

M: This is part of the Oral History of Psychology in Canada. I am talking with Blossom Wigdor in her home in Montreal on October 25, 1969. Blossom, lets start at the beginning. Where were you born?

W: I was born here in Montreal.

M: Into what kind of a family. What did you father do?

W: My father was a fur merchant who had emigrated from Russia at the turn of the Century. He went first to the United States and then came to Canada in 1923. And as the Manager of a branch of American Fur; then spent ~~almost every day~~ <sup>time</sup> going way up to the North. At that time, they had to go and actually meet the fur traders and trappers themselves. And he travelled all over the Canadian Northern, buying furs and bringing them back here.

M: How many sisters?

W: I had one sister, who was 2½ years <sup>YOUNGER</sup> ~~older~~ than myself who became a nursery school teacher, taught for a number of years and then decided to have her own family. She had three girls. And unfortunately, she contracted leukemia and died 2½ years ago. Very prematurely. So she and both my parents are dead now. They ~~both~~ died in the last couple of years.

M: And then you went to school here?

W: We lived in Outremont at that time, ~~and~~ when I was born, my parents were living in Outremont and I went to the Outremont schools. I went to <sup>STRATHCONA</sup> ~~Psyche~~ Academy, I did my primary school, <sup>three</sup> secondary school, except for one grade. At that time, they happened to eliminate the grade 7. They were trying to make

2.

more room for a high school. I went one year ~~in~~ <sup>to the</sup> High School for girls, in grade 7.

M: What kind of school is this that you attended mostly for nearly all of your. ~~SCHOOLING~~

W: Well, it was a protestant ~~school~~, public school.

M: Coeducational?

W: Coeducational. And actually our class was the first class where girls could opt for physics rather than music, in high school.

M: Did you opt for physics?

W: I opted for physics, because I was absolutely hopeless when it came to music, I could not sing a note. So I opted for physics and we had ~~SOME SATISFACTION~~ because I managed to get my best marks in physics. It was very irritating to the boys who were taking physics. The ~~was~~ was there

M: One form of the feminist movement, I suppose?

W: Well no. I do not think that I could ever class myself as a feminist, because I never felt terribly militant about women's rights. I think that women do have more difficulty proving themselves in the areas both professional and industrial.

M: What happened that you were part of this change which for girls -

W: That is right. And this was the first, although girls have been going through university, many years before but they still have been sort of channelled into things like music and home economics and things like that.

3.

M: Now, have you got any recollection at all of where, how, at what time you first heard the word "psychology"? Did it mean anything to you?

W: Well, I entered University, McGill, in 1941 and it was really not very meaningful <sup>for me.</sup> We knew there were psychology courses, but <sup>it was</sup> not <sup>so</sup> terribly meaningful <sup>for me.</sup> and I think McGill is one of the few other universities who were just coming out of the age where psychology was part of the philosophy department and Dr. Tate, William <sup>TATE</sup> was teaching Introductory Psychology which was not the best introduction to psychology that one could have in that respect. However, he gave the introductory course and I was very interested <sup>in</sup> Political Science and Psychology, Sociology, in terms of humanity. It was not until, I think, my third year at the university that I really thought of psychology as a separate entity. And that was due really to the influence of two and later perhaps three people interested in <sup>that</sup> undergraduate year. One of them was not a psychologist really but he introduced me to a great deal of SOCIAL psychology and that was F. Laviolette who is professor of Sociology and I think Chairman of the Department, probably still at Tulane; the last time I heard he was at Tulane, but he taught <sup>a</sup> course in Social Psychology, here at McGill, <sup>in</sup> all those years, and ~~he~~ He was very interested in the whole problem of the displacement of the Japanese, during the war, ~~you know and~~ He suggested that I do a term paper on the MENTAL HEALTH MOVEMENT <sup>AND THE NEO-FREUDIANS</sup> of that time, ~~Ken and I and Tom,~~ <sup>THE KAREN Horney AND ERIC FROMM</sup> group, and that was really one of the things that made me look at the Psychology. ~~in~~  
~~the terms of the~~ ~~of approaching~~

psychology from an odd angle and I had to learn a great deal of that in years to come. And the second person who really made psychology seem a profession~~al~~, a possible profession, was Frances Alexander because she was the first professional psychologist that I met in the sense that she did some kind of practice, she was interested in *testing* and was teaching some applied aspects as an undergraduate course. *but* still she exposed ~~us~~ <sup>us</sup> for the first time to what a professional psychologist might do and I think that was very important ~~sort of~~ <sup>step in my</sup> taking psychology. And she went on, when we were in our fourth year undergraduate, to suggesting or to having Molly ~~Howard~~ <sup>HARROWER</sup> who was at the Neuro and Helga Malloy who was <sup>also</sup> up there, talk to a group ~~sort~~ <sup>and give an</sup> of an extra curriculum <sup>COURSE</sup> on testing and on projective techniques. It was something relatively new and we had an evening seminar which was under really the auspices of the Old Quebec Psychological Association, I am not sure exactly what we called it...

M: PAPQ.

W: Psychological Association of the Province of Quebec, PAPQ, that's right. That was very small but active organization at that time with Father Mailloux and Dr. Alexander being the founders I think of that group, and students and there were other young members of the profession who were very involved. She did organize an evening seminar where we had a course on projective testing and she talked about some of the other <sup>APPLIED ASPECTS</sup>.

Dr. Alexander

introduced us to the other projective techniques, but we were a very small group; we were about eight or nine of us in the small

group. There was Brother Deslaurier I remember, there was one or two other people who have not gone in Psychology, there was myself, Mary Hoffman who is now a psychologist at the St. Mary's took this course and it was really one of the few probably semi-formal courses in projective techniques in Canada. I do not think anywhere else, because when I ~~was in~~ <sup>came to</sup> Toronto in 1946, projective technique was still considered a little suspect. It is now again considered a little suspect but we have gone full circle, perhaps.

M: Don't you Toronto until I get more of the picture of Psychology at McGill. To start back now when you started and you say that your first course in Psychology was from Tate?

W: From William Tate. It was just a straight Introductory Psychology ~~of~~ course because we were only allowed to take one, ~~of~~ <sup>AND</sup> that in your second year ~~because~~ <sup>WAS</sup> a PRE-REQUISITE to any other Psychology course.

M: Now, I never met Tate although I used to hear about him, but I don't think I ever met him, he was in poor health I think or something. What was he like, and what was his course like? I gather you to think it was that way psychology.

W: I think our introductory psychology course was where ~~he was born and it was~~ a much more general kind of non-biologically oriented course than the kind of introductory course that you have now. But, he was a very authoritarian sort of ~~tall~~ <sup>follow</sup>; he was quite an elderly man by the time I took the course, I don't know how old he was then but he was close to retirement, very authoritarian type and we really didn't get , I mean the lectures were rather cut + dried, and you had no

contact although but classes were much smaller than they are today. The class, I don't think, was <sup>not</sup> more than 50 to 100 in the first year in psychology class to compare this to the 2,000 in Introductory Psychology at McGill to-day to realize the enormity in the difference but even so he was the kind of man that even with a hundred, nobody sort of dared go up and talked to him; he was very very distant from us. And this is, I think, partly because he was quite elderly at the time and partly because he just had this kind of personality.

M: Now, who else would have been in the department?

W: Well, at that time, Dr. Kellog was in the department and Dr. Morton was in the department. But Dr. Morton left probably that year, 1942, '41 or '42 to join the Armed Services and go to Ottawa. So, that really we were in a period where academic staff were down to the very minimum level. We had only Dr. Kellog, Dr. Tate...

M: Dr. Kellog, I think, in something I was reading this morning, he was sort of called back out of retirement to help because of the...

W: It may very well be, because although I spoke of <sup>t</sup> ~~Tate~~, Dr. Kellog was probably some years younger but he was not well, he had very acute arthritis.

M: Did you have any work from him?

W: Yes, I took Statistics from him. He was really interested in the quantitative measurement and aspects of psychology and I took a course in Psychological Statistics. And Dr.

he was a very nice man and very approachable and he really, one got most fond of him, not in lectures though; he was not a <sup>great</sup> lecturer, he was quiet rather shy man I think. And he also one could go to him and he would give you a reading list and direct you in a way that was meaningful and very helpful. I think that he also was of a great help in keeping me in psychology, because we really had to be motivated in terms of stimulation because there were Dr. Kellog, Dr. Alexander, there was Ed Webster in the department at that time.

M: What time?

W: What time, I mean I remember him vaguely because he taught Industrial Psychology which I didn't take as an undergraduate. M. de Jersey was there at the time, I don't know when M. de Jersey left, when he left McGill, he went at first to Yale I think or some place like that and then I had lost track.

M: But he was on the staff?

W: I think he was actually a graduate student or a demonstrator or something like that, I don't <sup>know</sup> ~~think~~, because he helped in the Experimental Psychology course. I think Dr. Kellog actually gave the course, but most of it was labs and I think M. de Jersey ran the labs at that time. And I don't really remember what his title was but it would be something I believe as a demonstrator or an assistant or something like that. And those were the only people in the staff at the time.

