

LOUISE THOMPSON WELCH

M: This is part of the oral history of psychology in Canada. I am talking with Louise Thompson Welch in Winnipeg, where we are attending the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, on May 29th, 1970.

Now, Louise, let's start at the beginning. Where were you born?

W: I was born in Saint John, New Brunswick.

M: And into what kind of a family? What did your father do?

W: My father worked with a newspaper. He was a machinist and he used to devise parts for machines that were needed. That sort of thing.

M: Did you have any brothers and sisters?

W: There are five children. My brother is the oldest and then there are four girls, and I am the youngest in the family.

M: And what sort of a home was it from the point of view of, let's say, reading?

W: Well I would say that it was a good home from that point of view. My father read a great deal and my mother was a reader. I think perhaps my father read more than my mother in the way of books because, with five children, my mother was tied up a lot with household activities. Nevertheless there were times that she did set aside for herself and we knew this was her time. Sunday afternoon was always reading time.

M: Was there a lot in the home to read, most of the time?

W: Yes we had very good books. Not so many of them in quantity, but what was there was very good. We had all of the old classics. For instance I remember one time saying to my father, "Oh, here is a book by your namesake," his name was John Milton. I said, "Have you read Paradise Lost?" And he said, "Oh yes, I have read that." So these were books that were there and were read by the family.

M: What were your parents' attitudes toward education? Did they just take it for granted or was it every important in their view?

W: It was taken for granted in that it was assumed that we would all keep going until we had reached our level. Three of us went on to university. One of my sisters was a teacher. At that time you didn't need to have a degree and she went to the teachers training college. Another sister had always planned on being a nurse and she started in with nurse's training and then she found it a little strenuous. Her health wasn't as good as the rest of us at that time, although she has been well since. So she went into business after that.

M: But the attitude was, perhaps, that both your parents wanted you children to get more education than they had had?

W: Oh yes. They had had the usual education that you can get in a country school because both of them had come from outside the city and they had been married and then my father had decided that they would move into the city. So I suppose you would say they were, in large part, self educated, with all the reading that they did. But they just took it for granted that we were going to keep on. There was no pressure to do this but an assumption that there it was, and if you were capable you would do it.

M: What was the home like from the point of view of religion? What was the attitude to religion?

W: I think it was a strongly religious home. There wasn't too much talk about sin. I don't remember the word "sin" coming into our household. Instead of saying, "This is sinful to do this," they used

the term "wrong"---"You mustn't do this because it is wrong." We all attended church once a week and all the children went to Sunday School. We were in some young people's organizations. We always kept a firm connection with the church.

M: What denomination?

W: ^{we} They were Anglican.

M: Then Sunday wasn't a particularly grim day. It wasn't a day on which everything was prohibited was it?

W: No, it wasn't grim, in the least. It began with church in the morning and then we would have a family dinner. This was usually a light meal, not a big family dinner, because everybody had been out at church. After that each member was on his own and I remember, when we were very young, my sisters and I used to play dolls. We would get the house all rearranged with markings off for rooms and turn chairs upside down. We were allowed to do this on Sunday provided we let my parents have a little quiet for reading. Sometimes we went out for a family drive if it was an especially nice day, but this wasn't part of the ritual by any means. Occasionally we would go and visit relatives. My mother had two sisters also married and living in the city and their families. We were always very close to them with visiting back and forth. So this might also be part of the Sunday activities.

M: Were family prayers part of the ritual in the home?

W: No, we didn't have family prayers. We would occasionally have Bible readings but these were not on any kind of scheduled basis. Impromptu.

M: When you started to school, what kind of school was it? What are your earliest recollections of school?

