

January 5th, 1934

S. P. Eagleson, Esq.,
Secretary-Treasurer,
National Research Council,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Mr. Eagleson,

I wish to thank you very much for your letter of the 30th of December concerning the Parasitology Committee.

I fully share your regrets that there should be any misunderstanding concerning this committee, but I have just consulted Sir Arthur's file and feel convinced that he regarded it as a joint committee of the National Research Council and the University appointed by both institutions, rather than as a committee of the Council only. This seems to me to be implicit in the letters which he wrote asking the members originally suggested (other than those of the National Research Council) to serve, and in his letters to the Department of Agriculture asking them to appoint two members to the committee.

Professor Fantham, whom I consulted yesterday, certainly believes himself to be a properly appointed member of the committee, which seems to me to support my interpretation of Sir Arthur's attitude. I imagine that Sir Arthur intended to suggest Professor Fantham's name at the July meeting but forgot to do so, but the impression left in Professor Fantham's mind and the note to this office are evidence that Sir Arthur felt that the committee might add to its members and that the University might nominate new members directly.

This is apparently not the view taken by the National Research Council, so that I think it particularly desirable that the exact constitution of the committee should be settled. Whether Professor Fantham is or is not at the moment a member of the committee is a question that might lead to unpleasantness, so that I think you will agree that it is desirable that he should be elected, or re-elected, with every form of legality as soon as possible.

I hope that a little clarifying of the situation now may prevent any subsequent friction and enable the co-operation of the bodies interested to be complete and effective.