M: Molly <sup>HARROWER</sup> ~~Harold~~ was not teaching?

W: No, she was just about to leave to, she must have left around 1942, because actually when Helga Malloy gave her course,

~~HOWARD~~  
HARROWER

~~Howard~~ only came occasionally to Montreal on some sort of consulting basis. I think she had already left to go to the United States.

M: Now, in terms of the courses that you took, you have Introductory first of all by Tate. And then you have Statistics, was it your second year?

W: No, in the third year. In the second year, in the McGill system, you have four years. In the first year, you don't take any of those optional courses really. You take a compulsory Math, English, French.

M: And you took Psychology first in your second year?

W: Yes, second year. At the same time, I took Sociology, Economics, Political Science, and things like that.

M: And was that Sociology course taught by this man?

W: No, Dawson, Carol Dawson, the man who wrote the book "Introductory Text in Sociology". He gave Introductory course. It was really in my third year, I did not take an official honours undergraduate because there weren't just enough people and just what you did is just look around for courses that ~~interfit~~ fit in. So, I didn't take the honours undergraduate course, but took in my third year, the Socio-Psychology course which Laviolette gave because I don't think they were giving Socio-Psychology in the Psychology Department at that time. They may have but I can't remember now. And I took a course with Frances Alexander which was probably something like Developmental Personality.

M: Was she a good teacher?

W: She was a good teacher. She was a good teacher because



she had a fair amount of experience, she was very involved and she gave us a great deal of direction in terms of reading. I think in those days, we were much more <sup>on your own</sup> and you got out of the course, much more of what you put in, in the sense if you went to the readings and really took off ~~with~~ <sup>with</sup>, these people I suggest that you could get a great deal out of it. They were not inspiring teachers in terms of being exceptionally dynamic and of course there was almost no research going on at McGill at the time. So you really have to depend on your readings to find out what was going on in those researches.

M: The things that you took initially where this deal of project and the project work...

W: Projective Techniques did not come until 1945. But I think at that point, I started to be involved in the field of personality which Alexander taught. The fact was there was such a thing as a professional where you could do psycho-diagnostic that you could meet people, etc...

M: At that stage, you began to think of the possibility of psychology?

W: At that point, I became involved in the idea of interpersonal relationship and psychology. I took about 7 undergraduate courses in Psychology, between the third and fourth year. Now, I can't remember what they were all called, but I took probably everything which was offered at that time. Actually I couldn't make up my mind until 1945 when I was going to go into Medicine or stay in Psychology. I had ruled out things like Social work because that didn't interest me at all and I had done a term paper

for somebody, I can't remember who now on the Mental Health Movement. I got very involved with the historical development of the Mental Health, the Mental Hygiene Movement

M: Who was the Montreal man who was so, on the Front Street Clinic?

W: B. Silverman?

M: But before B. Silverman?

W: Before him?

M: A man I knew quite well...

W: Probably, but I can't remember at the moment his name because there was a whole group of people that actually ...

M: Dr. Mitchell!

W: That's right. Dr. Mitchell. He started the group, and then Silverman, I guess didn't take over until 1945 perhaps, or maybe earlier than that. I have a feeling that B. Silverman was there, no, he was there in 1941 I think because when we had to do field work in 1944-45, we had to for testing, we had to go out to School for Crippled Children...

M: And would it be Frances Alexander's courses?

W: That's right. So she was really the one who doesn't bother doing something that involves psychology. In 1945, I still hadn't make up my mind...

M: The alternative that appealed to you...

W: Was Medecine. It would have been Medecine and probably have got into Psychiatry, Psychiatric specialty but historically, as we all know in 1945, was the end of the war, and they were <sup>SWAMPED</sup> sudden with <sup>VETERANS</sup> ~~Veterans~~, although I had high marks. <sup>The Dean</sup> He took a look

at my left hand, he saw that I was engaged and he said: "We can't afford to risk taking a woman who is about to get married and we have all these men who want to make career in Medecine and you will probably drop out after a while". So I did not get into McGill Medical School and probably just as well, because at that time, my husband anyway was working in Toronto and I would have <sup>had</sup> to leave. So, I left after the BA.

M: But now you did apply for Medecine, and if they had accepted you, you would have gone into Medecine.

W: Probably I would have. I dont really know because I was getting married and I don't know whether I would have really stay through....

M:

W: Oh yes, I applied and I had an interview at that time with the Dean, I don't remember what his name was at that point, but this was in the outcome. I think it is very interesting what happened in those '44, '45, I think why a number of us went into Psychology. If you remember Rosalie <sup>ARBESS</sup> Harvest Clark, she died some years ago but she was in the same class as I. She was one of the early psychologists and went into the vocational rehabilitation field. But there were a group of us and a small group, two or three remained in psychology at the time as I said and McGill was offering very little but I think it was <sup>the altitude</sup> ~~light~~. People were suddenly becoming interested in the field. The Armed Forces were using psychological tests. There was this whole feeling of psycho-diagnostic being a valuable possibility in terms of proper mental treatment and there was a lot more interest,

never before because really even Psychiatry has been a very limited sort of unaccepted part of Medecine where you had a few psychiatrists working in a hospital and really until the army started to use psychiatrists and give people a chance to... and there was all the talk about psychiatric casualties, etc., there were lot of interest in it and lot of interesting things had happened. Actually in 1945 in a colloquium, Bill <sup>LINE</sup> Lang who was at that time Colonel in the Armed Forces came to talk to us about what they planned, how the Personnel Services were operating in the Army and what their plans were for post-war treatment of the Veterans and of the demobilization, etc... and rehabilitation. And I remember very distinctly he said "I don't want to encourage any of you to go into Psychology, if you think that you are going to have a part in this rehabilitative process"; because what we really plan to do is train for about six weeks or several months our welfare personnel officers so that they, personnel selection officers, and some of the welfare people, not welfare, they were personnel selection people and other perhaps officers on demobilization who might be interested to train them to do this rehabilitation, etc... "Don't, he said get any ideas that you are going to be involved in this". But we were very impressed with Bill <sup>LINE</sup> Lang who at that time was a very dashy<sup>ly</sup> looking man in this uniform and we thought quite impressed that a psychologist could have ~~to~~ arrived <sup>at</sup> to the rank of Colonel in the Army. So we were a relatively small group and you have to think that in 1945, the class of nucleus we were in the psychology club. I was I think the President of the Psychology Club at that time or certainly one of the officers...

---

M: The Psychology Club at McGill?

W: At McGill. This is the undergraduate psychology club. Those people who took interest in psychology. So you see the interest has sort of crystallized at that point and he came to talk to this group and we were only about twenty if we were twenty. I think that would be a lot. And the group honours, the third and fourth years and graduate students as well. I don't think we were more than twenty. So that was a very discouraging picture although he had a positive effect in terms of I think, thinking of that psychology might not be such a bad thing, but he was not very encouraging of course as you know in ~~year~~ later developments. This is rather funny because he really, not more than six months eight months after this, maybe it was a year after, the thinking of this question of course was completely revised and probably the use of psychologists in the Department of Veteran Affairs was one of the things that gave Clinical Psychology in Canada a great deal of <sup>impetus</sup> ~~emphatize~~. I had a feeling that although the Ontario Hospital System, <sup>used them</sup> but it was really that system and the DVA which really ~~in the way in terms of using~~ psychologists in hospital situations because until then, I think most of them <sup>were</sup> in schools and maybe some kind of practice and it was very limited. About one year later, we psychologists were starting at the department of Veteran Affairs, after the war; because this is 1945, I graduated in June '45 and I think that Dr. ~~King~~ <sup>LING</sup> probably came down to speak somewhere around March of that year.

M: Didn't have anything like the impact in Canada that had in the States, because of course just an explosion in the States on there on the intake of students entered in Psychology nothing on that scale which corresponded in size happened in Canada and I am ~~to~~ to know why. Why it didn't? Why did it happen there? Why didn't not happen here? However that is not the story. In your impression I think this is colored by Quebec Local, the question was that great deal to give a great in Quebec to the development of Clinical Psychology.

W: of the Ontario, what I knew of the Ontario, because when I went into the ~~MA~~ it was in Ontario. It was 1946 in the Toronto area. And even in the Toronto area, there was only one psychologist with the Armed Services, and probably several with the Ontario Hospital. I don't know how many there were but there were not any large number.

M: By that time we were, I don't remember the figures, but in 1946, they must have been thirty.

W: In the Ontario Hospital System?

M: But I don't recall in detail when that was or how many they were. But now, what else do you remember about the psychological picture, the picture about psychologists in Montreal in particular in 1945?

W: In Montreal, we had as I said a small department that had a cross-contact with the students in the third and fourth year, simply because we were so few and you have to sort of get your education by going and talking to your professors. They

talk to you. It was easy. There were reading ~~lessons~~<sup>lists</sup>, direction and discussion and then going to meetings. We were very <sup>well</sup> encouraged to join CPA. I am not sure what year I joined but I certainly joined as an undergraduate, first as a student, and then became a full member.