W: This was an elementary school going from Grades 1 to 8 although the buildings were separate. There were two buildings. One in which the Grades 1 to 4 had classrooms and another one, Grades 5 to 8. These two buildings were connected by both a bridge and a tunnel. I remember it was always considered a very gay thing to be going over to the auditorium in the larger school and to go up on this bridge. For 6-year olds this seemed like a tremendous height. It wasn't all that enclosed. It was sort of a lacy iron so that you could look down and feel you were really on quite an adventure just going from one school to the other. We used to meet there for assemblies and special days like Victoria Day and Loyalist Day which was May 18th and was sort of specific to Saint John because this was the date when the Loyalists arrived, from Massachusetts, in 1783. We kept this day all the years that I was in school but I don't believe they keep it now. They combine it with the other holiday.

M: That reminds me to ask you what the origin of your parents was? Were they born in New Brunswick?

W: They were born in New Brunswick. My father's grandparents were born in Ireland and my mother's great-grandparents were born in Scotland, and then they moved to Ireland and then they came out to New Brunswick.

M: They themselves were not Loyalists.

W: No, although some of the intermarriage is with Loyalist stock.

M: In school, do you recall having any very marked likes or dislikes for subjects or particular things, early on?

W: I think I liked all the subjects about the same. I always enjoyed reading. It was a great pleasure to me to think that we could have these

books in school. Naturally we had all been getting into books before we went to school. It was great fun. As the youngest one I used to listen to the others doing their reading. I could read before I went to school.

M: As you moved through the grades, were you a strikingly successful student? Were you a good student? Did you usually stand high in your classes?

W: I wouldn't have used the words "strikingly successful" but I was always at the head of the class. These were the days when, if you were sitting in the first seat in the first row, this meant that you were the top pupil. The spatial arrangement in the classroom represented your rank.

M: And you were nearly always in the front seat. Now you moved from grade school to highschool in Saint John. By this time were you developing any preferences for subjects?

W: Strangely enough I liked mathematics very much, through highschool. I liked the challenge of problem solving. As we got into things like algebra and geometry where we were given original problems to solve, I remember that I often did this at night, even though it might not have been a specific assignment. If I had heard about it, I couldn't just rest and let the problem simmer. I just had to get at it and solve it. This excited me very much. I would rather do that than something else.

M: Have you any idea when you first encountered the word "psychology" to have it mean anything?

W: I think probably it was in university. I don't really remember encountering this in highschool.

M: Did you have vocational plans or ideas about what you were going to become? First of all, was it taken for granted that you would go on to

university? Were you such a good student that your teachers expected it?

W: Yes, that was always taken for granted. Even by myself. I just assumed that I would go on. I had thought, in highschool, and even in early college days, of being a teacher and probably a highschool teacher.

M: You could have gone directly to normal school, in those days, but you didn't.

W: I had no intention of doing that.

M: If you were going to be a teacher you intended to be a highschool teacher, which meant that you would have to have some university. Naturally, living there, you went to the University of New Brunswick.

W: Yes. I went there partly because I had a scholarship at UNB. Lord Beaverbrook had established, I think about 6 at that time, scholarships which they used to try to distribute geographically in so far as they could. They chose the people mainly from the results of the matriculation examinations. This was an entirely separate thing from the highschool leaving. This was all done the week after school had closed and was a set of nine or ten exams.

M: It seems to me that Florence Snodgrass said that she won one of those.

W: Yes, very likely, because she is from New Brunswick. This was a four-year scholarship based largely on the achievement on these examinations. I suppose this was the only objective measure they had for people.

M: What did you take in your first year?

W: The first year was pretty well laid on by the University. We had English literature and French and Latin, this was a requirement in those days. We also had chemistry and physics and mathematics.

M: Do you remember having a preference, at university, as between physics and chemistry?

