ORAL HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY IN CANADA

INTERVIEW

RUTH HOYT-CAMERON

THIS IS PART OF THE ORAL HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY IN CANADA. I AM TALKING TO DR. RUTH HOYT-CAMERON IN HER BEAUTIFUL HOME IN WEST VANCOUVER ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1976.

Q. First, let's start at the beginning. Where were you born?

A. Massachusetts, in Methuen, Massachusetts.

Q. And into what sort of a family -- what did your father do?

A. My father worked at artesian well drilling. He worked in textiles and I think that's the main things he worked in.

Q. And your mother -- before she was married?

A. My mother, before she was married, lived with her grandmother and was an apprentice dressmaker.

Q. And brothers and sisters?

A. I have two brothers; one is in motor vehicle inspection services in Massachusetts, and the other one works for radio.

Q. Also in the States?

A. Yes.

Q. Both of them older than you?

A. One is older and one is younger.

Q. What are your earliest recollections of the home

Q. (Cont'd)

before you started school? What sort of a home was it economically. Was it high ...

A. It was an average middle-class, rather family-oriented home. A large family -- my father's. My mother's family were all in England. My mother's family were mill owners, and my father's family were farmers from New Brunswick.

Q. So that your mother's family would be economically better off than your father's family.

A. Well, yes and no. By the time mother came along -- as she said, "shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves in few generations".

Q. It had been?

A. It had been.

Q. Okay. In terms of religion -- what sort of a home was it?

A. Very strong religious home in that it was a rather strict Methodist household until we grew up.

Q. Do you remember, as a very young child, family prayers and going to church and Sunday school?

A. I don't remember family prayers particularly. Yes, we went to church and Sunday school both morning and evening.

Q. Would you say that your parents were devout active Methodists?

A. My father was very devout, active all through his life. My mother was sort of medium-going I would say.

Q. Had her family been Anglican?

A. No, her father was Anglican, her mother was Catholic, and mother was Anglican.

Q. Educationally, was it from the point of view -- had you learned to read before you went to school?

A. I don't recall that I had, no. We were read to from the time I can remember back in my childhood.

Q. Was there plenty to read in the home?

A. Yes, always plenty to read of all levels. My father was quite interested in poetry. Mother was interested in all sorts of things and there were many child's books as well as records in the home.

Q. Records -- do you mean Victrola records?

A. Victrola records.

Q. Mostly classical music?

A. There were both and child's records as well.

Q. Well now -- when you started school, how old were you?

A. Five years old.

Q. And as you moved through elementary school were you a bright child in school?

A. I was considered bright, yes.

Q. Did your parents place a high value on education or were

A. A very high value on education. In fact they insisted when many others were leaving school that we go, and no way were we allowed to leave before we finished high school.

Q. But were you required by your parents -- ambitions for you to do well at school.

A. Absolutely.

Q. They expected ...

A. Actually a little ... probably too stringent, I think in that nothing was ever quite good enough.

Q. Were you more successful in school or less

successful than your brothers?

A. I think we were successful in different ways. My older brother was very bright, finished high school at 16 but refused to go to university unless he was provided with a car. He's regretted it all his life. My younger brother is bright and very good with people but didn't tend to want to go any further in school, though he was very much encouraged to do so.

Q. But you did.

A. I did because I went into nursing and originally wanted medicine. But that was out of the question. It was during the depression. I went into nursing and while I was in nursing, I went to Johns Hopkins Hospital and spent some time in the neurosurgical department and became very interested in the behaviour of people with brain damage. And it was there I decided that I was going to become a psychologist.

Q. Do you have any idea when you first encountered the word psychology to have any real meaning?

A. Yes. I knew I was going to study behaviour and primarily behaviour related to damage. When I went back to my own hospital, that was the Johns Hopkins. When I went back to my own hospital I was put in charge of all children's services. And at that time it was very important

A. (Cont'd)

that nursing people get a university education.

Q. So all of them did.

A. They didn't but those who were in charge ... I happened to be a head nurse.

Q. I see.

A. And then a supervisor. And those who were in charge -- they said if you're going any further in nursing you must get a college education. Our own hospital was fortunate in that all our sciences were taught by Brown University professors. And so, I went on and took courses at night at Brown.

Q. Courses in what?

A. In management and I've forgotten what other courses there were but primarily it was management and something else.

Q. Psychology.

A. No, not psychology at that time.

Q. Because, at that time, according to Wally Lambert, just before the war they had some real giants at Brown

Q. (Cont'd)

in psychology.

A. Yes they did.

Q. Walker and Hunter.

A. Yes.

Q. Also

A. No, I was in the education area at that time.

Q. Now we've skipped something I want to get back to. When you were in high school what were your favourite subjects or your favourite bête noire?

A. I think biology probably was. In that high school you had three choices. One, college entrance; two, commercial and, three, general. If you had any intention of going on to college, you took the college course and there was very little in the way of elective subjects you took the mapped-out course.

Q. What did you take?

A. English.

Q. No. I mean ...

A. I took the college.

Q. Oh, I see.

A. College entrance.

Q. Well now, that implies that you or your parents decided that you were going to go on after high school.

A. They hoped we all would. Yes. In fact both my brother and I took college and then he changed in his last couple of years to commercial -- part college part commercial.

Q. I see.

A. And the younger one -- I can't remember what he took.

Q. This implies a strong desire on their part ...

A. Oh, very definitely.

Q. All their children to go as far as possible. (A. That's right).

Q. Was this based on, as it sometimes is, with middle-class families, I want my children to have a better education than I was able to get?

A. Partly that and partly that they realized that advancement, both socially and economically and pleasurably was a result of ... related to education. Yes.

Q. When you left school, you entered nursing, but did you enter nurse's training school in the university or train as a nurse in ...

A. Trained as a nurse three years.

Q. So, you did go to college immediately.

A. No.

Q. You hinted that this is partly because you really wanted to get into medicine and weren't accepted.

A. No, no. Economically I didn't have funds to do it.

Q. Oh, and you're family didn't.

A. Yes, my family didn't. No, it was during the depression

Q. So it was a matter of economics that made you turn to livelihood earning and your occupation.

A. That's right.

Q. Then you must've done very well in nursing.

A. Very well, indeed.

Q. And when you got through -- when you qualified

Q. (Cont'd)

as a nurse, how long did you serve as a nurse before Johns Hopkins?

A. I went to Johns Hopkins before I took up my position right at the very end of my training -- before I took up my position at the hospital.

Q. Then you must've been spotted as an unusually promising ...

A. I was sent.

Q. Yeah. And supported?

A. Oh, no. I was paid for the job I did down there.

Q. I see. But nevertheless you must've been identified by them (A. I was) as a very promising nurse. (A. That's right). And it was at Johns Hopkins. Was it because of your ... the work you did at the hospital that you became interested in behaviour and especially in brain damage, or was this an earlier interest that you pursued when you got there?

A. No, it was the interest I had because I worked on Dr. Damy's floor in brain surgery.

Q. At Johns Hopkins.

A. At Johns Hopkins, yes.

Q. I see. So it was an interest developed out of what you found yourself working in.

A. In nursing, yes.

Q. And then when you went back to your hospital -- where was that -- in your home town?

A. Brown Hospital. We were at Providence, Rhode Island.

Q. Oh. Is that the hospital in which you originally had your training?

A. Yes it was.

Q. Then you capitalized on this Johns Hopkins, or they did, on this Johns Hopkins training to place you in a very responsible nursing ...

A. I had the job before I left.

Q. I see. Well now you say you took the evening work mostly in administration.

A. Primarily administration and education courses as I can recall. But I can't recall what they were.

Q. Yeah. These were evening courses -- did they lead to a degree?

A. I was given credits which counted toward my degree at Boston University. Yes.

Q. What made you decide to go to university?

A. Well, for the simple reason that I knew that there was no further advancement for me where I was.

Q. In the nursing profession?

A. In the nursing profession.

Q. Was that in university?

A. There was a scholarship made available for anyone who could qualify for it for undergraduate work in education. It was not nursing education at the time. It was education. I applied for the scholarship and I got it. First, before I did this, I went to what they call inter-session and summer session at Boston University at my own expense. And then made application for this scholarship. It was granted.

Q. And was this ... Was your summer course work and so on aiming toward a teaching certificate?

A. Well, it was aiming toward it, yes. Degree in education.

Q. Which would qualify you as a teacher?

A. Yes.

Q. I see. Well then you had some credits, you got your scholarship and you entered what?

A. Boston University.

Q. Yeah.

A. School of education.

Q. School of education. And you were there how long?

A. Three years.

Q. And you graduated with what?

A. B. Sc. in Education.

Q. B. Sc. in Education. Then what happened?

A. I then took a position at the Children's Hospital in Boston where I had charge of all surgical wards with the exception of the orthopedic wards. I did have again the neurosurgery in children, and again my interest sparked. However prior to going to Boston University I did take psychology ... Prior to going to Children's Hospital I took psychology at Boston University. I took several pyschology courses.

Q. From whom?

A. The only one I can remember was Vaughan and Kingsley. Two I remember. Vaughan and Kingsley. General

A. (Cont'd)

Psychology from Dr. Vaughan and Developmental from Dr. Kingsley I think his name was.

Q. Kingsbury?

A. Kingsley.

Q. Kingsley.

A. Now, wait a minute. We also had Donald Durell. Those were three I remember. And Donald Durell was primarily interested in reading disabilities. I wasn't. But I had to take the course.

Q. Now did you take this with other nurses, or with their general ...

A. General.

Q. How did you come to do this -- because of your work with children?

A. Well, you had quite a broad selection of subjects. And these were subjects I was interested in outside of the educational subjects. These were subjects I was interested in and took them.

Q. And these were sufficient to get you interested seriously in becoming a psychologist?

A. Oh, very much so. I had never intended after that to stay in nursing entirely. Once I had been to university, nursing was a means to an end, though I did thoroughly enjoy my work at Children's Hospital, Boston.

Q. Do you know at what point in your nursing career -- you turned to nursing/for economic reasons you couldn't go when into medicine? Do you know at what point in your nursing career you made psychology your career objective?

A. I realized it when I went to Boston University that that was the road to take if I was going to study brain behaviour.

