

2. As directed at the last meeting, an official letter was written by the President and myself to the National Association of Dental Faculties, tendering, for reasons given, the resignation of the R. C. D. S. from membership in the Association. After the meeting of the Association in Chicago, in August last, I received a communication from the Secretary saying that the resignation had not been accepted, and asking us to send a representative to the next meeting of the Association at Fortress Monroe, in August, 1894. The correspondence will be laid before you for action.

3. During the year I have been advised of four prosecutions against violators of the provisions of the Dental Act. The first was brought by Dr. H. F. Kinsman, against one Shrieve, an itinerant vendor of patent medicines, who was extracting teeth, ostensibly free of charge. The prosecution was successful and a fine inflicted, which was paid over to me as Secretary of the College.

As the prosecution was not understood to have been authorized by the representative of the district, the payment of \$40 has not been made to Dr. Kinsman. It will be for the Board to determine whether this should be done.

The second case was Pratt vs. Patterson, of Lucknow, at the instigation of Dr. Guaemar, of Kincardine. A fine was imposed and the defendant gave notice of appeal. The case was then taken in charge by Dr. Stirton, representative of the district, and by advice of the Executive Committee, he retained counsel and prepared to defend the appeal. At the last moment the defendant paid the fine, which was remitted to me, and withdrew the appeal. The \$40 allowed by resolution of the Board for each conviction secured by direction of the district representative, has been paid to Mr. Pratt.

The account of Mr. Guthrie, Q.C., counsel in the case, will be presented to you.

The third case was Dowd vs. Beam, near Welland. The defendant pleaded guilty, but subsequently his attorney, in looking over the papers, advised him to apply to have the conviction quashed, on the ground of defective information. By direction of our President, our solicitor looked into the matter, and was so doubtful of success that he would not advise the College to defend. The conviction was quashed.

The fourth case was McCoy vs. Ellis, on Manitoulin Island. Two charges were laid, on both of which he pleaded guilty, and was fined \$40 or ten days in gaol for each offence, the sentences to run concurrently. The defendant elected to go to gaol. The prosecutor, who was not authorized by the district representative, sends a bill for \$80. Wrote him that it would be laid before the Board. From these cases, it is quite clear that it will not be wise for the Board to incur any liability for prosecutions which are not authorized directly by its members.