W: Yes, I liked the physics. I remember that the first set of exams we wrote, I came top in the class in physics. This, I think, influenced me partly, to choose a combination of physics and maths as the subjects I would train for as a teacher. This was my first thought, in my first year. Then, as the summer rolled by and I was doing some thinking, I noticed that most of the jobs in the sciences were held by men. So perhaps it wasn't a good idea for a college girl to decide to teach the things that were considered a man's job. So the next year I was thinking more in terms of languages. I liked French very much, especially the French literature we were reading. I also enjoyed Latin. I think this was partly the subject itself, because it makes certain demands in condensation of thought and that kind of thing. I don't know whether you have heard of Bob ^{Cattley} Gatlery, I think he has retired now; but he was on the staff at UNB for a long time and he really made that subject ^{(Latin) come} alive, so that everybody enjoyed it thoroughly. This was also, in fact, somewhat of a training in the use of English, because if we would translate the Latin into what he thought was rather sloppy phrasing, he would stop us and say, "That just won't do. Think again and come up with a new translation." You were forced into trying to condense it.

M: So it was really partly the teacher, as well as the subject. The way he taught it. So you really switched your major emphasis in your second year to languages.

W: This was also the year that I had a general course in psychology. This was the first year in which you could elect to take psychology.

M: And it was not called philosophy?

W: No, it was called "general psychology." That was taught by Dr. ~~Kiersted~~, ~~Keirstead~~, ~~Burton's~~ father, Wilfred. He was a professor of philosophy. He was a very important man at UNB. He was a person that everybody should have taken classes from when an undergraduate at that time. ~~Just to be--~~ He taught philosophy, economics, psychology and then later, education. So he really started all of these fields and when I look back it seems incredible that he would have kept up so well in all of them. Of course, he was a remarkable man.

M: Yes he must have been. Do you recall what he used in this course in psychology?

W: I think he used Woodworth--one of the earlier Woodworth books. This was in 1934-35. I enjoyed the course tremendously but then I am not sure whether it was the subject matter or the way in which it was taught. Almost anything that he taught he made interesting and the students loved it. Later I took education courses from him and he was equally effective there. I am getting ahead of my story, but when I came back to be his assistant at UNB, as a lecturer for three years, I decided then that I should pick up the philosophy which I had never done, with him. So I sat in on all of the courses that he gave--the ordinary course and the honours course, so that I got the philosophy from him later, but not as an undergraduate.

M: Did psychology turn out to be more interesting to you, more exciting? Was this the point at which you decided that this was especially interesting to you?

W: Yes, this year and the two following years, when I was doing the education courses. I decided that I would like to work with highschool age students but not as a teacher. Rather in guidance and counselling. This was my thought as I went on for graduate work too, that I would--

M: There wasn't a place for this, generally speaking, was there? Were there guidance teachers?

W: No, but this is what I wanted to do. I felt that by the time I was ready there would be a place ready for me. Of course, there was no question of clinical because people didn't even use that word in those days. One heard it every now and then but a place there was even more remote than a place in the school system.

M: In your third year--would you just broadly describe how you got into psychology from that.

W: In those days we had very little given in psychology, so it wasn't a case of what you could choose. We got into things like educational psychology and tests and that kind of thing, but it came under the heading of the educational courses. So it is very hard for me to label it one or the other. It is even difficult when I get on to graduate work because at Edinburgh much the same thing happened.

M: We mustn't get over there yet! By the time you graduated what were you thinking of doing?

W: I was still planning on being a school counsellor, helping people to decide in terms of their abilities, where they might best direct their work.

M: Did you have to maintain first-class honours right through your university course to keep this Beaverbrook scholarship?

W: No, there was no rigid requirement of that sort but you did have to keep passing from year to year. I don't think any of the students ever had much trouble doing that. There was no specific requirement of honours standing.

M: What was your record?

W: I took first-class honours. You could not go on in psychology in those days, because Dr. Kiersted who was running the whole show gave this ^{one} year introductory psychology and then he went into his philosophy work like logic and this kind of thing, which you could, if you were interested, keep on. Or you could continue in education. I kept on in the education. In those days there was no honours course in education and I had wanted to do honours. I had decided ^{that it} ~~that this~~ would be a good thing to concentrate on two subjects. You could not honour in one ^{subject} in those days, although I think you can now. You had to group and there were certain groupings that were permissible. I grouped French and Latin, so I kept on with those two subjects for the next two years, doing double courses in each so that these accounted for four out of the five and the education course in the junior and senior year was the fifth subject.