Q. And you graduated with what degree from Boston after three years?

A. B. Sc. in Education.

Q. Oh, yes.

A. I took the four years in three.

Q. Yeah. Still academically achieving, over-achieving.

A. Well, I had to in order to get the full scholarship. And actually it was not too difficult. We'd had fair courses in science at nursing from Brown professors. So these all counted you see.

Q. And, anyway, all through your academic experience -- studying, writing exams had come relatively easy to you.

A. I never wrote an exam until I went to McGill University.

Q. Really?

A. No.

Q. What do you mean?

A. Well, in Boston, a real exam, a final exam. At high school we had a man by the name of Mr. Thompson who didn't believe in final examinations. He said they were spurious. He believed in examinations throughout the year. And, so, that's what we did. Then I went to Boston Universty. If you achieved a certain academic level, you didn't have to take the final exams.

Q. Your term papers and term assignments.

A. Term papers and term assignments. You didn't take the final examinations. You took the examinations throughout.

Q. Uh huh. Very interesting.

A. So that I'd never taken a final examination until I went to McGill University.

A. I found it a very harrowing experience, particularly with people walking up and down the aisles. This was never done. Never was done wherever I was.

Q. I used to, throughout my teaching career, every chance I got, I stopped final examinations. I tend completely to agree with that philosophy. Now, what did you do after Boston?

A. After Boston University I did take the -- was it two or four years, I can't remember just when I graduated from Boston University, '42 I think. So, it must've been four years. I was at Children's Hospital in charge of the surgical children's wards. From there, as soon as the war was over we were frozen because of the war. We couldn't move. And as soon as the war was over I left not knowing exactly what I wanted to do, but I thought I'd take six months at the Neurological Institute in Montreal. So I came up. When I got here I found that I had just about everything that they could teach me. The head of the Institute, the nursing head, said there's no sense you going through the regular stipulated course, you'll have to take the examination, but you can do anything you want in the time you're here for experience, which was fortunate. I was able to take a certain amount of time in X-ray, I took a certain amount in Electroencephalography, I took some time in the Biochemistry Laboratory; I took some time in the operating

(A. - cont'd.)

room, and I spent primarily, most of my time, in the Neurophysiological Laboratory under Jasper. (Q. Oh.) And it was interesting that Dr. Jasper, who was head of the Neurophysiology Laboratory, was head of Psychology at Bradley Home in Providence, Rhode Island, as psychologist when I was there. He didn't remember me but I remembered him, and he had gone on from psychology to neurophysiology, I guess it was, to neurophysiology, to medicine and to all the higher degrees; and I worked under him and Mary Roach at the Neurophysiological Laboratory.

Q. Was Bob Malmo already there?

A. Bob Malmo was at the Allen Memorial.

Q. Oh, yes, oh yes. That's different.

A. It's associated with the Royal Victoria.

Q. Well Jasper already was, I guess, at that time over there, already in China.

A. Yes, he already -- I think he had the chair in Neurophysiology at McGill. He had already taken a Doctor of Science at the Sorbonne or took it while I was there.

Q. Was the great surgeon . . .?

A. Oh yes. Dr. Wilder Penfield, one of the finest people, I think, I have ever known. Quiet, fair, not difficult, but a will of steel.

Q. And very human.

A. Very human, and very approachable.

Q. I encountered a widow whose husband had died as a result of a brain tumor that Penfield had operated on, and her description of Penfield's treatment of her when she was bereaved was a most touching account. It was human -- a very human interest in his patients.

A. He was kind. He saw to it that the patient got the very best of care.

Q. And his interest extended to relatives of the patient. Now, you were there six months -- what, at your own expense or paid?

A. No, at my own expense.

Q. By this time you had developed some resources which would enable you to go to a place like the Neurological Institute.

A. Yes. I didn't have an awful lot, but they did provide room and board. I had everything else I needed, and for six months -- well, that wasn't too long; you didn't need an awful lot of money. At the end of that time I knew . . .

Q. I take it -- before you go on, that, I take it, was an important element in your background of experience.

A. Very definitely. I knew by that time I was going to McGill University. (Q. Oh.) At least, I wanted to go to

(A. - cont'd.)

McGill University. I wanted to take psychology, so I went to Dr. Jasper and said this is what I'd like to do, and he recommended me. Fortunately I didn't read the calendar. So he said he would give me every recommendation. In the meantime my hospital had written to me, my own hospital had written to me, asking me if I would come back for the summer. They would give me a certain salary, and I said yes, I would. I went back and earned enough money, put my application in to McGill University . . .

Q. You went back to Rhode Island?

A. I went back to Rhode Island and took over the Children's Memorial . By the way, at Rhode Island before I left I had supervised the building and the setting up and the complete furnishings of the Children's Hospital . It was called the Potter Memorial. And so I was going back to this place that I had . . .

Q. Designed?

A. I'd helped design. I didn't design it but I'd helped design in the smaller aspects of size of rooms and size of elevators and kitchens, and all equipment was chosen by me, and furnishings, with the exception of the Memorial Room, which was done by the Rodin School of Design; and that was given by the Potter family. I went back to my own hospital and while I was there -- no, that was the second time; I went back to my own hospital, earned and saved $500 and made application

(A. - cont'd.)

to McGill University and was accepted, on the basis of Jasper's recommendation, into the Psychology Department.

Q. You say it was fortunate you hadn't read the calendar.

A. Had I read the calendar I wouldn't have applied. I didn't have the pre-qualifications for Psychology, the required academic courses.

Q. But on Dr. Jasper's recommendation they ignored that.

A. They ignored that because I had had, while I was at the Neuro I had taken courses in neurophysiology with the fellows, and anatomy with the fellow group. So they accepted me, and when I went to . . .

Q. Who did?

A. Dr. McLeod -- Dr. Robert McLeod.

Q. Oh, Robbie was there.

A. Robbie was there. I went in and talked to him when I went to McGill and I said well now, this is the situation. I know what I want to do, and I want to work with -- I think I want to work with lobotomies. Having seen what I have seen, I want to work with brain-damaged people; and he said,"Well, you're just the kind of person we want. This is the first year ." And he said, "You must take these courses,"

(A. - cont'd.)

and I said, "How long will it take me to make up my deficient courses and do a thesis?" "Oh," he said, "you can do it in a year." "But," he said, "you must take this list of courses and you must go around to every professor and you ask them if you might possibly be in their class," which seemed to me to be a bit ridiculous. They didn't know me and I didn't know them. Everyone said yes until I got to Hebb. He just looked at me and said, "How do I know?" He said, "If there's a space in my class you can have it." And I thought, "Well, if this is what I'm up against, I don't know." However, there was a space in his class and I got it. I became one of Hebb's students in that -- that was the first year. By the time -- by Christmas time I realized myself that I was not going to get through this material and do a thesis, so I opted to do it in two years. But I did get in without a qualifying year and without a graduate record.

Q. Graduate record exam.

A. Exam, yes. Without. I came to do . . .

Q. Now, this must have been '47.

A. '46.

Q. '46? Was Hebb there that early?

A. Yes, Hebb was there -- was it '46 or fall of '47? Fall of '47.

Q. I think he came in the fall of '47.

A. Yes, it was the fall of '47; but they waived these requirements -- why, I don't know, but they did, and by Christmas time I realized I had far more work to do than I could possibly accomplish in a year, so I went to Dr. McLeod and said "I won't attempt my thesis this year. I'll attend to class work"-- which I did. When it came to the thesis -- oh, that year I had to take experimental . . .

Q. With whom?

A. Hebb. I'll tell you about that in a minute. I had to take History of Psychology, which was done in seminar form with Dr. McLeod, and I took Statistics with George Ferguson. Now those were the three required courses. It seems to me there was another course I took, but I can't remember what it was. Now the experimental class was separated and eighteen were selected out and the rest went to -- the eighteen went to Hebb and the rest, which was a much larger class, went to George Ferguson, I think it was. Hebb's class was run on seminar form, and he paired us off and he gave us each a subject, whether we knew anything about psychology or not. We were given a subject and we had to go and look that subject up. We not only had to give a talk on it; we had to demonstrate it. Mine happened to be reflex, and I knew what reflex was, but that's all. It was pretty hard. At that time we had to make our own equipment. There was no buying any equipment. We had to make our own equipment.

(Beginning of Side 2, Tape 1. Level of recording so low that most of the first few minutes cannot be heard well enough to transcribe.)

A. . . . responsible for the knowledge of everyone else's subject, and at the end of that semester we were given the examination. Now I can't remember whether it was a graded or (rest unintelligible) . The second semester we had to do an original. It had to be written up finally in 200 words in an abstract form that was publishable. that the two of us did on closed circle (rest unintelligible) .

Q. Who was your colleague?

A. Calvert -- Martha Calvert. She happened to have taken drafting and was very good at it, and so drafted all the little cards that we used. Our first sampling was 50 -- 150, I'm sorry -- no, 50 of each, which made 150 on the triangle -- no, the arrowhead, I'm sorry; the arrowhead and the circle. Unfortunately we didn't randomize the people on the cards. We did one card - fifty and one card - fifty, one card - fifty, and so we made the graph and took it into Hebb. "Well," he said, "I'm very sorry. Looks very nice, but you've got to do it all over again. That's not any good." Trying to get subjects at that time was pretty awful. However, we redid the whole thing, randomizing the use of the cards and I made up the graph again. It was almost identical, so probably . . . I took them in to Hebb and he said, "Ruth, it's not good to be right," .

Q. Oh, that's very typical.

A. At the end of the class he sat and talked to us, the eighteen of us. Some of them were leaving for Harvard, some of them were staying at McGill, some of them were going into other disciplines, and he said to us, "You've all done exceedingly well. You all should pass, but you all won't. Eighteen is too many to go into the Ph.D. level, so some of you are going to fail." With that he walked out and was terribly surprised that we were upset. He never had a class that studied more, so at the end we all passed and he couldn't possibly fail any of them, but it was a pretty harrowing experience. And then there was the Ph.D.'s and . . .

Q. But not all of the eighteen.

A. Not all -- all of the eighteen passed psychology. Some of them went into other faculties. Some of them went into other universities, which Hebb advised if you had done undergraduate at McGill; he didn't want them unless it was a very special case.

