

1934  
July - November

Getting In 21 open  
and begging for the  
extra 50,000 because  
of delays of construction

5th July 1934.

Dr. R.K. Lambert,  
The Rockefeller Foundation,  
49 West 49th Street,  
New York City.

Dear Dr. Lambert,

I am enclosing herewith a complete statement of all the funds which have been used for neurological work during the last six years and since Dr. Cone's and my arrival in Montreal. As you will see, there have been no contributions made by the University from general funds. They have all been by special contribution with the exception of this past year when \$5,000.00 was turned over to the Department.

You will note that in the year 1933-34, up until July 1st, we have expended \$57,040.00 whereas our total income for that period has been \$5,040.00, leaving a deficit of about \$52,000.00. If during the present month of July our expenses are continued at the same rate as during the past year there will appear a further deficit of \$4,487.00 which will make a total deficit of \$56,377.00 for the period between the last payment of the Rockefeller Foundation and the formal beginning of the Laboratories.

I have asked Mr. Beatty to write Mr. Mason that the Laboratories will open formally on the 1st of August. We will be functioning there, however, from the 15th of July on.

Leaving out all of the details of the manner in which the misunderstanding arose, it seems to me obvious that the intention of the Foundation was that I would carry on scientific work from the time of the beginning of their contribution. This I have done about as well as though we had been in the Institute. It is obvious also that if the



Letter to Dr. Lambert continued.

Foundation was ready at any time to inaugurate the Laboratories there must be an accumulating sum which might possibly be used for this purpose.

I am sorry to have caused you additional trouble, but I believe that to have stopped scientific work would have been inconceivable, and had we brought up the request a year ago to the Foundation, as we should have done, and had we been refused backing for the coming year I should, on my part, have declined to continue with the whole undertaking.

You asked why the funds of the University, which are to come from the City and Province for the year 1933-34, are not available for scientific work. First, the actual cost of the building as we are planning it now has increased, but by careful saving and good work on the part of the architects we shall keep down to about \$4,000 over the estimated amount. Secondly, the amounts promised to McGill, which you have on your statement of yesterday, have been actually received, but a certain other donor who it was hoped would contribute, has failed us. This makes it necessary to add the \$23,744.00, which you find indicated on your statement, to the undertaking. I am trying to make it clear that the difficulty is not entirely due to increase in the cost of the building.

I may say finally that I am ready to throw all the research funds at my disposal into the cause, but if the scientific work in the Institute is handicapped it will jeopardize whatever hope we may have of further backing for future advance from local quarters here in Montreal and place a damper on the first years of work there.

I enjoyed the day with you very much yesterday and hope you did not find yourself too tired. Please give Dr. Gregg my kindest regards when you write him.

Yours sincerely,

WGP/HL  
1 encl.