M: Did doing an honours course involve an extra year?

W: No, it was the kind of subjects and the concentration. Usually students were restricted in selecting honours courses. Occasionally, if you wanted to take more of a particular subject but you were not honouring in it, you could select it as your fifth subject. That is, you would double

up on one, say, take two English courses, but the English professor might encourage you not to do that if he had found that you were a border-line student. He would say, "Why take on more than it is possible to do?" So this depended greatly on the guidance of the professor giving the subject. You had to maintain a certain standard. In your honours courses which were on a higher level and more difficult, you had to get higher grades, which never made sense to me except that I guess the professor worked it out in his own head. You had to get an 80% or more which was very high. Then, on your ordinary subject, you had to get 70%. These marks may now sound very low, but in fact, the first standing in those days was 70% or above, second class was 60-70% and a passing grade was 40-60%. Forty percent was a passing grade.

M: Did you go to Edinburgh when you graduated?

W: I taught for one year. In those days we were able to write a set of examinations which were called the Grammar School License Examinations. If you passed these successfully, and they were strictly academic subjects, they did not measure your teaching ability of any of those things ^{you could teach.} However, during your college years you were also required to do some practice teaching, but this came in with the education course. By the time you finished your two courses in education you had done enough practice teaching to satisfy the requirements for the Grammar School License. There was also an exam in physical training which I remember we had to do at the Teachers Training School, which was also located in Fredericton. What we did was go through the exercises required and do some practice in them and then we did an exam.

M: And you taught how long?

W: I taught one year. I had planned to go on.

M: Was this just to make money?

W: Not really, although--

M: Maybe you had to do this to confirm your License?

W: I think so. I think that there had to be some teaching there, and I wasn't just sure of where I wanted to go and what subjects I wanted to choose.

M: How did you come to decide what you wanted to do and where you were going to do it?

W: I think perhaps the first idea I had about Edinburgh was that one of the students in my class had gone on to do law at Edinburgh. This was a new thought to me. Before that I really hadn't given any time to thinking of a university outside of the main ones in Canada and the top ones in the United States. But at this point I started writing to Edinburgh to find out what their requirements would be. During the summer I decided that I would go but my father was not too keen on this. He said that there were plenty of universities in North America and why should I choose Edinburgh? This seemed like quite a distance off because people weren't flying back and forth as they are to-day. This was a fairly long ocean voyage. But my mother was quite keen on it. She thought, "This is something that no one in the family has ever done, why not?" By this time I had had the extra year of teaching and she felt that I was old enough to go, although I am sure she has some question about it.

M: Did you talk to ^{Keirstead} Kiersted about these plans or to any of your professors?

W: Just incidentally. They thought it was quite a good idea to go on to Edinburgh. I didn't find out until later that the daughter of the President of the University had done the same course at Edinburgh that I was planning to do. This had no bearing on my going but it had some bearing on his approving my appointment when I came back, because this meant something to him. His own daughter had gone through ~~the~~ ^{the} same course. I took the course which is called the Bachelor of Education. This is the same one that George Ferguson did. He was there when I was there. He had finished the Bachelor's degree and was doing his Ph.D. in psychology.

M: Now, paint a picture of that young girl from New Brunswick arriving in Edinburgh.

W: When I arrived there the first thing I did was to get in touch with the Dean of Women, because we had had some writing back and forth. She asked me whether I would rather live in residence ^{or} ~~or~~ in "digs" as they called it. I asked what the difference was and she said, "Some of the people who are graduates prefer to be in digs because it is more fun and more freedom. I will tell you that there is a place where there are three medical students, one English girl and two Scottish girls, and there is room in this house for one more student. If you would like to look at that and meet those girls and see how you like them--." So I decided that this would be worth following up and went to the house and liked the living arrangements and liked very much the three medical students. So this is where I lived for the year. This was settled fairly quickly, very soon after I arrived.