Q. Well now, this course you describe in experimental with Hebb must have been an undergraduate course.

A. No, it was not. It was a graduate course. They had undergraduate, but as I said, I had missed it and I just had to make it all up myself.

Q. That's what led me to believe that it was an undergraduate course. Then it must have been before he used his seminar with the manuscript of his . . .

A. That was the second year he did that.

Q. Oh, you were in one of those . . .

A. I was in that, too, completely; all the way through with Hebb, and it was one of the, I think, best training I have ever seen for speaking, for criticizing and for summarizing work. By the time one finished that course one really could do it. You lose it as the time goes on, but the first part of the course was done by giving each individual certain things to read. You then had to present them in five minutes, the first session, five minutes, and present them, not only the content but a criticism, in five minutes. It was then thrown open to the class, but you were timed on it, you were stopwatched; and in four minutes you were given one minute to finish, and if you weren't finished you were cut off, so you learned to stopwatch yourself. And then everyone had to pounce on the . . .

Q. Had to?

A. Well, if you didn't you were needled. Hebb would needle if it was a small group, and if he found someone wasn't participating, he would needle you, so you had to read everyone else's work; and he would needle and he would needle and he would needle until you learned, you worked and you criticized or you

(A. - cont'd.)

commented or you did something on all these things.

Q. He would leap in with criticism of a presentation, would insist that members of the group . . .?

A. Members of the group do it. Oh, he sometimes would contribute. If it was good he'd say so, if it wasn't very good he'd say so, if you weren't doing it quite right he would tell you what you were doing wrong, so it was a good training seminar. That was the first half of the year.

Q. Was he caustic at all?

A. Hebb was always caustic. He was one of the most caustic people at a verbal level I have ever known, but never realized what this was doing, because he was the kindest individual underneat that caustic exterior that -- he was always the one who went around to see if students had enough money, quietly. He was always the one to see if there were problems, always; but at a verbal level he was very caustic, but you came to learn that with Hebb you returned all he sent. He didn't wish you to sit and take it; he wanted you to criticize him too, to come right straight up to him, or else he just didn't bother, but this was his way of teaching.

Q. Not everybody has -- not all of his students would have the temperament that would enable them to do that. I imagine some of them must have been seriously hurt.

A. Some fell by the wayside. Others just sort of, I guess -- I don't know whether they changed or whether they endured until they finished their Master's level; but if you got to know Hebb, then you realized that it was a surface thing, and he was well worth knowing, was Don Hebb, in all respects: as a scholar, as an individual, as a person. He was well worth knowing, and it's always been a great joy to me to have been one of his students, really.

Q. And you were one of the ones, out of that group of eighteen, you were accepted for the Ph.D. program.

A. I survived, and I only survived because he said, "I'm not going to take you for Ph.D. work" one afternoon. So I said, "You're not?" He said, "No." And I said, "Why not?" He said, "I have never had a woman in my laboratory." So I said, "So?" And he said, "And besides, I don't know what I'd do with you when you finished." He said, "There's no place at present for women in psychology in Canada." And so I said, "That's none of your business. I don't consider that is your problem; that is my problem." And he said, "Well, I consider that I must help my students to get placed," and I said, "Well, that's not your problem, that's my problem. Am I qualified to go on? Do you think I'm qualified to go on? Do you think I'm of the calibre that could do Ph.D. work?" He said, "You are." I said, "Then you've no right to refuse me." And this went on for a full afternoon; a whole afternoon Hebb and I argued back and forth, until he finally said (shouting), "You're accepted!"

Q. Oh, that's beautiful!

A. And from then on he never treated me in any way any differently, with the exception of one thing. I had to do everything the boys had to do. I had to clean my own cages, I had to do everything. I had to learn to use the power tools in the basement. I had to make my own equipment, but one thing, he'd never let me go down and use the power tools alone. I used to say, "Let me learn to use them. Why don't you leave me alone?" That was the only difference.

Q. So he was still feeling a little protective.

A. Well, he was feeling a little protective in that I do something to power tools. But I had to learn to use them and I had to make my own equipment, and I had to compete -- there was no question about that; and then after that there were several that came along, right after that .

Q. That debate you had with Don is currently a very hot debate that's going on in psychology again because of the prospective unemployment, and there are those who think that because there has been a shut-down in the academic employment market, graduate departments should restrict their admission for Ph.D.'s because we are going to have far more of them than we need, at least in the academic market; and there are others who take the opposite position, who claim that we should not, as you said to Don, it's none of our business. It's up to the students. If they want to go on, provided they know it'll be tough to get a job, that's up to them. And you would be on the expansive side.

A. Well, I wouldn't say expansive, but I would say women should be given the same opportunity that men have. I would say that if jobs are difficult to come by, then the total number should be cut down, but not necessarily female-male.

Q. Oh, no.

A. The total number of students, not just . . .

Q. I don't think there's any discussion of that.

A. Oh, I thought you said the same thing.

Q. No, now it's more general. There's not a suggestion that it should be cut on a sex basis at all, but that admissions should be restricted because we're leading -- otherwise we're leading people up the garden path, and of the output, well, we're going to have a hell of a time . . .

A. I don't know, really. I think it's a subject that needs a lot of study before one could really answer that question. Many students are not going to stay here, many will, and many will come in. It's a situation that exists today in nursing, and it's a very bad situation. It's one that's occurred only within the past few years with the instigation of these two-year courses, and I was talking to a nurse recently and she said that they're just doing anything but nursing, and I just wonder what they would have done if they had taken something different, or why they don't change their field of endeavor.

Q. Well, that's a side track. Let's get back to McGill, and you must have done some work, although Hebb was dominant throughout your Ph.D. program . . .

A. Yes. I did my early work with Ross on electro-shock therapy and -- not therapy, but the effects of electric shock on the brain, and I did it in rats and (spoken too softly to hear) .

Q. At McGill, in the McGill lab, and not at . . . ?

A. Oh no, no. It was not done with treatment. It was done primarily with the physiological effects on the rat.

Q. Well, this would be at least related to Hebb's . . .

A. Oh, very definitely -- brain damage. It was -- yeah.

Q. Who else at McGill?

A. That's the only one -- he's the only one I really worked with for experimental work.

Q. Well now, tell us about Robbie McLeod.

A. Robbie McLeod was only there one year, as I recall. It seems to me he was there one year and then Hebb took over the second year. I had Robbie McLeod in a seminar in the History of Psychology. He was very good in it, very, very good. He was a very gentle, pleasant individual, a very good teacher. But that was the only thing I ever had with him.

Q. How did his humanism and Gestalt leanings fit with Hebb's?

A. Oh, they were quite different people. Hebb had both theory and a down-to-earth approach to things, whereas I think McLeod's was a little bit more ethereal, I'd say.

Q. I once was a discussant with Ray Smith at a meeting out West, a discussant of one of Robbie's papers, and of course in my discussion I said something to the effect that behind this eminent scholar I detect lurking in the background something of a mystic.

A. Yes, he was .

Q. And he got up and he said "I don't want to be called a mystic."

A. Yes, he was that type of individual. He was never a harsh man; he was always a very gentle man, and a gentleman as well.

Q. Yes, yes. What about George Ferguson?

A. George was a very well organized teacher, exceedingly well organized. He was a very well prepared lecturer, and if you borrowed his notes, even his side comments were in them. He had prepared them beautifully, and he was an excellent teacher, was George, a very good teacher; and I think he came to be a very good manager as well at McGill, from what I gather.

Q. Yes, but his statistics book has been very successful as a result of his self-organization.

A. Well, he was. He was a very, very well organized individual in his work. He was very forgetful. He was a theorist, no question, but he was an excellent teacher, just an excellent teacher.

Q. Who else was at McGill?

A. Subec? was there.

Q. Oh yes. (Machine apparently turned off briefly - next remark cut off at beginning.)

A. . . . with the difficulty.

Q. John kept writing me, just before he died, a series of scribbled letters exhibiting not only deep depression -- he felt that he was being persecuted by students who were writing editorials in the student paper about the brain-washing that they claimed he was doing for the Department of Defence; but these letters were of a sort that made me very concerned about his state of health, and I was very relieved when he said in one of these that he had placed himself under psychiatric care, but in spite of this he did away with himself.

A. He never seemed, from the time I knew him, a happy man, never, and I wondered if it were other things in his life, really, rather than his psychology, because I never thought his marriage was happy.

Q. I don't know about that.

A. It might have been, but I don't know. It just -- when I saw them together it never seemed that it was a happy situation.

Q. Well, he had a father, he had a father that he worshipped, long since dead; but John had many very interesting aspects to his career. One of them was playing the stock market very successfully. Another was playing the horses, also successfully, and much of his motivation in doing this kind of thing was to establish a scholarship in memory of his father. Now I frankly don't know the extent to which his apparent unhappiness was a cultural thing.

(Both speak simultaneously - unintelligible.)

A. . . . at McGill, I found, I think unreasonably so. I mean, he gave the appearance of never being a happy person, not happy because of his position but a basically happy (unhappy?) person -- very driving . . .

Q. Yes - oh, incredibly.

A. . . . of everybody including himself.

Q. Yes, that's right.

A. He never expected of someone else what he didn't give.

Q. That's right. Well, anyway, was he on staff?

A. He was on the staff, yes.

Q. And did you take any -- do any work with him?

A. I don't recall taking any classes with John. He was in the laboratory when I was there and he was -- he participated in seminars, but I don't think I ever had a class with John. I think John did mostly undergraduate work, didn't he, when he first came to McGill. / (Q.: Probably.) He was a relatively new . . .

Q. Binder hadn't arrived yet . . .

A. Oh yes, Binder was there.

Q. Oh, was he?

A. Yes. Binder was there. Now, did I take classes with Binder? It seems to me I did.

Q. Well, it doesn't matter whether you took classes with him (rest obscured by A's remarks) .

A. No, I don't think I did, but he again was very well received, and he was very good, too. Very good.

Q. Talk a bit about the alleged bifurcation of the department at McGill in the early fifties -- alleged from outside, based on stories that former students told us, that there were two classes of students: an elite that worked with Hebb and his colleagues, and then the second-class citizens that went to Webster.