M: Who would have done that?

W: That was again Frances Alexander and Dr. Kellogg backed her up but Frances Alexander was a great one for <sup>having</sup> an identification with one's profession and she encouraged us certainly to go into this and also to join the PAPQ, Quebec Psychological Association which she ~~thought~~<sup>was instrumental in founding</sup> in my ~~year~~ year. And I think that's interesting, is historically interesting because at that time it was a very small, completely bilingual group. By completely bilingual, I mean without any guideline ~~have been~~ set up, ~~no simply~~, everybody spoke whatever language they wanted to speak and if you spoke in French you could be answered in English and there was that great deal of easy communication without any of this tension and self-consciousness and this was, I think, very unusual. I couldn't tell you how many were involved but the people, the names that stand out in terms of the senior members was probably Mailloux who again is now Chairman of the Department of Psychology at the UM. It was founded in 1942 I believe and that was a very new thing and had very few students in Psychology at that time at the U of M and Frances Alexander with the two sort of, I don't know who was Chairman and Vice-Chairman or President or Vice-President but they were the two founding members. Then the people like Dr. Webster of course was

very involved in PAPQ. I don't know if you remember J.A.S. Bois?

M: Will I ever forget him. He was very active in everything.

W: Very active in everything; one of the early members. I can't remember too well some of the other people; it's interesting into the background of the time...

M: Would Bridges be involved at all?

W: Yes, <sup>Wyn</sup> ~~Wyn~~ Bridges was there, I think in some of the early days, Bob Malmo was there, I think it would be close to 1945...



M: Now, as far as psychology, working professionally as a psychologist apart from the Academic, who else was there? Was there anybody...

W: There were very few in Quebec, working as psychologists. There were very few. I think there was Jim Howard working in Industrial Psychology -

M: ~~Martin~~ Morton came back. Did he ever come back?

W: I don't think he ever came back. He remained in Ottawa. I have to think that there was of course the Institute; they had a Miss or Mrs. Brown there for some years who was doing infant testing on children and was about to get her doctorate. I can't remember her first name. I don't think there was anybody at the Allan until Dr. Malmo came there and that was towards the end of the War, I don't remember exactly the date but I would suspect it was not much earlier than 1945. At the Douglas, they must have had at the time *one at the then Verdun* Protestant hospital. I don't really think they had psychologists because I think the first psychologist they had was Dr. ~~Cassier~~ *DORKEN and then DR POSER* who went there much later than that; I can't remember... And certainly not things like the Montreal General because we were instrumental in getting Psychology into those places. The Montreal Children's may have had someone before Dr. *RABINOVITCH*. They did have someone before but again I don't remember who it was.

M: You are in your graduating year, Bill ~~Long~~ *LINÉ* has been here and what happened to you next?

W: The day after graduation, I got my BA on May 30, 1945 and I got married on May 31, 1945 and after a week or two, I ended up in Toronto and after three months of domesticity, ~~it was kind of a salvation~~, I hid<sup>ed</sup> myself down in the Department of Psychology at the University of Toronto and, ~~so~~<sup>SAW</sup>, I believe, Bill ~~Lang~~<sup>LINE</sup> because he was in contact, ~~that~~ that was late in the year, of course by today's standard, it would have been a hopeless problem, but we are thinking way back and this must have been September, the beginning of September, and I said I am terribly interested in coming back and I am not a honours student but I got my transcripts and had high second or first class standard, I don't remember, in everything I take, and I had enough courses. ~~In other~~<sup>WORDS</sup> way I had what was equivalent and then Dr. Kellogg said that really what I had taken was the equivalent to honours standing and I am not even sure we were even given a honours BA at that time because they just didn't have the sort of personnel.

M: Apart from ~~Lang~~<sup>LINE</sup> was Bill ~~Lang~~<sup>LINE</sup> back?

W: Bill ~~Lang~~<sup>LINE</sup> was just back.

M: Was he in charge of graduate affairs?

W: I think he was in charge of graduate affairs. That is probably why I went to him, I went to him before I saw Professor E.A. BOTT who was Chairman of the Department. As a matter of fact, Dave told me, sort of research we had just in terms of term papers of doing experimental psychology courses, personnel supervision because University of Toronto has some kind of courses. You could take research, methodology or something like that, anyway that require it which meant that I was eligible to take my

Master's in one year instead of two years. So I was admitted into the Master's course at the University of Toronto. At that time of course there was <sup>all</sup> all kinds of new impression, because everybody was coming back at this time, Professor ~~Beck~~ <sup>BOTT</sup> of course was there. In my Master's year, I did not take any course from Professor ~~Beck~~ <sup>BOTT</sup>. But there was Dr. Myers, you were giving a course in Clinical problems.

M: This was in 1945-46?

W: In 45-46, I got my Master's degree in 1946. So this was 45-46.

M: I didn't think I was back yet.

W: You gave a seminar on Clinical problems. There was John Ireland and myself and Allan Malone who was ~~the~~ priest, a member of the Congregation of St. ~~Basile~~ <sup>BASIL</sup>, we were only eight of us, I think. I took Industrial Psychology from Dr. ~~Cosgrave~~ <sup>COSGRAVE</sup>. Bill <sup>LINE</sup> gave something, it was a seminar ~~even~~ on History of Psychology or on, I think Professor BOTT was still giving Systematic Psychology but I was ~~taking~~ History of Psychology. It really discussed the personality, theories and various functions to development. We were heavily loaded in the way of courses that I cannot remember whether there were four or five courses. There were at least Clinical problems, History of Psychology, my transcripts which I had but I can't remember and Industrial Psychology, there was of course the other people who were very active in the Department and I was involved with some. There was Mary Northway of course, Reva Gerstein was still - I don't know whether that

position was that she was still very more closely attached, there was Reva Potashin who was a graduate student as well but I think working on her Doctorate at the time and of course with the Institute of Child Study that Dr. ~~Berkowitz~~<sup>BLATZ</sup> set up. I didn't actually take any courses from Dr. ~~Berkowitz~~<sup>BLATZ</sup>; he was involved in Nursery School except in terms of observing and knowing about children behaviour.

M: Was Mary Salter there?

W: Mary Salter I think, came back afterwards, after I had my Master's just towards the end, although she got her Ph.D. at the time. Did Mary have her Ph.D. before she went overseas with the Armed Forces? Perhaps, but I think she came back sort of towards the end of that year and I didn't really have any contact with her although I did after that because she was one of the advisors to D.V.A. afterwards. But, then there was ~~Margaret~~<sup>MAGDA ARNOLD</sup> and I think I vaguely remember being in the class she gave and I don't remember but maybe it was on Projective Techniques or something, or Personality, I can't remember.

M:

W: Yes, but I didn't take her course. I knew Carl BERNHARDT and he was a very very nice person. As a matter of fact, the thing that one remembers about the Department at that time, is that there was Dr. Ketchum who was teaching Social Psychology and I can't remember I think I took something from him and I think there were about five seminars so I am not sure exactly which ones I took. I think I did take one and he was charming. He was stimulating<sup>to</sup> students, involving them and so did you,

because your course was very much of a live sort of practical aspects and all of us were interested in going into the Clinical applied field. It was very important. Of course, but everyone was terribly involved with all the students and we were terribly involved with our professors so that there was ~~I don't think~~ <sup>OPPORTUNITY</sup> ~~have~~ professors sit around drinking beer ~~in the class~~ <sup>and discussing</sup> any more maybe they do, but the fact that we could discuss together and talk a great deal I think everyone accepts the fact that in graduate work so much of what you learn has to do with the informal communications that go on when you can sit around having coffee and talking. I think this is what happened because we were a relatively small group at that time.

M: still at the undergraduate level?

W: That's right. And so we were I don't know how many graduates we were but I sort of vaguely remember that many of our seminars didn't have more than eight or ten or so at the time. One thing I might mention is that having come from the very under-staffed McGill situation, I had anticipated a great deal of difficulty, although I thought that I might find that I had huge gaps in my knowledge, etc., and that I would have trouble keeping up with my course and this surprised me that it was not hard, I mean I had to do a fair amount of work but I was still being able to come out with a high average and not be still behind ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> people who had come out of the Honours Psychology at U of T ~~and I was that was interesting because it wasn't a way to the people, at least they gave us the guides.~~ We had read the things that we should have read and we had knew,

at least there weren't huge gaps in our information. I did five seminars, four or five, there was an awful lot of seminars

In addition to that I worked on my thesis because we had to write a Master's thesis, and I did ~~that sort of a thing~~. Bill <sup>LINE</sup> ~~Lang~~ was actually the director of my thesis but I was working in an area where Mary Northway was sort of involved, interested because she had some connections with the Leaside School Board going into schools to get subjects, etc., and <sup>because of</sup> Mary Northway ~~because~~ I used Socio Metric study, and ~~what~~ I did was a study of the relationship between personality and socio-metric standing. At that time there was a great deal of interesting <sup>in the fact</sup> ~~effect~~ that there were kids at children schools who were considered outsiders either because they were overly aggressive or overly quiet, might actually be the most disturbed rather than - the idea was the quiet ones might be as disturbed as the aggressive ones and no one actually had done any work in terms of personality investigation of the so called recessive and overly aggressive doing as well as the ones that were highly <sup>accepted</sup> so that earlier in this study, personality and social status or social choice. At that time, in the Mental <sup>Hygiene</sup>