M: Now your appearance at the University, or the University's appearance to you.

W: Then I went along to the University and had an interview with Godfrey Thomson, who was the first person I saw. He questioned me about whether I spelled my name with a "p" or without. When I said "with" he said, "The best Thomsons in Scotland spell it without." That was our initial round.

M: His was "without" of course.

W: His was without. The next thing that happened was that we were deciding whether I should go into the second year of the B. Ed. or the first. They were giving courses in elementary statistics, some beginning courses in tests and measurements which sounded to me very much like an overlap of some of the education courses I had had. We talked about this. He said, "Well my suggestion to you is to join the second year of the B. Ed. course." The first year was called a Diploma year. He said to join the second year and then we would talk about it at Christmas. But we never had that conversation because by that time I think he was satisfied that I was able to keep on with it and I was in my own mind quite comfortable.

M: Who did you take classes from?

W: Godfrey Thomson. He was a very good teacher. It was just as if the electricity had been turned on when he came in the room. Very dynamic. It was a small class of 17 and he thought it was large class. One day he was very irritated with all of us because we hadn't got the assignments done that he had expected. He said, "I don't want to come back and find this undone. This is too large a group and I am just looking for a reason to cut some of you out." So that stirred things up. We all loved his classes. He had two classes with us. One was on general

philosophy of education--what we were trying to do, where we were going. In this he would introduce some of his ideas on selection of people for higher education which was always very close to his heart. This was a chance, too, for him to give us some of his ^{personal} philosophical thinking. Then on the other side we had a very intense statistical course. No nonsense there at all!

Then I had James Drever Sr. It was called a Bachelor of Education course but, actually, as I think of it now, most of the courses were what we would call now psychological. These two departments ^{worked} ~~were both~~ together. It was a joint degree given by both departments. There was no other way. It was all laid on. The courses were there. You didn't choose them. Dre~~ve~~r wasn't nearly as dynamic a person. He was a very attractive person but more sort of a Santa Clausy type. White curly hair and round ruddy face. Thomson was thin and a^scetic looking. Physically they were so different and their personalities rather matched their appearance. I don't think Drever was much older than Godfrey Thomson but he was heavier and a slower moving and slower talking individual. He seemed to have less energy whether this was really true or not.

M; Did he interest you more in psychology? Did he turn you on or off?

W: He interested me more because he had such a very firm grasp of the development of psychology and he gave us this side of it. The historical roots and what was developing. Also he was the instigator of the seminars which we had once a week and I think these were the highlight of the week. We had a seminar every Wednesday from four to six on a particular topic which had been assigned to a student. The student would

present the material originally but the best part of it was Drever's comments at the end and the discussion which came out of it. I think this is where I remember him most as an interesting person.

M: Did he use the Collins and Drever texts in this course?

W: No. He gave us a laboratory course which he farmed out. He did some of the sections that he particularly liked and then ~~Murray~~ ^{Mary} Collins would do some of the lecturing, and then Boris ^{Semionoff} ~~Semunoff~~, who is still at Edinburgh, did part of it too. They are the three I remember. There were two or three other lecturers. There was a Mr. MacDonald and ^a Margaret Laidlaw, who was a developmental psychologist. This was in 1938-39. It was a wonderful year. It was an interesting place to live. I remember seeing a lot of theatre because where we lived was just a block from the King's Theatre and not too far away from the other main theatre in Edinburgh. One of the medical students was very fond of going to plays. Sometimes we would, at the very last minute, decide that we just couldn't miss a particular play, and we still had time to get over. I remember it as a year where I saw a lot of plays. This wasn't possible in Saint John. We would see something occasionally, but to be so near everything--ballet, operas, symphony concerts. So in addition to the straight university work ~~I think~~ I enjoyed all these other things.