A. Well, it wasn't primarily those who went to Webster; it was primarily those who elected to do clinical, that's all. It wasn't those -- it wasn't necessarily based on the individual; it was based on the fact that they didn't have sense enough to do the theory before they did the clinical. That's true. I don't know as they were called second-class citizens; they were just considered -- I suppose that's as good a description . . . (Q. speaks - unintelligible.) They just weren't the worthy -- those who took clinical.

Q. In terms of staff, who's who? The ones on the Hebb, on the theoretical-experimental hardnosed side there'd be Hebb, Binder, Ferguson -- would that be true?

A. Yes, that was true.

Q. Who's on the soft, clinical side?

A. Well, I never knew where Lukens stood, really.

Q. He was an irascible type, wasn't he?

A. He was. He was very difficult, Lukens was. He was one of these -- he was very bright, but he couldn't separate his bright ideas from his non-bright ideas. He had a very difficult time. They would just pour out of him, but he had no ability to separate them. He wanted to manipulate students and to get them to do what he wanted them to do, and I had an idea about -- I've forgotten what it was, but it was doing something in a socio-psychological milieu of a small class project and, I don't know, I just happened

(A. - cont'd.)

to think of it, and I said -- I asked him about it and he said "That would be good," and he kept at me and at me -- "You do it and I'll write it up," so I said I'm not going to even do it now, because I wouldn't allow him to do that. If I do anything I should write my own material, and I finally had to go to Hebb and tell him I refused to take any more classes with Lukens; I couldn't tolerate it, and he said "I don't care whether you take classes or not." He said, "You just have to pass the exam, and not for the -- but the final exam. I don't care what you do." And Hebb never insisted on you taking any course except statistics, experimental, and -- what was the other one? And one other; I've forgotten what it was. Those were absolute basics. But he said "I don't care whether you take any class or not," he said, "you just have to pass the exam."

Q. I understand that -- I gather that you weren't the only one who had -- was up against this problem with Lukens.

A. Oh no, a lot of the students were. A lot of the students withstood it. I was older and I think that was to my advantage in that I felt a little bit more secure in taking a stand on these things than some of the students that were just coming out of undergraduate work and had never done anything else; so I didn't hesitate, if I didn't like something, to say so, and I just couldn't tolerate Lukens' teaching. He was an enthusiastic man, he had lots of ideas, but he tried to push it down, you know, until you wanted to just jump out of your skin almost sometimes in class. We had a lot of difficulty with him. So I never knew

(A. - cont'd.)

where he stood, and I never knew where Pat Solberg stood, either.

Q. Pat?

A. Solberg.

Q. Solberg. I didn't know him at all.

A. No, a girl -- woman. She was a rather bright woman but a very strange woman. I didn't get along with her exactly. And Wrigley -- I guess Wrigley was statistics. He must have been hard-nosed. And there were other people there but I can't remember who they were, for teaching clinical . . . (Name, unintelligible) I've forgotten, but there were other people on the clinical side.

Q. My studies of eminence in psychology have led me to guess that of equal or even greater importance in the development of an effective psychological career than one's teachers are one's colleagues in advanced graduate work. Who were your colleagues?

A. Goodness. Sam Rabinovitch I remember very well.

Q. Did you know Sam is seriously ill?

A. No, I didn't.

Q. Did you know that Dan Berline died ten days ago?

A. Oh no, I didn't. In fact, there was something recently that I was looking at that had Dan Berline's name on it. Was it a sudden death?

Q. No. After two years and three operations, abdominal surgery, he just faded away.

A. I see. Well, wasn't he one of the directors still at C.P.A. or something? He's on the list somewhere.

Q. Oh, he's supposed to be -- was one of our two representatives to I.U.P.S., but he was supposed to go to Paris for a conference but he couldn't make it.

A. Well, what's wrong with Sam? I was thinking of him the other day, as a matter of fact.

Q. Abdominal cancer

A. Well now, his wife was also a colleague. Leila Ghent -- I'd forgotten Leila

Q. I remember the name.

A. Leila Ghent, and she was very bright. And then there was a coloured girl from Howard -- Vera . . . Isn't that funny, I can't remember her name. She was quite bright too, a nice person. Craig Mooney was there.

Q. What about Craig?

A. Well, Craig was never any different than he ever was. I mean, he was just the same at McGill as he was whenever you -- whenever anyone saw him. He was just the same sort of person.

Q. Dilettante?

A. Yes, dilettante, bright, unhappy . . .

Q. Discontented?

A. Discontented, bitter, whatever was going on or whatever he was doing. It was to me such a terrible waste. He had so many talents -- a terrible, terrible waste. Craig was there, Rusty Wendt was there. (Q. Oh yes.) Bob Wake was there. Um, Pym was there, in the undergraduate, and in the Master's level, June Pym.

Q. Who had the most influence on you?

A. None of the students at all. (Q. No?) No, not really. Hebb was the one. Oh, Ron Forgues was there, and then that other chap, that funny chap. He hated the place like mad -- great big heavy-set chap in clinical or personnel or something or other. I've forgotten what he ended up in. You'd know him if I could -- he was there. He always used to amuse me no end. He always used to pick his rats up in the court? Oh dear. I can't remember his name. Sam, Ron Forgues was there. Um . . . Woody Herron was there.

Q. Oh yes. I've got a beautiful tape from Sam.

A. Have you?

Q. his childhood, his growing up in the ghetto of Montreal -- it's just fascinating.

A. He was a wonderful person, really, Sam was. I can remember when we had a pigeon to do some work on, and we all loathed that pigeon. I don't know why, but we just loathed the pigeon. When it was all finished Sam said, "I'm going to make a pigeon pie." So he said to me, "May I use your apartment to make the pigeon pie?" and I said "Be my guest," so he went home and made the pigeon pie and brought it over to the laboratory and we all the pigeon pie.

Q. Vented your spleen.

A. Well, his wife -- I can't remember her name, either -- was there.

Q. I thought you said that was -- her name was Leila Kent (Ghent?).

A. No, no. Oh no. Leila Ghent was married to a chap at Allen Memorial. His name was Ghent -- a psychiatrist, I think. He was there. He was .

Q. The other gal who married a psychiatrist.

A. Dine -- Dean -- I know who you mean.

Q. Muriel . . .

A. Muriel Stern.

Q. Stern -- was she there?

A. She was there part of the time, yes. I understand she's divorced, is that correct?

Q. Yes, she went through a very bad couple of years. . .

A. Did she?

Q. . . . breaking away, but now claims to be herself.

A. Well, that's good. She's at McGill still, isn't she? She's on staff, isn't she? (Q. Oh, yes, yes.) Now he was -- wasn't he -- he was a practicing psychiatrist, wasn't he?

Q. Yes. I did my tape of her -- I said, as I said to you, "What did your father do?" and she said "He was a robber."

A. I always say my father was a horse thief.

(Beginning of Tape #2. Again, the first minute or so is recorded at such a low level that it can hardly be heard.)

Q. Let's go back now. How did (rest unintelligible)

A. Tom Cook came down looking for someone as his assistant, and Hebb called me in, knowing that I'd had quite a lot of experience in administration, and asked me if I'd like to try for the job, and he told me what it was -- which it wasn't; that was what Tom told me -- and I said "yes, I think it might be rather interesting," and so I did and was accepted right away; and I -- as I say, I then took my boards, and Hebb made me rewrite that page on my thesis. He just didn't like the way it was written,

(A. - cont'd.)

that's all. He just did not like the way it was written, and I said if he'd stayed home and supervised me, I wouldn't have been in this mess. He had been away all year, you know, and I had really no supervision that year at all for my thesis, and he was very -- he's very good at putting a lot into a little in writing, and he expected his students to do this, you see. And of course we were never as good as he was, but he finally insisted I do it, and I finally did it.

Q. What -- you did it after you'd moved to Ottawa?

A. After I'd moved to Ottawa, yes.

Q. And, uh -- talk a bit about Tom Cook.

A. Well, Tom was a -- how should I say it? -- very easy-going but not as muddled as people thought he was. Tom had his own ideas of administration, which were different from Whit Morton's, and Tom felt by doing certain things his way he'd finally get them across, and many of these things looked muddled to people, and I said to someone "This is organized disorganization," which it was with Tom, but very difficult for someone to work with, except Tom would always take it in good spirit when you'd chew him out - always. I sort of came between -- was the in-between man with Tom and Whit in that Tom would go in and Whit would give him a job to do and tell him how to do it, and Tom would come and give me the job to do and tell me how to do it. I would subsequently have to present

(A. - cont'd.)

the job, not to Tom but to Whit, and of course it would not be as Whit had dictated it; and after a few times doing this and finding out that it wasn't exactly as he wanted, I thought "There's something going wrong here." So I said . . .

Q. Was communication . . .

A. Well, Tom was telling me how he wanted it to be done, thinking he'd get his way this way. After a certain length of time I said to Tom, "If I'm going to have a job to do that Whit gives you to do, then I'm going to be in on the initial instructions or I'm not going to do it." I said, "I'm not going to take this 'It's wrong' or 'That's not the way I wanted it done.' I want to know first hand." And he just chuckled. He gave in. He always would if you caught him out on something like that, but he was a good man to work with and he was very kind and very knowledgeable in his own area.

Q. Easy-going is, I take it, the description not just of his attitude toward other people but his attitude toward himself.

A. He wasn't as easy-going as people think. He got very tense underneath this, which he never took out on anyone either verbally or any other way, but one would notice it if they knew Tom well -- one, by his smoking, which was cigarette, cigarette; and two was a tremor, and you would see Tom begin, when he was getting very tense, his hand would begin to have a tremor. He wasn't quite as easygoing under all this as people seemed to

(A. - cont'd.)

think. He did take things seriously, and he worked very hard himself. Ah . . .

Q. But he didn't . . .

A. He didn't push anyone.

Q. . . . push himself.

A. He didn't push himself, either, but when he got to the point where he wasn't -- or people were criticizing him too much or he wasn't living up to what he thought -- you'd note this increase in smoking and you'd note this increase in tremor and a general sort of tension about him. He would never -- he wouldn't give instructions to anyone. He was a laissez-faire individual unless it was something peculiar like this division of thought between his way to operate and Whit's way to operate. Which was right and which was wrong, I don't think was a question. It was just a matter of two different opinions, that's all. But if you had to present it to the one who was going to make judgment, then you had to do it the way he wanted it.