Institute there was a psycho-analyst and psychiatrist by the name of Bird. Do you remember him? I forgot his first name. He wrote a book related to - he went to a Western Reserve in Cincinnati and he wrote a book on "Flying and Stress or Flying under Stress" which was his study of pilots and their breakdown during the War. Anyway he knew a bit about Projective Techniques and nobody else in Toronto at that time was

terribly interested or knew very much about it. So what we were able to ~~do~~ go in Leaside schools where we had a fairly *homogenous* *population* and do some <sup>Socio</sup> symmetric studies, eliminating of course some who were too old for their grade or there were some other reasons and doing personality studies on them and I managed to get that finished by working late hours ~~in the morning~~ by May, so that I got my Master's in 1946. Some of the interesting things were when I asked people in the Leaside School ~~at that~~ what language was spoken at home, thinking I might eliminate people who perhaps were not able to speak English too well, or they might be outsiders, because of that reason, a group of thirteen and fourteen year old would raise their hands and ask what do we mean by what language we speak at home and I had to explain that some people didn't speak English, they might speak Italian, Jewish, French or something like that and I still got that question *answered* that we speak Canadian at home. It's hard to believe but this was white-collar, skilled and professional group. Anglo-saxon ~~was a very waspy~~ community and they were just not aware, the children were not aware that there was anything Canadian outside of their particular *milieu*. So, that was very interesting. I think that at that time, we didn't have any idea where we were going to work or what we were going to do. We got out ~~of~~ <sup>with</sup> our Master's degrees, there was <sup>Rosalind Falk -</sup> ~~Carl~~ Diamond, who later went to work with Carl Rogers and she was one of the group. So we were quite a-

M: What, your generation of graduate students you mean?

W: Yes, she got her Master's with me and it was quite an

active group and there were all people really remained in psychology at either the teaching level or in the applied field and we really didn't know what we were going to do?

M: Just before you go on to what you are going to do next, can you sort of stand back and in that respect say anymore about how you ~~perceived~~<sup>PERCEIVED</sup> the difference or the similarity between a

but just what was your impression of the Department of Psychology at McGill and the Department of Psychology at Toronto and I don't mean badly terms, I mean in characteristic psychological terms. As a company of psychologists in each place, what is your retrospective impression of. You have already said that the Toronto group seemed to be very much involved with applied activities -

W: I think that the McGill group even then and it was such a small group that except for Frances Alexander, one didn't get the strong impact of applied activities, where the University of Toronto I think worked up at everybody even those who perhaps more active but everybody was applied in the sense that they just didn't seem to be the same thing as, psychology was much more a behaviour thing, not just an abstract.

M: Not an academic study -

W: Not an academic study, but everyone was doing something. I think Dr. Ketchum was involved with things like propaganda and assimilation of information, Dr. ~~Lyon~~<sup>LIVE</sup> was very interested in personnel thing.

M: It sure hit the department at that time, when the whole department had gone and got themselves involved -



W: And they came back - there were people even who were perhaps very academic before the War, had been *pushed* into being applied -

M: The contrast with McGill, you were there at a time when people like Morton were not here. So this would add to -

W: The people who came back were, Carl Williams I think came back, just as I was finishing my thesis in 1946, he must have come back in '46 or something like that and there were some graduate students becoming more involved and more academic, researchers, I don't remember what he was doing but I think he was doing something that was more academic. I vaguely remember there were more academic type, research sort of animal psychology was becoming more involved but I don't think that when I first came, there was even anyone teaching <sup>physiological</sup> there was Carl ~~Burn~~ <sup>BEVNHARDT</sup>; he was teaching Comparative Psychology, but I don't think there was too much of the way the actual laboratory research at all so in effect there was the Institute of Child Study being there, people being very involved in those studies and Mary Northway being involved in the school system. The only one who <sup>was</sup> sort of academic was perhaps Professor <sup>BOTT</sup> himself and that was from many things that seem applied but I think one just or something, this was an interesting historical thing that one couldn't really become actively involved or very interested. Everybody was ~~Applied~~. I had much more the impression that the older graduates or recent graduates and people also very involved in that because first thing, they were involved in

practical , all those people were involved in,  
I think was also more or less a clinical psychol-  
ogist very involved -

M: The fact that you missed any interesting activity in  
*PERSONALITY* or projectives due to the fact that Mary Ainsworth  
had not come back yet, she had been before, but -

W: She was away, I missed that, so really what I got was  
a very ~~sort of~~ general grounding and what there was  
available in terms of theory and I still *did not have* too much  
in a way of actual practice except that kind of clinical problems,  
what would you do, and what the situation.  
And I had as an undergraduate course, quite a bit of testing, in  
the course that Dr. Alexander gave, we did go out and do things  
like *testing crippled children*. At that time we did the kind of  
things that you would do now probably at the graduate level. We  
did that undergraduate.

M: What did you work on for me in the clinical problems,  
you remember?

W: I probably have it written somewhere, I saved all those  
papers but I don't remember, I really don't. What I remember is  
that in Dr. Crossgrove's course in Industrial, we went through  
all those tests that industries use and also he taught us the  
point of view of scaling and test construction and things like  
that. So, actually it was quite an extensive course and we had  
a lot of practice from that point of view and actually I took  
Professor *Bott's* course in 1947, not in '46. After having  
my Master's, I wanted to stay on; I didn't know; I didn't really

register at the doctoral candidate because I didn't know what my plans would be and I felt a little tired<sup>of</sup> studying at that point, but I wanted at least to accumulate some credits, the exposure~~was~~ and keep in touch. So, I only took Professor Bott's course in Systematic in '47. That was very interesting. We were again probably the same group, more or less, because some other people took longer to do their Master's and some of them were early doctoral people; I vaguely remember doing a paper on sort of what ~~a~~ *philosophic* thought had on modern day psychology. There was one. I am quite sure it was Dave and I really understood what we were talking about but it was very full of . I think that Professor Bott's course was really the sort of thing that one could see the relevance of the influence of philosophy and psychology, although today we still talk about some of these things. You don't see in any of the other graduate curriculum, something that would be called <sup>a</sup> graduate course ~~be~~ anywhere near that sort of thing that Professor Bott taught in Systematic Psychology.

M: Do you recall that seminar being ?

W: No, I don't recall that Seminar being

Sometimes we were not quite sure what was being discussed; rather so and so really. I think we all sort of sat there and we went through the motions really of writing these papers but they were not very thoughtful or very deep papers. I think I must have the one that I wrote because it seems to me it's a bit of a relic at that time. I am not sure I even understood what I wrote in the sense that you use terminology and

and ideas that I don't think were to meaningful to us. In that way it was not *too meaningful*.

M: He was probably one of the last of the Socratic teachers and perhaps

and other times get absolutely furious at him for his hability to ask you simple questions and get simple answers and then

W: I think that this probably diminished by the time I got there because he was *older* and I think he was getting more tired in the sense he would let us sort of let things go by. I think out of "they are not going to take the way I do, anyway"; we were rather hopeless so, they were perhaps less tempting to push us so that the dullness and the kind of feeling, so what, was much more the attitude and I actually must confess that I only went to the end of February, although I got credit for the course by writing papers and sending them to ~~him~~ and *he* was kind enough to correct them, to give me credit for <sup>the course</sup>. I left at the end of February because my husband was transferred in January back to Montreal and I stayed on an other month and a half. I went until the beginning of March but I didn't want to maintain *two households* so I left Toronto in March 1947. But the thing that I remember very well is the amount of ~~help~~ *help* and the involvement that was there but it was very much on the applied field except perhaps I was selective too. For instance, I had very little to do with

Carl BERNHARDT except that sort of general department, there weren't any really organized colloquia or anything like that but we did get together occasionally when there was a meeting of some sort and so that I did have some contact with him.

M: Speaking of meetings, do you remember your first CPA meeting?

W: I remember some very early ones, but I am trying to think of what the first one would be.

M: It was a meeting I think in Montreal, in '42.

W: No, I wouldn't have been involved with that. I remember that there was a meeting in Montreal or Toronto something - it must have been quite early in '46 or somewhere but I don't remember too much right now. An other person that was around at the University of Toronto was Mary Wright. She had come back around that time, '46 or so and the reason I am bringing that is because I remember at one of the early meetings that we got together - because there were so few of us and those who just graduated were in this kind of setting. But I can't remember the first one. I remember going quite early to one in Halifax, one in Kingston. Now these would probably be sometime before I got my Doctorate which ~~was~~<sup>was</sup> in '52. So, it must have been somewhere before '46.

M: It does not matter which one but just once you get to tell about any of the psychologists other than those of Toronto and McGill that you recollect having seen or heard at CPA?

