your guard against that.

*Mr. Rawson:* It was enacted twenty-four years ago, when the original Act was passed, that any one who had practised up to that time should be allowed to register; and this Bill, we understand, is not intended to be a new Act—it is just an amendment.

*Witness:* That is so. That was provided for twenty-three years ago, when the Act was passed. All persons who had been practising dentistry—even only pulling out teeth—including a great many chemists, were registered at that time. The door was opened then, but we think that it has been closed since, and that it would be unfair for those who have been illegally practising within recent years to be admitted. Of course, if it were a matter of compromise, we might permit them to sit for examination, but we do not think even that would be fair. It would be really sweeping away all the Acts that have been passed and starting *de novo*. Then, with regard to the question of different branches, hitherto a man has been able to start a company or an association and have different branches. This is what is called "covering"—one man who was registered covering several who were not registered. There was a very severe Bill brought in some years ago in England with regard to dentists and doctors, which absolutely prohibited that in the Old Country, so that a man could not have several practices under one name. If a man has branches he must have qualified men in charge of those branches.

6. *Mr. EU.*] You are referring to dental companies?—Yes. A man may have his name up in half a dozen different places. Of course these so-called companies are not companies. I do not think there is one of them that I know of which is a company. They are all conducted by one or two individuals—some of them are not even dentists. Then, with regard to clause 11, and that part of it at the top of page 3 where it reads, "and has been continuously and wholly engaged during that period in studying the theory and practice of dentistry or dental surgery." I think this would be an unnecessary hardship upon some young men. For instance, one young man that I know of served two years and a half, and was then seized with the war fever and went to South Africa, and when he came back we could not examine him. He had broken his term. It was not continuous, and he had to take it over again. In all medical and dental work at Home, as long as a man serves the three years, it does not matter whether it is continuous. He must serve the whole period, but not necessarily continuously. We think that such an enactment here would be a measure of justice to students.

7. *Mr. Sidey.*] You said, Mr. Hoby, that you are representing the dentists. Were there any special resolutions passed at the meeting of which you spoke?—Yes. I have embodied their purport in my statement.

8. Was the meeting representative of the Wellington dentists?—There were over thirty dentists there.

9. Supposing a foreign dentist, who does not produce any evidence of having had any previous training or served an apprenticeship, applies for examination, do you not think it would be unfair that he should be allowed to enter the profession simply on account of his having passed an examination, though he does not show that he has had any previous training?—Unquestionably. We had a Belgian mountebank come here at one time, and he presented certain documents which proved to be nothing more than letters showing that he had been practising in Belgium. He was placed upon the register upon that, though absolutely unqualified in every way.

10. Do you not think that a man could pass an examination which you might set him by studying for, say, a year's time, though he had had no previous training at all?—I do not think it would be fair to the students who had passed the examination.