Q. You knew, of course, that Whit (rest unintelligible)

A. Well, Whit of course is a relative of Bill's family, you know. (Q. Oh?) Whit's mother and Bill's mother are cousins.

Q. Oh, really? (A. Yes.) Oh, so you . . .

A. Yes, (sounds like "by the rote" - a name?)

Q. I remember the time that Tom replaced me when I went overseas, and he was such an unsuccessful -- you observed this -- he was such an unsucessful undergraduate teacher . . .

A. Oh, he wouldn't be a good teacher.

Q. . . . and then much later on, in I suppose the late fifties, somebody came to us and said, would we take Tom on and put him with Al Sheppard to see if some of his stuff couldn't be brought the publication stage, and we did; and of all the people to put him with, Al Sheppard was the least likely to be productive.

A. Well, Al -- they were trying to get Tom to make Al productive. That was the point.

Q. Well, when you put two unproductive people together . .

A. You're not getting production, no. True enough. Well, the agreement with Tom on that was if Tom would take this two or three years at Halifax, they would then allow him to work somewhere on his transfer of training and they would pay him a certain salary, and this was what Tom wanted to get back to, you see. (Q. Yes.) The point came up that there could only be one of us in headquarters and they said, well naturally, Ruth would have to go to the laboratory. Well, Tom didn't like administration, really. He really did not like administration, (Q. No, no.) and he was wanting to get -- he couldn't go to the laboratory; there was no place now in the laboratories for him. He needed to have a place of his own, and he wanted to do his own research, so

(A. - cont'd.)

Whit called me in one day and said "I guess we'll send you to the laboratories," and I said "What for?" and he said, "Well, we can only have one person here," and I said "Well that's not a good reason to send me to the laboratories." So again, another half day of arguing, and I said "Just remember, I had been trained in administration before I came to you," and I said "I have now a good reputation here. I'm not so sure if I went to the laboratory, and the kind of laboratory you've got there, that I would have something I could work on really successfully. I can work successfully here." "Well that will always be remembered." I said, "Oh no, your recommendation comes from your last job, Whit, just remember that." So we argued and we argued and we argued. "Well you've been here so many years." I said "Jones has been here seven; that's three more years than I've been here." I said "You want to send someone, send him." And so this went on all day and I said "I'm just not going, Whitney, that's all there is to it." I'd already -- the first year I was at the Defence? Research Board I'd been offered a job down in the U.S., to come down to one of their granting agencies, but I felt I had an obligation taking the job and staying more than a year, so I thought I can always go to the U.S. I still was not a citizen at that time, and I said "I'm just not going to go and that's all there is to it." So finally he gave up and said "Let's go home and have a sherry." So they had to have someone in the laboratory at Halifax, and it was a place where Tom liked to be -- in the Maritimes -- so he

(A. - cont'd.)

said he would take that for three years if they would then guarantee him a place somewhere to do his own research, and with Al working on this, and he said he wanted to work with Al. (Q. Yeah.) They said well, they'd ask, and of course we'd been trying to get publications out of Al Sheppard, you know, and it was just like trying to get coal out of a rock pile; you couldn't get them. Nice person, but that was the story behind it.

Q. There's an interesting contrast between your story of what happened and my story, because from my point of view taking Tom Cook into Al's laboratory was said to be for the purpose of getting Tom to be productive, but you've got exactly the opposite story. That's interesting.

A. It's the opposite story, actually, because they were trying -- we were trying to get publications out of Al, and as you know we had meeting after meeting after meeting with him and we couldn't get them, and they said well, if they put Tom there Tom was interested in his work and probably they could get together and get publications out.

Q. It didn't work.

A. No. Well, Tom didn't have to be productive, you see, on the Research Board because in administration there was no way to be. Down in Halifax I never knew what he did. I never did know what he did, so I just more or less stayed away from there. He was with the Navy, and it's very

difficult working in those situations, it really is, unless you're pretty hard-nosed and Tom was not hard-nosed, as you know.

Q. No, he wasn't, he was a very well liked . . .

A. Very well liked, yes, very well liked.

Q. Socially a very friendly, sociable person, but ah . . . Now along about here some time you became Secretary-Treasurer of C.P.A. When was that?

A. Was it '64 to '66 or was it '66 to '68? '64 to '66.

Q. That late? Oh.

A. Yes, it was that late.

Q. I thought it was some time in the fifties.

A. No, it was in the sixties. It was after I was married, because Bill was doing the running and for two solid years I didn't have a lunch hour. I worked on C.P.A. stuff -- I'd be up at five o'clock in the morning and work on C.P.A. stuff, I worked at noon-time, I worked at night; and Bill would go over in the evening to that rat's hole and collect the stuff, because it wasn't safe for me to be over there. He would collect all the stuff that the secretary had got, or made up, and he said to me then "If you people live in a rat's hole, that's the way you're going to be treated," and I said "Well, we're moving out of there as soon as I can find a place," and so I went over to

(A. - cont'd.)

Mr. Beach, who owned this apartment house. I'd been to his man who ran the place, whatever they call them -- superintendent of the apartment house -- and, oh, he gave me a long story, so I just thought well, I'm not going to get anywhere this way, so I went to Mr. Beach, who owned several apartment houses and I said "This is my story," I said, "I need an office. I need it close to the Defence Research Board. I need two rooms and I've only got so much money," and I knew that his apartments were letting for more than $225, and I said "I can pay you $225, and I need that sort of combination," so he said "All right, we'll give you this apartment on the second floor." I said "There'll be no coming and going except the secretary and myself and probably the odd person, so there'll be no wear and tear. There'll be little wear and tear on the kitchen equipment because we might have lunch, again we might not. We don't know." And I said "That's all of it." So I went to get the apartment; the superintendent tried to put me in a little place on the first floor with the secretary, with a bulge in the kitchen -- no, a bulge in the office I was to have which came from the furnace room, and I said "No way. Mr. Beach promised me the one upstairs." So he said "Well, all right." So upstairs we went, and he said "I'm going to take the kitchen equipment out," and I said "No, you're not." I said "I was promised the apartment as it is." So therefore I got it for $225, and my secretary or the secretary who was in the office at the time said "How did you get that?" I said "I went and told him what I'd pay for it." She said

"I pay almost as much as that for a bachelor." And she came to me and she said, "Was your rent raised?" I said "No." She said "Mine was raised ten percent (laughing - unintelligible)" " . . . I told him I couldn't pay it," and I said he kind of wants us and the psychiatric department in there and he wouldn't mind having more offices in there, this kind of office, because of the lack of wear and tear. (Q. Yeah, yeah.) So that's how we got it.

Q. Well, go back and tell me about the rat-hole.

A. The rat-hole was a little tiny hole that Blair had got and had done very well with, with no money if you remember. He had a secretary only part time, who had a filing system that was in her head. His wife had made curtains for it and any of the extra little things, Blair had done himself, and it was situated over a grocery store over in a part of town that was a little bit run down, I must say, and I worked there for a short period of time but I couldn't be there after dark without someone with me.

Q. That's why Bill had . . .

A. Well, Blair had told me, yes, Blair had told me. He said "I wouldn't advise you to go alone at night," and he said "I wouldn't advise you to be in the building alone at any time." Well, some Sundays I've gone, but usually we brought the work home, and I was only there a short time. I just said

(A. - cont'd.)
"I just can't cope under those circumstances because, one, I don't have the time to go over there, and in this way I can work noon-time," and I was a wreck by the -- I think it was '64 - '66 that I was secretary-treasurer.

Q. Two years?

A. Two years.

Q. I thought it was longer.

A. No, I told them when I took it I would do it -- well, I was just married, as you know, in '60. I had two kids, a large house. I had a -- my job was at that time very . . .

Q. I thought it was before you were married.

A. No, no. And it was a time when I was travelling a great deal, it was a time when my job was very demanding, and I was exhausted, and I said no way would I take it, and they said "You'll have to get someone." I said "That's not my job. I'll try but it's not my job," but we finally convinced Sloan to take it after that.

Q. How did it come about that you were persuaded to take the job?

A. Blair - Blair wanted out. (Q. Yeah.) He'd had it long enough and I didn't blame him and I thought that he had done an exceedingly good job with what he had work with, (Q. Yeah.)

(A. - cont'd.)
and he had very little and he was one of those who were brought up on a shoestring in psychology, just as Hebb was, you know; we had to do everything on a shoestring, (Q. Yes.) and I said I was tired of doing things on a shoestring, that I didn't think it was quite that necessary any longer, and I couldn't do it.

Q. Well, we're back into a penny-pinching phase again, and that can make it very difficult for everybody.

A. It does make it difficult. It makes it exceedingly difficult. They finally loosened up - things were a little bit better after a while and it was easier to work, but I thought two years was as long as I could cope . . .

Q. My impression was that you were . . .

A. No. I was active in the society practically all the time in some way or other up until I retired, and then coming out here -- well, you know there's not really much interest in psychology out here. . .

Q. Well, certainly . . .

A. . . . and so I didn't particularly want to be associated -- we'd had it.

Q. Well now, what else should we cover? We've uh -- I was astonished when I taped Whit Morton that he felt that during the war he had been double-crossed by Bill Lyon by being sent over

(Q. - cont'd.)

to persuade Jim Harg to do things the Ottawa way. Do you know anything about that story?

A. No I don't.

Q. I haven't heard that from anybody else. Do you know Jim?

A. Very well, as a matter of fact, and he and Lyon, of course, got along like two grizzlies. (Q. Yeah, yeah.) Two grizzlies, and uh, (Q. Well, anybody . .) I remember him saying something about Whit coming over to do the -- he said "silly ass" or something like that, "Do you think I'd do anything Bill Lyon said?"

Q. Anybody who tries to persuade Jim Harg should do it some other way.

A. He's still living, you know. (Q. Oh, yes.) He's still writing. I thought he was long since dead. In fact, I used to write to him every Christmas, and when he came to Ottawa he always came to visit me, and all of a sudden the cards stopped, and the last card came back, and then within these past few months I had a paper from him on management, (Q. OH?) so I wrote back and I said "Dear Jim, very nice to hear you are writing. I thought you were six foot under." I thought he was, you know. He had a bad heart, or did have when I knew him in Montreal. (Q. Yes.) He had, um, I felt somehow that he had an aneurysm, but that may be wrong, or he's living on borrowed

(A. cont'd.)

time now. Well, he must be close to eighty.