W: Yes, one of the - she was a ~~Chinese~~ psychologist from

Dalhousie, a woman, ~~Marilyn~~<sup>MARION</sup> Grant and she takes of  
being a charming, rather sensitive and knowledgeable woman.  
Perhaps I remember the women more because they were fewer and we  
got to know them easily -

M:

W: No, I never really got to know her. I mean I know her  
by name, I knew she was a but I really didn't  
know her very well -

M: When did Frances Alexander leave for New York?

W: She must have left around 1947. Then she went to New  
York. There was Dr. Chant who was around. I remember meeting  
him in one of the early CPA meetings because that was before he  
went to B.C. And I am sure there was a whole lot of people that  
will take me few minutes to recollect. Of course, there were  
people from the Montreal area and Toronto area of course the dif-  
ference you knew everybody. I find myself completely -----

M: No, I am just collecting impressions that people have of their early days, if they went to the meetings were more likely to see there, otherwise wouldn't see at all, you know -

W: That's right. We could see people like Chant who was always at every meeting, there were but I think

- there was Smith from Alberta and then there were some of us, sort of regulars. There were people like Mary Wright, McGill and Kingston areas, Blackburn. There seemed to be a new group of people that always came to meetings.

M: And got to know each other very well...

W: And got to know each other very well, very well. Of course George Ferguson came back after the War. Dalbir Bindra came back, came to McGill after the War...

M: Now, lets get back with you; when you returned from Toronto with a Master's plus some post MA...

W: I think I should say what happened. As we graduated, we didn't know what we were going to do, there were really no set psychology jobs available. There was question of making jobs for us. Vaguely there was a feeling that there were things for psychologist to do, but there was no such thing as job openings for psychologists. And no one really knew what a psychologist was. They would employ psychologists in personnel offices, but no one really knew. My feeling is that although there were people in the Ontario Hospital System, but there were not too many openings at that time, because I think you may have placed one or two of the people in the Ontario Hospital System, but didn't

have many people there. And actually it was hard to know — D.V.A. did have two psychologists or at that time, the Veterans and Military hospitals had maybe two psychologists or so; but many people with BAs who had something taking a testing course or two-year undergraduate and as professionals, were not professional psychologists working in hospitals and being accepted as even *in the Armed* services.

M: Was there at Sunnybrook by the way, that was given a special kind of training by the...

W: Sunnybrook was not even opened then. This is what I am trying to ~~tell you~~ <sup>SAY</sup> — and what happened was that Bill <sup>LINE</sup> Lyon

around April or May just when we were about to graduate, asked a few of us <sup>whether</sup> ~~what~~ we'd be interested ~~in~~, if they felt it was not going to work, training these people. <sup>welfare officers etc</sup> I think they looked around and saw what was happening in the States or what they really wanted us to do and they felt that using people like ourselves and Mary Salter at that time, as consultants that they could perhaps set up something in the way <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ psychology services that would be more professional. And so he asked myself, ~~Rob~~ Diamond, I can't remember who the other people were, but there were three of us at least, three or four of us who were asked to go to Scarborough and Christie street at that time, as psychologists. But there were no jobs for psychologists in D.V.A. at that time and in order to give us an internship, we were hired as nursing ORDERLIES <sup>Because that</sup> was the lowest possible salary range and they were <sup>GOING to</sup> ~~gonna~~ pay us \$100. a month for this training period which would be about six



months training period. So we agreed to go. We went to Christie street who had one psychologist there by the name of ~~LORNA Lorraine~~ <sup>McFADGEN</sup>, I don't know if you remember her and she was I think, an ex-social worker with a BA and some psychology courses and I remember I was told... In June of '46, I had gone to Carmel to take a course in Projective Techniques with Bruno Klopfer; that was very interesting because at that time, Bruno was still on the East Coast and he was running a very small workshop of three weeks where you could come for a week or two weeks or three weeks, and I went down there in 1946, in June, right after graduation to take the course and there were Pauline VerHAUS was teaching there, Florence MIALE and Klopfer himself, and other psychologists were down there and we had really very intensive course. We did Rorschach and Rorschach interpretation from about 3:00 a.m. until 8:00 p.m.; but it was very intensive, very good. I went back afterwards for a more advanced ~~Professor~~ course, just 10 days, but I spent three weeks. So I really came back to Toronto being one of the very few people who ~~was~~ <sup>it</sup> trained in Rorschach because ~~he~~ was still considered somewhat suspect in those days. You remember Dr. Lewis who was Head of Psychiatry and Dr. ~~FERRER~~ who was Editor of the Journal

M: Did you take a Psychiatry major over there at...

W: No, I took, I may have, I think we went over... -

M: At Christie street, you ran into Charlie Bailey?

W: That's right! It was Bill Bailey<sup>lie</sup>, Colonel Baillie and I think ~~that~~ because he was ~~at~~ the Old Colonel School. I remember seeing him in conferences and <sup>his</sup> saying "what that man needs

Wigdor

is a wire brush". We started the service <sup>in Christie Street</sup> ~~there~~ and after a few months, over six months, we went in June, they gave <sup>me</sup> a leave for the three weeks to go to the course in the Carmel's, so I came back toward the end of June and worked ~~at~~ Christie street for about five months ~~and they~~ <sup>or</sup>, six months rather, ~~we had~~ <sup>AS</sup> an internship. Under lot of political pressure, they opened up the Psychiatric wing first at Sunnybrook Hospital before the rest was opened. We tracked through the mud up there because there was no transportation, believe it or not in Toronto to Sunnybrook which now seems to be the middle of the City, but in those days, it was way out, and a ~~shovel~~ <sup>SHUTTLE</sup> service picked us up corner Bathurst and Eglinton and ~~shovelled~~ <sup>SHUTTLED</sup> us over there because there was no other way of getting to work in the morning and they ~~shovelled~~ <sup>SHUTTLED</sup> us back at night. But Bill Bailey said to me: "If you promise to be very careful of what you say about those projective techniques, we'll let you use them here but only you can use them because you have been trained; I don't want any of that nonsense ~~from~~ <sup>from</sup> anybody else". You can imagine in 1946. "And let me see if it looks worthwhile". So, I think I was the only person using it in the ~~CA.~~ <sup>beginning</sup> ~~CA.~~ But, I don't know about the Ontario Hospital System, but it was maybe just being so called proved. About 5 years later ~~when~~ I know that Don Hebb brought a student to me and said: "We don't know what to do with this MA (without mentioning with this MA Graduate, because he was taking a sort of semi-academic thing) and he wants to go into Clinical and if we don't teach him Projective Techniques; he won't be able to get a job". And that was about five years later; so you see how quickly things changed. Now I am not so sure - it

went like many things like education and things like that, we have gone full circle. From 1946 to '56 or even perhaps '60, Projective Techniques became the <sup>PRIMARY</sup> ~~tool~~ <sup>tool</sup> of the diagnostic assessment in new hospital situations. We worked there, we went to Sunnybrook. I stayed in Sunnybrook. I was working there with Lee KALLANT at that time, for a while, with ROZE, Diamond, myself...

M: Helen Porter has come there -

W: No, she came right after I left, 1947. There was someone else who was there, not ~~McLaren~~ <sup>MADGEON</sup> because he left under the pressure of psychologists coming in and I don't remember who, ... there was another young woman who left after she got married and raised a family... And then, there were the people out at Scarborough, this is <sup>WAS</sup> the rehabilitation. <sup>UNIT</sup> This was a very interesting time and a lot of pressure because here we were in '46, we were new psychologists most of us with Dr. ~~Lyons~~ <sup>LIVE</sup> and Dr. Mary Salter as consultants but working with this whole group of Veterans that came back and the whole went through the Scarborough, at least most of them went through Scarborough, rehabilitation and there was some rather <sup>SEVERE</sup> ~~severe~~ cases...

M:

W: I don't remember him...

M:

W: Oh yes! and he went to <sup>PHYSICAL</sup> ~~Physical~~ Medecine, doesn't he?