Q. Oh yes, he must be, but my belief is that he still operates a consulting office in Montreal, although . . .

A. Well, I really don't know whether he does or not. He lives in Rigaud. He was a very down-to-earth, sensible individual clinically when you talked to him, when you went -- a very down-to-earth individual, and did a lot of good assessment, really, of people -- (Q. Yes.) a lot of good assessment.

Q. And the whole Canadian H.Q. overseas -- it was a totally different (A. Was it?) problem than it was in Ottawa. But of the -- who of the veteran psychologists that we haven't talked about had you gotten to know and formed impressions of?

A. (First few words unintelligible) . . . psychology for so long, Roger, I seem to forget people.

Q. What about George Hunsberger?

A. I never knew him. (Q. Oh.) I think I ran across him once, and as I recall, he was acting the fool? He was in England at the time. Is that the one?

Q. Yes, he was for Oxford.

A. And then another chap who was at McGill when I went there to apply. I don't think he was there the following year, or if he was, he was only there sort of as a ghost. His name was, uh, ...

Q. I know who you mean, a gentleman.

A. They said he was a very great gentleman, but very ill.

Q. . . . second to Tate. (A. Tate.) Very poor -- oh, you're talking about Tate, are you?

A. Tate, that's the name.

Q. Oh, I thought it was Sell[?], his assistant, who was also ill.

A. I don't know him, but Tate I think I -- well, maybe it's his assistant I'm talking about. I may not have known Tate. It may have been his assistant. All I can remember is, he was a very drawn and haggard individual.

Q. Yes. He apparently was a terrible lecturer, but very good individually with students.

A. Well, I never knew him. As I said, he was like a ghost. You'd see him come and go, and someone said he was on the staff. Now, that's all I happen to know of him. And let me see, who were the others?

Q. Well, Bott . . .

A. Well, Bott, yes. He was a very fine individual, was Bott. Bott's performance I can always remember in meetings. I thought, when I first went to DRB, Bott was senile, but they

(A. - cont'd.)

said "Bott's been acting like that since he was seven." I can remember my first assignment when I went to DRB. It was a very nasty one, and that was to evaluate Blotz's work, which was horrible. (Q. Oh, gee.) That was my first assignment. No one else would do it. Well, of course I didn't know Blotz very well, and so I didn't know what Blotz -- well, I didn't care, anyway. So I made an evaluation and I went and I talked to Blotz and I talked to that chap who worked with him - Mike . .

Q. Graco.

A. Graco, and I thought he wasn't bright. I don't know whether he was or not, but I didn't really think Mike was very bright. I thought he was a very hard-working man but not bright, (Q. Not bright.) and I talked to him and he talked about this formula he had for insecurity, and then he said, "Of course you know security and insecurity are not reciprocal, but" he said "the reciprocal of the security formula gave us numbers to work with the insecurity." You know, by the time I got finished I was whirling, so I came back and I thought, this is not good statistics, but since I'm not a real expert in statistics I think I'd better send it to the statisticians; so I sent the theory and a lot of the statistics along to a statistician, and he wrote back exactly the same criticism I had independently made of it. So I thought, well he's a statistician and he's a good one. He was -- Main, he name was, and he was a very good statistician.

(A. - cont'd.)

I thought, well, he doesn't know anything about psychology. Now I'll send it to Smith, George Smith. Now,he was a biostatistician and knew something of the -- he wrote back the same thing that Main did. So I wrote up my criticism and I went to the Board meeting. I can remember it very well. The Board meeting -- not the Board meeting, the committee meeting -- Psychiatry Committee . . .

Q. Psychology.

A. Psychology? Yes, the Advisory Committee on Psychology. They were meeting and I was to present this criticism; Tom, with his tongue in his cheek, knowing exactly what I was going to say; so I got up and -- Blotz was applying for a, oh I don't know . . .

Q. A very substantial . . .

A. A very substantial sum of money, and I said he shouldn't get it. So I got up and gave this criticism, and Toronto turned out in absolutely full force - they never had before - and I got up and gave this criticism and Bill Lyon said to me, he said, "You're from McGill, aren't you?" I said "Yes I am." He said "I know it." They gave lots of money, and then Blotz and I corresponded for years over that money, because Blotz got, at that time, that same year, a hundred thousand dollars, I think, from another agency, or the next year from another agency; and he wanted to put our

(A. - cont'd.)
money in with it and I said, no, he couldn't do it. It just was not feasible, just could not be done. And so I don't think he ever used the money; I've forgotten what the money was used for -- it was used for something, because you didn't take money back.

Q. He got four years of support.

A. Well, Boyce? had support from -- what was it, the Mental Fund?

Q. Twenty-five thousand a year from National Health and Welfare on a Mental Health grant. (A. Yes.) It was bundled through . . .

A. Yes, but he was substantial then, at any rate. (Q. Yes.) And I said no, he couldn't do that, and so we argued back and forth for years, and I forget what the money was finally used for. But they said "What are we going to do about this statistics?"- Mike did. I said "You'd better start all over again." This went on for years, true, you know, and finally it just sort of petered out. They never gave him any money after that; but he was a wonderful person, a wonderful lecturer, but he would never let you ask him questions. (Q. Oh boy.) Oh and he could field them! I went just for the amusement to listen to him, because he was a very amusing and a very bright lecturer too.

Q. Oh my, yes. He was a very bright person.

A. He was bright and he was entertaining and he was a delight to talk to. I loved to go talk to him because no matter what you said, it didn't make any difference, you know, (Q. Yes.) but Mike got very disturbed, but I never felt he was very bright.

Q. No, I don't think so either, but since Bernhardt died he's been the acting and still is director of the Institute.

A. Well,if you're in the right place at the right time, mind you, that makes a lot of difference, it really does.

Q. It's been disastrous for the Institute.

A. Has it? (Q. Oh yes.) Well, I'm not surprised. If you put someone like that at the head of something you're going to get disaster.

Q. Among Blotz's failures or weaknesses was that he never could tolerate a bright second, and . . .

A. Well, that's not unusual. If he can't tolerate questions he wouldn't tolerate (too low to hear) . Now another person, of course, is Bromley. I think he gave a lot to psychology in his area, in the area he (Q., coughing: Yeah.) and he is another man whom people considered brusque and harsh on themselves but he had a very soft heart.

Q. Well, one would never guess that from . . .

A. He was very soft-hearted, that's right, and he's a very human individual. I'll never forget my first introduction to him with his family, and his family then were two little boys and they still live -- the younger one has just moved from Victoria and they still live with me (him?). He's gone to the States, in fact I had a letter from his wife saying they were -- well then one was about eighteen months and the other was a couple of years old, and he had been working with this man and went home and these two children crawled up his front and down his back. I changed my opinion -- he was quite a different person. He's as soft at the core as he can be.

Q. I didn't meet his boys until they were much older, and Reg typically was making sure that they were well trained in self defense and he had them going to karate classes and so on. Do you remember the time when Reg was limping all over the place because one of his sons had thrown him?

A. Well, I can remember Reg wanting the children not only to take -- it was judo, by the way; karate's out -- swimming lessons? and he talked about it as if it was dancing lessons (laughing - unintelligible) . He said "I certainly want them to be proficient in all these things." And then he wanted them to go to a country schoolhouse.

Q. Yeah, and so he built way out of town.

A. . . . to a country schoolhouse, and Reg was a laissez-faire parent at first, and you should never hurt their

(A. - cont'd.)

little egos with a wallop on the tail. A child went to school and he said "I almost got the strap today." He said, "How did this happen?" He said "I didn't do my work and I had to stay in at recess and the principal came in and he saw me, and he said 'What are you doing here?', and I said 'I didn't do my work and they kept me in at recess.' He said 'If you don't do it by the end of recess I'm going to give you the strap.'" And Reg said "What did you do?" He said "I did my work." He said "From then on I realized their little egos were (unintelligible). And then of course there was Blair.

Q. Before you leave Bromley, did you know that when I taped Reg and he had moved from the lab to Ottawa, and you can imagine how Reg would go on, which he did. I finally had to

(End of Side 1, Tape 2.)

(First 2-3 minutes of Side 2 cannot be heard)

Q. . . . I've offered them to John Poppleson if he can find any corresponding relevance to them to trade. (?) All right, now, Blair.

A. Blair again was a very bright individual and I think very well placed when he was in -- he was a great help to me in doing many of the clinical things that I was not trained to do. Also he was a great help in getting things done when I was alone and had to cover everything. When something would come

(A. - cont'd.)

up that I felt one of his people might do, I'd send down and say "Can you get this done for me?" He had several trained people with him -- there was and . He had other people, and he would get them done, and he was a real support in many, many ways, was Blair. Very, very good, and very good at promoting psychology in the Army.

Q. Oh, and very good at promoting psychology out of the Army.

A. Heavy. I've just seen him a couple of -- he was out here last year just as we moved to this house, or just before we moved (rest unintelligible).

Q. Well out in Alberta he was made chairman of the committee that drafted the new mental health act. Imagine a psychologist being appointed chairman! It's a terrific job.

A. Well just look at Kenny, head of C.P.C. and Head Chancellor at McGill. (Q. Yeah.) Of course they're coming into their own, Roger, eventually. It does take time. (Q. Yep.) Now who were the others? Because I knew more in the States, although I can't remember their names, than I knew here, because there weren't very many here at first, Roger.

Q. Right.

A. It wasn't until Beck -- up until just before I left DRB I could practically name any principal psychologist across Canada.

Q. Yeah, yeah. There were probably less than a hundred . . .

A. Then there was Blackburn. Where is he now?

Q. Blackburn is dead.

A. Is he?

Q. He was, uh -- he married a wealthy widow from Brockville? and had himself a hell of a time with the money.

A. Yes. Well, I gathered he was. We went, and I was so pleased, really, to see him at last having some fun out of life. (Q. Yes.) He had a dreadful time, really, when you stop to think of it. His wife was ill, (Q. Terrible.) and his daughter had Addison's disease, and his son, who was his only hope, developed epilepsy in his teen-age years.

Q. Oh, I didn't know that.

A. And then I think Blackburn just threw up his hands when he went to -- was it York? Not York . . .

Q. Trent?

A. Trent. And then I met and had dinner with him.

Q. Oh, he married that Woolford woman before he went to Trent, (A. Did he?) because once in Kingston shortly after he had been married to her . . .

A. He was living with her in Kingston. That's right.

Q. I thought they were married.

A. Well, I don't think they were for a while.

Q. Well, at any rate . . .

A. I think his divorce was coming through at that time.

Q. . . . he had bought himself a sports car, a European model, and the delight with which he wheeled me home in this sporty car . . . (A. I know.) . . . and then we went up to this penthouse apartment that his wife had . . .

A. You remember my husband? (Making introductions.)

A_2. It's good to see you again. I came home to eat.

A. Would you take and turn the water -- the light on underneath the water, the pan of water there, and turn the light on underneath the curry, but a very low light and stir it every once in a while, will you, so it won't curdle -- please?

Q. (First few words inaudible) We went up to this penthouse apartment and his wife had given him a present for Christmas, which was a dazzling, garish bar. Did you ever see . . ?

A. No, I didn't see the bar.

Q. It was all sorts of fluorescent violent-coloured lights and here were all his books still in packing cases along the wall, but his delight was this toy that he had been given. I shared his delight in that and . . .

A. I don't know whether -- who I went with, but they had this lovely old home that they were re-doing, and I don't remember whether it was Lou Beck that I was travelling with at the time. I have an idea that it was Lou Beck. Lou Beck and I took a trip across the country once together after I went to DRB, and I think it was Lou Beck and we both came away and we both looked at one another and we said "Isn't that nice?" because we both felt the same way -- "Julian is getting some fun out of life." They had a place in the Virgin Islands, too.

Q. They spent . . .

A. When did he die?

Q. Oh, about a year and a half ago -- quite some time ago.

A. Oh, I didn't know.

Q. He's one of the ones I miss.

A. Of course Hebb remarried again, you know. This was his third marriage and he was very happy. (Q. Apparently.) Just as happy as a clam -- he had five new children. (They both laugh.) Hebb, who couldn't tolerate them! And he was getting along beautifully with these five new ones. (Next remark unintelligible.) Marvelous! Oh, and Father Mahieu and Adrien Pinard.

Q. Yes. They're both still . . .

A. Still working?

Q. Yes. Adrien has left the priesthood . . .

A. Oh, I didn't know -- no, I didn't know this. This doesn't surprise me.

Q. . . . left the priesthood and married a former nun.

A. Well, this doesn't surprise me. Adrien was different than Mahieu, really, and I had them out to the house one day. I don't know whether you? were there that day or not. They were in for a meeting and I had Mahieu, Adrien and a few others on the way to the airport and Adrien turned to me and said "It's so nice to get into a home. You know, we're not invited very often," and this doesn't surprise me.

Q. Well, it also doesn't surprise me, but what did surprise me was the depth of Adrien's devotion to separatism.

A. Oh no, it didn't me. We knew it for a long time. We knew that he was a separatist, really, a bright, very strong one, even when we were employing him. He didn't come out in the open, but even when he was on the committee we knew he was a separatist at that time. We've known this for years.

Q. David Belanger -- did you know the disaster that struck him? (A. No.) He was driving back from a visit to

the States with his wife, who was crippled, and his daughter -- I think she was driving -- and they were involved in a head-on collision that Dave says should have killed them all. They came to way off the highway in a field and his daughter had multiple fractures of the collar-bone and arm. She is now recovered. His wife, who was crippled anyway, broke her other leg, and Dave was in hospital for three months.

A. Is he all right now? (Q. Yes.) Dave was a very nice chap, and I think one of the sort of strong points at the University of Montreal, one of the very strong points. Now who else do we have?

Q. What about Ray Chevanel?

A. I just knew him casually, and again, I thought he was a very nice person, but not . . .

Q. Not heavyweight?

A. Not top-heavy material. The same with the other chap who was a statistician there.

Q. Jay? Haw?

A. Jay Haw. A nice individual, probably a good statistician, I don't know, but not heavy on the experimental end of it. In fact the University of Ottawa was not any where near . . .

Q. Who at Carleton besides Rusty Wendt . . . oh, and Bob Wake.

A. I knew Bob Wake. He was at McGill with me.

Q. Bob's now been shunted over to St. Patrick's.

A. He was shunted a long time ago. I think he was taken out of the headship, wasn't he? (Q. Yes.) He never should have had it.

Q. Whether he finished his term, or . . .

A. No. He was taken out and was replaced.

Q. Who do you know -- who have you known out west? At Edmonton, for instance.

A. Doug Smith, and he was, I thought, a very able man. He wouldn't participate very much and he sort of gave up, but I thought he was a very able individual, Doug Smith was. And then there was Joe, Joe -- I never can remember his . . .

Q. Royce?

A. Joe Royce. I thought he was around the bend half the time. He was -- he and his autokinetic effect, and he was in many ways like Al Sheppard. We had a hard time getting anything out of him, and when we did it really wasn't terribly good. I don't know what happened -- oh he went off into the deep blue yonder too, I believe, into some theoretical . . .

Q. Theoretical institute?

A. Well, it wasn't psychologically oriented. It was

again mystically oriented, wasn't it?

Q. Well no, I think it was -- it's awfully hard to figure out, for me to figure out. It's called the Theoretical -- The Institute of Theoretical Psychology.

A. I thought it was kind of mystical, the way they talked about it . . .

Q. Well, maybe it is.

A. . . . and, ah . . .

Q. Willie Rundquist is (rest obscured by A's response).

A. I didn't know him very well.

Q. He's a delightful . . .

A. Is he? I didn't know him.

Q. . . . absolute nut, but . . .

Q. Oh, yeah.

Q. Let's see, (unintelligible, including name mentioned).

A. Just to meet, that was all, but I didn't know him at all. I had tea at his home once when I was out, but I really didn't know him.

Q. It might be better to think about the committee and the psychologists that from time to time you got to know . . .

A. Webster I developed a tremendous amount of respect for, you know, as I worked with him on the committee. He was one of the hardest hitting, hardest working individuals I ever came across to produce something, and I developed a tremendous amount of respect for him both personally and enjoyed him personally, which I didn't at McGill, and he said "I thought you were a bitch at McGill," (both laugh) but I was stupified? ("stupecated") but we get along very -- he sent me that soapstone thing on the -- not there, it's on the thing out there when Phil and I were married, but he and I worked very well together at DRB and he made an excellent chairman and worked very, very hard, really, and was very solid.

Q. Yeah, George Ferguson once said to me after I had got out of the chairmanship at Toronto, he said "Roger, were you paranoid when you ceased to be chairman?" I said "No." "Well," he said, "when Webster succeeded Don Hebb, Don Hebb has frequently expressed the view that Ed Webster tried his best to undo everything that Hebb had accomplished, and when I replaced Webster, Webster thought that I . . .

A. Well, Ferguson had very strange ideas (laughing, rest of sentence unintelligible). You can't rely too much on some of these ideas. (Q. Oh no.) Not really, not George, because I used to think he sat and thought things up and told people -- the tales he told me, I'm telling you, I . . .

Q. That voice of his . . .

A. Wonderful.

Q. . . . the voice of an actor . . .

A. Exactly.

Q. . . . and I think he gets carried away with it.

A. Well you know one of his secretaries said he spends so much time being someone else all the time, he doesn't know who he is, and I thought that was one of the best descriptions I ever heard of George Ferguson.

Q. I remember once at, I think it was a meeting in Ottawa, when developed a cold, so he got one of those deep voices, and he was carried away with it. He'd like to have that sort of a voice all the time.

A. Yes, he's an entertaining person, but as I say, you took what he said with a grain of salt, that he'd added to it . .

Q. Or a tablespoon.

A. Yes, a tablespoon -- quite. But a bright man, a very bright man, and as I said, an excellent teacher.

Q. Very well trained. Who else on the committee -- what about Wes Coombs? Who were the presidents of . . . ?

A. Well, Wes Coombs -- he was a person whom I liked but he never impressed me. That was all I knew about him, really, but I liked him as a person.

Q. Was he an officer when you were secretary-treasurer?

A. Didn't he just come in when I was leaving? I think this was what it was, because Hemming worked with Blair, you know. It was pretty difficult when someone very -- because he was going up to presidency, you see, when he left secretary-treasurership (Q. Oh yes.) and Hemming worked with him. It was quite different to work with someone like Wes Coombs, who would let things sort of slip a little bit and yet not -- I think that there was more there than came to the surface. That was my feeling about Wes, but he was a person I always liked. Then who else was on the committee? Zuzek -- if I said Zuzek, Zuzek always impressed me as a very unhappy person, and then when I saw him in his marriage I thought, I wonder if this is going to be happy. She was a very bright girl but a very dominating individual, and I just wondered.

Q. She had her own job to do, so that I've encountered John all over the world . . .

A. . . . without her.

Q. Without her.

A. Yes. Well, I wasn't impressed by that marriage at all. A lot of people were but I wasn't. Even I thought it was going to be . However . .

Q. I don't it was that that was wrong toward the end. It was this persecution of John that he took very much to heart (rest unintelligible).

A. Well John was a very sensitive individual. I don't think people realized this, you know, but he really was, and such a hard worker. I always enjoyed going to visit him as I enjoyed visiting Al Sheppard, but you know it was just like picking up so much sand in your hands with your fingers open to visit Al Sheppard. But I did like Wes; I liked him. And there was Bernhardt, who -- put it this way: he was probably one of the originators, one of the first people in psychology in Canada -- I don't know, but I never really knew him. And then there was -- I don't know, I guess he was on the committee when I first went there. There was Webster as chairman -- it's funny how you forget these things, yet I've got a very good memory for most things.