M: He may have taught University I think he taught at the University of - -

W: But wasn't he in <sup>PHYSICAL</sup> Rehabilitation and there is

another man, a psychiatrist who did an awful lot of rehabilitation of some of these people as a separate kind of and then after six months, they finally got psychiatrists and they got two graduate psychologists because it is something we have lived with for twenty years, we are just managing to get out of our horrible mess but we did manage to get three psychologists who started at a tremendous salary of \$2400. a year. But gradually in spite of all those handicaps, Psychology began to play a real role in terms of a contribution I think, to the Psychiatry Service to , to rehabilitation, to neurology and neuro-surgery. And as a matter of fact here we start to feel the change, Psychology starts to change again. The interest in research, it was not, I don't think, because there was not an interest in research before, but there was too few personnel, people had been forced into applied jobs and now for instance, we were getting involved with things like ~~looking~~<sup>looking</sup>-at-gun-shot-wounds and brain damage as well as tension problems, all kinds of things and we became part of the project, at that time. So,

never knew anybody's name at least we had the impression that he didn't know your name because he always called you : "Hey! you!" and I remember when I left Sunnybrook, because I wanted to go back to Montreal, I was so surprised because he knew my name. But, the first patient that I had was an older man who was being assessed for pension purposes and that was my first job. I never worked and I had never really had to cope with anyone, and this man kept

saying: "Yes, sister and no, sister", and I didn't know that they called nurses in the Armed Forces sister and I was getting more and more irritated at this very familiar man who was saying "Yes sister, no sister". But not only that, he said to me that he wasn't gonna take any test because nobody was going to interfere with his pension. So I went to Dr. BAILLIE and said: "I am terribly sorry but I can't test that man". Without raising his head from his desk, he said: "I thought you were a psychologist" and said "You go back and see what you can do". So I went back, he was very difficult, he was not cooperative. He said that there is no such thing as not cooperative patient, it is a question of how you approach him. And I think this was the <sup>most</sup> last thing that Dr. Bailey <sup>he</sup> taught me, <sup>that</sup> with a little bit of ingenuity, one can probably test any patient, being aware of course of the conditions in which you are testing. So this is one of the things I took away with <sup>we</sup> ~~the old~~ <sup>now</sup> Sunnybrook. I left Sunnybrook in 1947 on a transfer to Montreal. Dr. Dancey had come back from the Armed Services, he was Psychiatrist in the Armed Services and he became Advisor in Psychiatry and Chief Psychiatrist for the D.V.A. And he accepted my transfer from Toronto to Montreal and I went to Sainte-Anne de Bellevue for six months which is a ~~men~~ mental hospital and their psychologists became - I have done some group psycho-therapy at Sunnybrook because, as I said we were moving into all kinds of areas which have never been explored or certainly that psychologists have not been doing much of this in Toronto. We started to do some group psycho-therapy particularly with rehabilitation and people in terms of rehabilitation. And

then I went to Sainte-Anne. Donald Spearman was there at the time, who is now in Alberta and Georges Dufresne who is now at CBC. We were working at Sainte-Anne, Don left shortly. <sup>And</sup> Don may have come shortly after I left Sainte-Anne because we were six months there and then immediately <sup>went</sup> to Queen Mary Hospital. While we were in D.V.A. we did interesting things before I left Toronto is that they brought the D.V.A. people from across Canada for Seminars to Toronto and we got to know some of the people from the University of Montreal and from some of the other settings across Canada and really we were <sup>working</sup> with the Ontario Hospital System which was I think a system that used a lot of psychologists at the beginning of the <sup>clinical</sup> psychology movement. Then, I came back to Montreal in 1947; I had taken one course with professor ~~Bob McLeod~~ <sup>Bob McLeod</sup>, after my Master's. Then in 1948, I decided to go back; Bob McLeod was Chairman of the Department at McGill and he accepted me for a Doctoral work at McGill and while he was still there, <sup>I took</sup> ~~we~~ after one seminar, that year, which was 1948, actually he accepted me by <sup>for</sup> one seminar that year because I had to spread it out, I was still working and I wasn't sure how he ~~was going to~~ <sup>was going to</sup> organize at that time. My husband wasn't working because it was that transitional period where engineers were sort of displaced with this post-war period. He had come back here to do a job. That job sort of folded. Anyway, the course I took that year was Don Hebb's seminar on Human Experimental or something like that, I don't think he really had a name for it. Don had come to McGill but was not then Chairman of the Department; McLeod was still

Chairman of the Department and we worked that seminar where Don Hebb dedicated his first book ~~to~~ "Organization of Behaviour", because what we did that year was going over the book and we read ~~a journal~~ <sup>about</sup> the people in that course were ~~Bill~~ <sup>Bill Hyman</sup>, Don Hebb, myself, Brenda ~~Molner~~ <sup>McLennan</sup>, I think, White was in that course, that seminar, as well. It was an historic seminar and there were other people -

M:

W: You mean Bob . He was much later. This was in '48. Bob came I think, in the '50s.

M:

W: No, he wasn't. Dr. came later and came somewhat later; because they were still perhaps in the Forces or something like that. They were really not in that seminar and I try to think -

M: How about Bob Blair?

W: He was of course at most of the seminars, but I can't remember, there were some other people who were - I can't think of their names now, but we spent that year really well - it was a marvellous year because I learned a tremendous amount. Don was one of the best teachers I think that I ever met, ~~in a sense that I have never taken a big coordinator although the undergraduate was Phil McDonald, but he gets~~ <sup>te</sup> you and he is an inspiring teacher, someone who - he is afraid of women - but in a sense that I think, that they either adore him or they intimidate him, but he has a way of dealing <sup>with</sup> a problem and getting you involved in the conversation, so that you learn all about the ramifications and he is

extremely *use, by intellectually.*

M: Do you think it's because he, himself, seems to be so excited about the problem analysis?

W: I think so because he knows his subject matter so thoroughly; he lives it, reads it, knows it so thoroughly that -

M: That you know that he is explaining something that you are really getting a thorough.

W: That's right. And besides he has an inquiring mind. You just can't make a statement without being able to justify or show how you might go about proving it, in terms of -

M: Is he Socratic, would you say? Does he teach by questioning?

W: He does teach to some extent by questioning but I don't think it is really just a very questioning getting to pretty well the spot, but he discusses a problem in terms of all his ratifications and then if you have - Jackson was another fellow - anyway, I was thinking of him because he talked a great deal at seminars - he tends to provoke questions in your mind and then you would question him and what was the question that he will pause questions, so really he wasn't being socratic.

M: Would you say he is a demanding...?

W: Very demanding -

M: In terms of reading ?

W: And of course, he ran at our graduate seminars, I mean outside of the course, we went over his book because his book covered great many areas of psychology. It was a very fundamental book. But ~~he~~ also, we had to prepare and I remember what I did



was on the sleep at that time. It was something new for me. The amount of knowledge in terms of neuro-physiology and neuro-anatomy <sup>was</sup> because he taught psychology; and this was my first introduction because if you think of what we had <sup>at</sup> McGill, you ~~are gonna see~~ trouble. This is my first introduction to psychology as a biological science. And of course I had a lot to get up in terms of that. In 1949, I was officially registered as a Ph.D. candidate. By this time, the staff had increased considerably. Don Hebb had become Chairman of the Department and Bob McLeod had left to go to Cornell, I think. Bob McLeod, ~~I~~ did ~~go~~ <sup>to</sup> some lectures. He, of course, was a phenomenologist, not phenomenal but had a great deal of interest in phenomenology and I had some lectures by him. I don't think that was a formal course, I think it must have been sort of colloquium, sort of thing. In '49, Don Hebb was Chairman of the Department. He sort of inherited some of us. ~~That's why~~ there was Verity Ross at that time too, ~~he~~ kind of inherited Brenda and myself and few of us and he wasn't gonna have any more of George Ferguson was back, Bindra. In '49, I took one of <sup>George's</sup> ~~Len's~~ courses in Quantitative Measurements and Factor Analysis. We took course in Neuro-Anatomy and Neuro-Physiology at the Montreal Neurological Institute, part of the same course they gave graduate students in Medicine, the research fellows course, and Brenda and I went and we made brain models. She probably *did more* than I did, although it has been invaluable because working now for so many years in hospitals, I think that this is one of the things that perhaps some psychologists don't get enough of that if we want

respect of the people we work for, we have to know enough about Neuro-Anatomy, Neuro-Physiology. But this was a very difficult course because Jasper and McNAUGHTON were teaching and they were teaching <sup>it to</sup> at two research fellows in Medicine and we were not research fellows in Medicine, that was for sure. But we did - Don was a <sup>hard</sup> task master that way, I mean we read a lot ourselves or else. Then I took <sup>FERGUSON'S</sup> ~~Person's~~ course in Advance Statistics and Factor Analysis - it was called Quantitative Measurement and Factor Analysis and number of other courses. Not too many courses because Don had never believed in heavily loading graduate students with course work. You went to seminars but there were ~~NOT~~ a lot of course credits like some graduate schools and you were sort of forced into thinking and ~~kind~~ <sup>task</sup> to organize a thesis. That was the end in terms of research problems. At that time, ABE LUCHINS

had just come to McGill too and because I was interested in personality and because I was a clinical psychologist, Don had that little passion for either areas and although he used to laugh at me, he used to call himself a clinical psychologist at times because of his work on BRAIN damage. He really didn't think much of clinical psychology. There was Billy Huncan from University as well, and most of us who were there at that time, we were in the applied field, had to prove ourselves perhaps doubly, but at that time came and he was in personality and perception field. A very enthusiastic man, a very bright man and a very difficult man. But I knew him a great deal, I think, because I have a way of and he my thesis and got it written and all that sort of

thing. Actually, I think, after having a Master's, there was only a residence requirement of two years, but working at the same time. I was one of the last people they allowed -

M: You were allowed to continue to work?

W: They allowed us to keep a job because, Bill <sup>LYON</sup> Lyon who was then still Advisor in psychology and I think he remained Advisor in psychology until his death in '66; Mary Salter and then McDonald were Advisors in psychology D.V.A. and then Margu<sup>ette</sup> King. They were called kind of assistants to Bill <sup>LYON</sup> Lyon and both he and Dr.