Q. What about Carl Williams? Was he not on the committee?

A. He was a -- yes, he was good too, I can remember a fight we had, Carl and I. He couldn't accept the fact that I had two jobs to do. This was one thing that was Carl's problem, and Carl was an excellent chairman, a very good

(A. - cont'd.)

chairman. He ran that committee beautifully, and I can remember an awful application coming in, an awful application coming in, and they all jokingly laughed and said "Let's support it." I wrote -- well, when it came in I knew it was a dreadful one so I wrote back to the man and said "I'd like some explanation of this, this, this, this and this," and he wrote back a stinking letter saying it was up to the experts in the field to decide what was to be done and it was up to us to give the money to do it, and I wrote back and I said "I have the experts of Canada deciding this." Well because of this letter they passed the application, and at that time one of these hard-headed Navy people were there and he said yes, and I forget what they call them . . . I said "What did you say yes to that for?" and he said "I know damn well you're not going to let it go through," so when it came to the presentation of it I presented it, I presented the whole story. The committee had passed it and they said "What do you think?" and I said "There are other things that should be supported in preference to it," and so the board didn't pass it, and Carl wrote and said that unless this was passed he was going to resign. I don't know whether they finally gave the man a thousand dollars or something, but at any rate the man never turned out anything or turned out to be anything; but it was one of those applications, one of those silly things, and of course it was hurting Carl's, uh, ego I think more than anything else. He knew it wasn't any good as well as anyone else did, and I said to him "Carl, I have two jobs to do. I'm a staff officer as well as being

(A. - cont'd.)

secretary-treasurer," and I said "No way will I give up my privilege of voicing an opinion. No way." I said "I certainly will present everything the committee has said, and present it exactly the way it is, but," I said "when I take that hat off and put on my own hat, I will give my own opinion," and we had quite a to-do about this. Finally he got over it, I think, but -- he was a good chairman, was Carl, a very good chairman.

Q. He's been a very good president at Western.

A. He would. He's a good administrator, Carl is. I never . . .

Q. But he's stepping down in June of next year. He asked to be allowed to stay on for their centenary, which is next year, (A. Yes.) and they refused.

A. Well, that's too bad. I'm sorry to hear that because I felt he was -- I liked Carl. I never mind having a fight with him because he never means anything (rest unintelligible).

Q. Yeah.

A. And he was -- as I said, he's an excellent chairman, and he <u>ran</u> a meeting, Carl did.

Q. Yes, and he has a silver tongue.

A. Yes, and -- well, he always made a good appearance. You could always rely on him. No, he was a good man, was Carl,

(A. - cont'd.)

for a committee. I didn't know him as a psychologist. I just knew him as a committee member and he was very good but, uh . . . And then there was Nubini? and there again, a very good administrator, but I never thought very good as a psychologist. He worked for us at DRB in personnel and he turned out a couple of papers that they were following. Jamieson was the head of personnel at that time. He got Nubini in to do some work and Nubini wrote this paper and it was atrocious. I'm sure Nubini wouldn't say so now, and so I just raised Cain about it. It was an awful bit of work. I just raised Cain about it, and then when I heard Nubini was head of a department I thought, oh heavens to Betsy, but he did an excellent job. He was a good, a good administrator.

Q. Certainly not an outstanding scientist, (A. No.) but a very good chairman.

A. A very good chairman, and a good chairman of the (?). In fact, you were too, Roger. You ran an excellent . . .

Q. Thank you.

A. In fact I had -- I don't think I had one chairman who wasn't really a good chairman.

Q. I thought Rusty made a good chairman.

A. Well he was good with the medical people. You know, he never hesitated to face them, and you know they'd take it

(A. - cont'd.)

because he'd always say it with a grin, but he meant it.

Q. Ruth, let's finish up with some ball-park questions. Of all the books in psychology that you've read during your long career, which of them at the time most turned you on?

A. Well, I think that I'm biased. I don't think there's any question about being biased on this question, but I felt Hebb's was one of the best books . Also of course Boring's History of Psychology. It not only was a good text, it was a fascinating book to read. Both of them, but I felt Hebb's (was the) first book, and I suspect not only because Hebb wrote it but because we had part in tearing it apart and tearing it down, (Q. Sure.) and I'm sure that that's the reason that it has probably . . .

Q. . . . feel like a ghost co-author . . .

A. He -- we put him against the wall. He trained us for the first semester, and the last semester we let him have it, and he took every bit of it.

Q. He claims that he was very surprised at the effect of his book.

A. I think he was, really. Hebb, despite what people say, when you get right down to him is a very humble man. Lots of people don't think he is -- I know George Ferguson doesn't think he is, but he is, when you get right straight down to it, when you really get down to the nitty-gritty and talk to him

(A. - cont'd.)

he's a very humble man and he'll say things, "You know, I think they like me." Well you know people don't say things like that when they have any real sort of, uh . . .

Q. Arrogance.

A. Arrogance. And pleased, because you know these kids he took on, he said "You know, I get along with every one of them," all except -- there was one, he said "I don't get along with her very well." I said "I'm not surprised." But all the rest, and he and you know a person of arrogance doesn't say those things.

Q. That's right, that's right. But his manner often -- not his platform manner -- at the last A. P. A. meeting in Washington he was an invited speaker in one hotel and there were two others, and I thought to myself "I haven't heard the other two but I've heard Don often, and I think I'd better go to one of the other two," and then on second thoughts I decided don always has something fresh and new to say and I don't want to miss it, so I went to hear his address and it was absolutely top-flight new stuff -- new in the sense that he hadn't used it, he was not regurgitating old material.

A. Well this is what he would never do, you know, in class. I never had his elementary class and he had five hundred in it and I had a friend in it, and I said "How's Hebb's class going?" She said "He talked about everything from ants to elephants in the same lecture, and the only word I understood

was 'lobotomy'." She said to me "He didn't / follow the text." She said "I might understand it, but," she said "he stood up in the beginning and he said 'If you're going to be any good you won't follow a text,' he said, 'You've got the text. I expect you to read,' he said, 'and don't expect me to follow it, because I won't.'" And he gave them the current stuff that was coming along, and he said "If they're good they'll stay, but five hundred I don't want." I think two hundred out of five hundred passed that year.

Q. Muriel Stern was his, Don's right arm . . .

A. Oh yes. He was a -- as I said, if you wanted a lecture, a whole organized lecture, Hebb was not the man to go to; but if you wanted an interesting lecture, then he was good, and I would . . . Oh, Bridges -- old Bridges.

Q. Wynn.

A. Wynn. We mustn't forget him. Well I had Wynn shoved down my throat by Sir George Williams students until I was sick, and then I met him at a party and they sat at his feet, and I couldn't stand the man. I said to this (student?) "What's he got?" Ohhhh! I didn't even like his voice, which was very thin, and he sat there with the attitude "Amuse me," and he said to me one time "You don't like me very much, do you?" and I said "No, I don't." We got along all right but I didn't like Wynn. I felt that he -- he was a good lecturer. (Q. Yes.)

He was another one who wouldn't answer questions and didn't wish to be interrupted. I went to his lectures merely because he was a good lecturer and it was interesting, and he'd known these people, and he gave it at McGill and McGill students were not doing very well. And Hebb called me in and he said "Why are my students not doing well in Bridges' class?" So I said "Oh well, that's quite understandable. Bridges wants them to regurgitate and you've taught them not to do it, and they won't do it." I saw lectures that had been taken by his student, and they were word for word, ABC you know, and then they gave them back to him in examinations, and our students didn't do that, and I said "He doesn't want that," I said, "so don't get too worried about it if a student is good in other areas, but," I said "he is a good lecturer."

Q. An interesting, a popular lecturer.

A. Popular and -- I mean about history of psychology, that's and it was -- he made it interesting because he knew the people, at least some of them anyhow, so I went just as an extra lecture. I wasn't registered in the course, I just went to listen to it because I liked to hear it, but I didn't like him. I thought he was a nitwit, really, and I think he was a very strong man in psychology -- I don't think he was . . .

Q. He was well liked. (rest obscured by A's response)

A. He was very well liked, but I just -- his students loved him. McGill students didn't like him.

Q. That's interesting.

A. But Sir George Williams (students) just worshipped him, but I couldn't stand him; I just couldn't stand that man.

Q. He told me that he's now on his fourth . . .

A. Is he living?

Q. . . . wife. Oh yes, yes.

A. Well, is this wife very much younger than he is?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, she would -- this is a strange sort of thing. She took care of her father. She was thirty-five when she married him, and he was close to seventy. How old is he now? He must be ninety.

Q. Oh, he must be close to ninety.

A. Because years after I went to the Board, believe it or not, Wynn Bridges came to visit me. Now, can you credit that? I hadn't seen him in years, and he came up one day to visit me. He said "I just thought I'd like to see you." "What for?" I said to myself. He said "My wife wanted to get rid of me." But that was a very strange sort of thing. He and her father were very close friends,

(A. - cont'd.)

and he had sort of made up to her as he made up to all the women, as you know, and she had sort of succumbed to him and then he'd gone off with other people and her father died, and he was very much of a father figure to her, very much.

Q. Well, he told me that . . .

A. She was a nice person.

Q. He still visits his first wife when he's in New York and they're very good friends, and I met . . .

A. She's a psychologist, isn't she?

Q. Yes. Her name is -- her name was Banham.

A. That's right, Catherine Banham. Is that right?

Q. Yes. They, uh . . .

A. Now how that came out of the blue I don't know. Isn't that funny?

Q. It's Catherine Bridges who did the classic paper on emotion development emergence, distinctive emotional patterns in young children.

A. I think he was a bright man. I don't think there was any question about that. I think he was a bright man, but emotionally I thought he was as old as six years. I don't think he ever got beyond . But now who else was there?

Q. (mentions a name? - unintelligible) .

A. It's a real . . .

Q. . . . child psychologists we've known. You certainly know most of the . . .

A. Well you know, I did travel across the country practically all the time, but I met the woman at St. John, University of New Brunswick. What was her name, now? She was head of the department for quite a long time.

Q. Fredericton?

A. It may have been in Fredericton.

Q. Or St. John's, Newfoundland.

A. Oh no, it would have been New Brunswick or Fredericton, one or the other. Fredericton.

Q. I think the St. John campus has only recently . . .

A. Oh well, then, it's Fredericton.

Q. . . . so I think it was Fredericton. Do you mean -- you don't mean Snodgrass?

A. That's right.

Q. Florence Snodgrass?

A. Florence Snodgrass, yes. (Q. Oh.)