DANCEY were very anxious and very kind but if I wanted to go on the Ph.D., I should, and they would allow me to keep the job at the same time. But what happened really, worked out, was that at that time, because they were short of teachers to graduate courses, we were often giving <sup>courses</sup> them very late in the afternoon and in the evening even and I remember George Ferguson's course, we had something like 7:00 to 10:00 at night and I don't remember when Don Hebb had his but something like 4:00 to 6:00 and from 7:00 to 10:00 because the staff was busy <sup>with</sup> ~~to~~ the undergraduate courses during the day, and didn't have time -

M: And also the majority of graduate students still who had jobs -

W: Who had jobs. You see -

M: So would you say Don <sup>Hebb</sup> Hebb his part-time staff what you really mean is that you have to take -

W: A degree; if you registered for a degree and had to carry a full course, at the same than if you were full time, but they didn't insist it. I was one of the last ones that they let work.

Don't forget at that time, there was no such thing as being supported for your graduate study. I know supporting a graduate student and the time that we professors spent

There was no support for psychology for graduate. There may have been some but it was ~~meagre~~ <sup>small grants</sup> even Don Hebb<sub>1</sub> at that time, I ~~don't~~ think. It was years later that they got things like big grants ~~from the Ford foundation~~ <sup>from the Ford foundation</sup>. They had small grants, but... And of course, he was using those for physiological psychology students, and I thought I don't think any of the applied students but it certainly changed. As a graduate student, you really didn't expect - except we did get paid <sup>teaching assistance</sup> ~~teaching assistance~~. But that was <sup>just</sup> enough to cover our fees probably - So really they couldn't really impose, I think, no work at all because many of the students had no other way to make money. So what we had to do is, you were ~~grated~~ <sup>TREATED</sup> if you like as a full-time student... But one other thing was that Dr. Dancy and Dr. ~~Lyon~~ <sup>LINE</sup> were absolutely wonderful in the sense that they <sup>allowed that</sup> - I could leave the hospital at 4:00 and none was - there was no such thing as -

M: Did you take any work during this ~~two~~ <sup>three</sup> year period?

W: No, I don't think I ever took a course -

M: Who else was there beside the ones that you mentioned?

W: There was ~~Ludens~~ <sup>Ludens</sup>, Poser had come back at this time, maybe it was a little later because probably Poser had his Ph.D. about the same time I had it, not later. ~~Ludens~~ <sup>Ludens</sup>, Ed Webster, Don Hebb, Ferguson, ~~Bandra~~ <sup>Bandra</sup>, Malmo at the -

M: But you didn't take any work from Malmo?

W: No, I didn't take any work. I was teaching as a matter of fact undergraduates - I was teaching the course on Projective Techniques to some of the Master's people, but I was working on my Doctorate, I was -

M:

W: I think I wrote my thesis between 11:00 at night and 4:00 in the morning.

M: What was it on?

W: It was on personality and perception, ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Ludlans was the Director of my thesis. He was a very very dominating individual - which was good in some ways - bad in other ways - and made it very difficult to express *one's own ideas*

What I did was I was interested in how much does the situation change one's perception as compare to all the work done in that non-perception, is that consistent? Consistent goes to perception depending on our personality and what you do in the outside doesn't change it.

Later that something that was sort of built in, in terms of personality structures and the controversy with Ash and others that really you could change the situation so that you could change perception.

What I did was used a thing like a *autokinetic* movement and looked at the way compare to and

normal and doubtness seems like a movement illusion is very kind and the rigidity pictures of group. In other words how much structure do you need before you will see the common in terms of a percept and how do,

normal, in terms of how much structure they need.

There was an interesting part of the result in 1952 after working. I was still working for the D.V.A. at the Queen Mary and teaching Projective Techniques, writing this thesis. I got the degree in the Fall of 1952 and I remember very clearly walking into the

office, and I think all graduate students have this feeling. Brenda and I met in the Dean's office as we submitted our ~~papers~~ <sup>theses</sup> and I think we both looked terribly depressed at that moment. It is that feeling that you have done it but you just feel that it's not at all what you would like to do. But we both submitted it and we came up <sup>for</sup> your oral, I think it was the 1st of August and at that time Dean Thompson was the Dean of Graduate Studies. A charming, intelligent man. He was Chairman of course of the Committee, Don Hebb was on that Committee, Ed Webster, I suppose Lucas <sup>HINS</sup> must have been there too as the Director of my thesis and there were one or two other people, who test you. CARNEY LANDIS was the outside examiner for my thesis, which I think is interesting because he is one of the pillars of the American Psychology ~~but~~ <sup>or</sup> he <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ involved in the GREYSTONE project that had to do with perception and with personality. So he was my outside examiner. And I heard afterwards that he thought it was a good thesis, but what I remember is standing, waiting and having - coming back and congratulating you. This was the way ~~he~~ <sup>the Dean then congratulated</sup> that the students <sup>did</sup> made it, and then walking out and saying to Dr. Hebb that I was terribly <sup>pleased.</sup> ~~you know "Please..."~~ and he <sup>said</sup> ~~says~~ : "Don't call me Doctor Hebb, you remember, you call me Don". And it was years before I could call him Don. And I thought it was very interesting at the beginning, ~~and there were several of us,~~  
~~Ph.D. at that time and Danny Ross.~~  
 Those were the only people that were there at McGill at that time. Now we are something like 30 on the staff or 35. <sup>is</sup> starting to be around when I left, of course Wally LAMBERT has

come since then, a lot of people that you probably know. So that was 1952 and since then I stayed on the D.V.A. I think I stayed on because I have always <sup>had</sup> ~~made~~ the joint teaching. <sup>job,</sup> ~~And~~ ~~John~~ does not teach at the University at the graduate level. And things have changed so much in the year...

M: What do you teach now?

W: Over the years, I have taught projective techniques, identified with this area and it's hard to get out of it but I also teach <sup>other</sup> ~~of~~ courses <sup>now</sup> We have graduate seminars and I do have two Ph.D. <sup>candidates</sup> and I teach <sup>^</sup> nurses course, graduate nurses on <sup>new</sup> ~~new~~ <sup>human</sup> ~~new~~ <sup>Growth and</sup> development. So, after teaching -

M: What's your rank?

W: Assistant-professor. But only because being part-time is always a problem but I have been assistant-professor for 7 years now. And one other thing that happened is that our Department of Psychology in D.V.A. is now one of the few independent Psychology Departments in hospitals, in the sense that we are no longer sort of part of Psychiatry. For about 4 years ~~we~~ we are reporting directly to the Medical Director of the hospital, to his Assistant Medical Director. But this is something I think that psychology wanted to achieve <sup>for a long time has begun</sup> but ~~has not~~ to happen, now they have Children's Hospital, Ste-Justine Hospital, but in many hospitals, the Psychology Department still reports to the Chief in Psychiatry rather than directly to the Medical Director.

M: They lost a very good, well trained American Clinical



Psychologist at New York Hospital. He refused to be locked up in the Psychiatry -

W: I think in the States, it's a resolved problem but I think that in Canadian Psychology, Clinical Psychology, it's one of the big problems. Psychology has been too long under Psychiatry as a sub-department of Psychiatry.

M: Mary had told me that the new university hospital -

Now, naturally, it's the early period concentrating on and it isn't for a lack of interest in what has happened since that I suggest we turn back now and take a few general things. For those at McGill and only had very second hand information about it and mainly through students who went there or those who came last, there was a period I think in the '50s, Don Hebb was Chairman and there was alleged to be two ~~bright~~ <sup>QUITE</sup> separate categories of graduate students at McGill, there was the other elite group of real researchers in presumably physiological and working mainly with Hebb. And there was the second class *CLINICAL* graduate students on the right side. Was that true -

W: I think that when I graduated, there was no division, in '52, it did not happen yet because that's why we didn't really get Ph.D.s in Clinical Psychology as such; we got Ph.D.s in Personality, in Perception and all kinds of things that were allied and of course most of us had some experience and we had certainly more training than the average new Ph.D. would have but

right at that time or certainly after that, what happened was that there was this whole tendency in Quebec, not in Quebec, but all over - the Mental Health BORSARIES came in. They needed Mental Health workers and it had been decided that if you train ~~them~~ <sup>them</sup> ~~that~~ psychologists would come in under this training scheme of government support for training Mental Health workers. I assume, I was not in <sup>the</sup> planning of this, but I think this was one of the

*reasons* for this more clear cut division.

As I said earlier, Don Hebb really never could see applied psychology. He thought we were over-selling something that we knew so little about. He agreed that maybe it was necessary you couldn't put off giving services to <sup>the</sup> ~~community~~ <sup>ty</sup> definitely, but he never felt very comfortable about what we had to offer as psychologists, in terms of the scientific *knowledge*. So around '52 or '53, what happened was that there was a Psychology Department and within the sort of broad compound of the Psychology Department, there was a Center for Applied psychology with Ed Webster as the Head of that. Ed Webster was always *interested in* applied, not so much clinical but industrial. At that point, Erny ~~Poser~~ <sup>Poser</sup> must have been brought in at that point, and he was sort of a sub-organizer of the Clinical <sup>training</sup> and he and I had a course and I think Dr. Douglas, I am not sure - she came a little later - there were very few of us who were involved now in a programme for training M.Sc.(applied) psychologists. Now this was a Master's in applied. These were Clinical Psychologists and Industrial. I think *SAM RABINOVITZ* arrived about that time; he went at the Children Hospital - we got into this programme -

M: This was a very different programme in the traditional -

W: This was a very different programme in the traditional MA, M.Sc. to Ph.D. This was not a research oriented programme, no thesis was required. They had to do a problem, but it was a straight applied Master's course where the emphasis was on different <sup>APPLIED</sup> ~~people~~ skills <sup>with</sup> which they could go into hospitals or industries, etc... And we did try to give sort of a theoretical background of course, and they didn't have to. Actually, what developed as you know <sup>was that</sup> we were giving them too much scientific background in the sense that we were turning out people at Master's level who were not quite Ph.D.s but who were much more than what was going to be required at the <sup>lower</sup> ~~technicians~~ level. Of course, ~~history~~ <sup>AS SEEN AT</sup> Couchicing and all these conferences, we were training neither Ph.D.s nor the others, so that this ~~has~~ led to a lot of rethinking of the problem. But there definitely was, there was no doubt that there was a real division in the department; it wasn't so much that anyone said these were second class students <sup>but</sup> ~~or~~ that we undoubtedly did not get the bright ones because the ones who wanted to do teaching and the ones that wanted to do research went into the ...but they had to go to the physiology, but...

A large percentage of us went into physiology. Then we have famous graduates like Peter Milner, ~~Ron~~ Melzack who remained at McGill as well as <sup>other</sup> people who have done extremely well. I think that one thing one must say that the people that Don Hebb trained have <sup>in AD<sup>c</sup></sup> ~~gone~~ <sup>into</sup> tremendous contributions to psychology. So there were the physiological

people; There were also the people who were interested in the ~~interest~~ <sup>effects</sup> of early environment ~~and~~ stimulation. I mean the work of Woody Heron, <sup>BEXTON</sup> ~~to Bexton~~, and the work of Bob Thompson, all these people were people who were working with Don Hebb. It was not only straight physiological like Melzack and Hölner, but it was question of develop mental in terms of things like sensory stimulation ~~because~~ <sup>AND</sup> the sensory stimulation ~~is~~ <sup>in the</sup> important early environment. But these people were working - there were of course other people who were working with Bindra in Human experiment in other words, on problems of motivation and learning. Then there were the people who were working with Wally Lambert in Language Development, etc. But these were all considered in human abilities with Ferguson, people like Sullivan, George Spring <sup>hell</sup> then all these people were working in what they call Human Experimental or Human Ability or Physiological, and Animal. I guess that's <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ better way <sup>to put it</sup> physiological or animal because actually many of the early stimulation <sup>studies were with animals</sup> ~~although~~ except for their famous experiments of putting people in sensory deprivation situation. ~~Other most~~ <sup>Other most</sup> of the work was done by animals, cats, dogs. But those people were considered one kind and Don really had his way, the others wouldn't have at all but he couldn't of this need to train So, under those circumstances - So it was not only physiological but research. On the surface of course we all lived very closely, together, except that at one time, there was a physical separation; One time there were two different buildings. The <sup>DOWNER</sup>

Building, which was a Medical Research Building, had an area for psychology where the animals were and the more human and applied were in a separate building. This was due to a space problem but actually there was quite a division. Fortunately in the building <sup>which is</sup> next to us, Biological Sciences Building, everybody was closer together and with that, there has been this whole change anyway in the Clinical Psychology field, in '51 or '53 to 1967 that existed for 14 years that we were training out these people. First of all the field of Clinical Psychology changed, during that period we have all moved away from ~~things~~ <sup>techniques</sup>. Psychologist was purely giving a test and technicians to experimental research in things like psycho-pathology, investigation in research of psycho-therapy and all these things, so psychologists development that; the Clinical psychologist had moved away from the limited role; they had and what we were finding was that in this moving away, none of us was teaching, these applied psychology people were moving, giving them more and more theory and more we were intending to buy some more and more, in terms of the scientist professional model. So that it began -

M: Both were physically and spiritually moving together -

W: That's right. This is what was happening. Of course history that last, well two years ago we gave up our M.Sc. applied <sup>Centre for</sup> Applied Psychology no longer exists and the departments become, one department again, we have no MA, no M.Sc. in Clinical Psychology. We have a four year programme directed to the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology, because of this feeling that the MA in psychology is an obsolete animal and <sup>a course for</sup> ~~that of~~

*technicians in psychology*

course ~~this year~~ <sup>this year</sup> has started, not in the Psychology Department, but in the extension for the Department of Continuing Education, now the course for technicians in Psychology. There is a lot of controversy about this but this is what the thing was that you have to turn out people who have a broader base who could direct, administer and who will direct research in Clinical areas, but who may do some diagnostic testing to this - become a smaller part of the work. So, there has been again one

moved in the separation - there was a lot of tension, there was no doubt that there were lot of underlined feelings, lot of resentment but what happened was that we started to get better and better students; it was harder and harder to look at them as second class citizens. I think that Don Hebb <sup>well</sup> ~~was~~ always thinking of Clinical Psychology <sup>in the same way</sup> whether they were doing, testing or whatever they were doing, research has been rather - I think this is something he does -

M: to expect him to change -

W: That's right. There had been a change in his attitude. The problem now is that there is so much support in the Clinical areas, there are so many people coming in and you are adding staff, on the clinical side, because <sup>in order to</sup> train graduate students in clinical, you would find more staff for the graduate students. I think that the proportions are higher. And so that - now the other way the physiological people are becoming ~~all~~ worried that there <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ <sup>going to</sup> be sort of swamped by Clinical - of course, the only thing is the competition of clinical is a little bit different but still people interested in relating, finding

students, practical

M: *Has behaviour* modification *had much impact on the* local clinical scene?

W: Yes, we <sup>are</sup> all *quite interested*. Dr. Poser who has been away has probably influenced McGill psychology in terms of the clinical *programme* a great deal. Because he was not trained on the American scene or the Canadian but he was trained *in England* and he has just arrived and was very enthusiastic about it. I think it's not a desillusion after a little while, although surely

McGill people have tendency to be very much influenced by our thinking approach and they are much less <sup>dynamically</sup> psychologically oriented although Dr. Douglas always has been a dynamically oriented professor so they get both sides.

And I just want to say that Dr. Poser left, he took a year of sabbatical and went to *England* <sup>when</sup> and he came back and ~~of course~~ *he started a course in behaviour modification*

<sup>the</sup> students are claimed, they do get a fairly good exposure to <sup>behaviour</sup> ~~the~~ modifications. I think that most hospitals including our own have now <sup>have</sup> ~~some~~ of a small behaviour *therapy units* <sup>and</sup> people to study with Poser

I think that this is an area where psychologists have sort of started a *new approach*.

M: For instance, of all of the men teachers you had, which of them have had the greatest influence on your stands on the kind of psychologist you are?

W: I think that the first was Frances Alexander who was undoubtedly oriented in                      In terms of psychologists, it was Frances Alexander, Bill Lyell<sup>NE</sup> and Don Hebb. Because I am now a person who in terms of choosing which division of the university I am in, I am in the Biological Sciences division and not in the Social Sciences division because my research has been on Aging and in ~~Electric~~<sup>intellectual</sup> Changers and Memory Function and I am much more involved - and it's probably Don Hebb *in the last* analysis, who exerted the most influence in my present thinking because I moved away from this enthusiasm from Don. However, I think that they are both very involved but to realizing that it won't come pile together; you have to look at the both angles and I think he probably had                      , in my case because the question of being in the atmosphere more than having that much

H:                      when you think of the mass moving and in that order moving from psychoanalyst to unalist, to what?

W: I think to a biologist. I think Don Hebb is basically a biologist in really the true sense of the word rather unitary functional                      all in one bundle, sometimes approaching some different areas. I think that really I am a peculiar combination of all three things because I still am involved in working with people in terms of probably function and how would they change function in terms of their psychological environment. I am also concerned with what it is about their organism that makes the way it works -



Wigdor

M: Now, another question. In terms of books, you have read a lot of books at the time and with respect to, off this mass of books, which at the time you read it, who you most?

W: This is a very difficult question. I think that the books I read for Daviolette, at that time, in terms of

was the first incline I had, that people somehow were functioning in some sort of a dynamic environment. I think that a little book by *LINDNER* on the Culture and Influence of the Personality was another book very unimportant really - but

PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF CANADA

This copy is provided for research purposes only.  
Responsibility regarding questions of copyright  
that may arise in the use of this print is assumed  
by the recipient.

CALL NUMBER

COTE (M. G. 28, I 161, volume 37)

DATE FEB 21 1975

Cette copie a été préparée pour fins de recherche  
seulement. Le récipiendaire sera tenu responsable  
de toute infraction au droit de propriété de ce  
document.