M: I have often said I think Edinburgh is one of the few cities where I could be dropped by parachute on a rainy day, anywhere, and I would know it was Edinburgh. There is something very distinctive about it. I don't know what it is. I could be dropped in London or Paris and other places and I wouldn't know where I was. Did you really fall in love with

Edinburgh?

W: Yes, I did. I think the attractions were the people and the kind of life they led. As far as the weather was concerned, it was dark most of the winter and cold. It is not the climate that makes it attractive or the comforts of living. It is not a city where you go for comfortable living but it is very challenging and you get a lot of walking. It is very healthy in many ways. We used to walk to classes every day. This would take us 15 to 20 minutes. We would walk through "The Meadows" which are in behind the Castle. There is the Castle and you go past it and it is something that gets to you after a while.

M: Also the coldness and the discomfort of living is almost counter-balanced by the warmth and hospitality of the people, isn't it?

W: Yes, and when you would come inside there would always be the cheery fireplace and the hot tea.

M: Did you encounter a man by the name of Pilly in education there?

W: No.

M: Maybe he wasn't there then. My son was over for three years working in education with Pilly, but unfortunately at the time when Pilly was too old and was breaking up. He has gone back with his family to finish his doctorate in education this summer.

Now, what happened after Edinburgh?

W: I would like to mention that Cyril ^{Burt}~~Bert~~ was one of the external examiners that year. They had a system in Edinburgh where you had the internal examination (that you wrote) and the external readers. These two readers looked over your examinations but they also had an ^{oral}~~exam~~ examination with you.

Cyril B^uert spent most of our time trying to find out why I had come from New Brunswick in Canada to study in Edinburgh. I liked him very much. He was a very easy person to talk with. I had thought this would be a very frightening experience to be talking alone with these external examiners but, in fact, both of them were very very pleasant. I liked B^uert in particular. I saw him again later, either in Canada or at Yale. I am not just sure where. I reminded him that he had been one of my external examiners.

M: This was after the War, was it?

W: Yes.

M: Now, after Edinburgh, what?

W: After Edinburgh I came back to the University of New Brunswick as a lecturer. The War was coming and of course we knew this. Sometimes Canadians would meet me in Edinburgh and they would say, "There is a very bad crisis this weekend. What are you planning to do if war breaks out?" This always seemed to me like a very strange question. I would say, "Well I don't suppose I can stop it, if that is what you mean. I am going to stay here until I have to leave." Well that summer things were getting pretty hot and everyone knew that it was a matter of time. This was the 'after Munich' summer. Two of my sisters came over and two friends of theirs and this made five of us. We bought a second-hand car and travelled around England. We went to France and then decided we had better get back and not try to get into Germany at that time or any of the other countries. So we got home about three days before the Athenia was sunk. We came to New York and then home.

M: Oh, this was 1939. Then Munich had been the previous summer.

W: Yes. But there had been continuing crises. I remember one day in Paris we saw troops marching. We hadn't seen the morning papers and had not listened to any reports and wondered whether this was it. Actually these were exercises. Meanwhile I had been writing to Dr. ^{Keirstead} Kiersted and describing my work and asked him whether there were going to be any openings that he knew of at the University. He wrote back and said that he was very interested and would like me to come back and do some of the psychology courses or do some additional work in psychology, more than he was able to work into the programme. He would bring this to the University President and Senate and so on. This appointment was confirmed and I was the first woman to be appointed to the University of New Brunswick staff. There had always been ^{only} men there. (I am not sure about the rest of Canada.) Someone mentioned to me later, when I had a full professorship at the UNB that I was the first woman in Canada to have a full professorship. I wasn't moved to try to prove or disprove this but I'll throw that out. This may be true. There were other women I know on university staffs but they didn't have full professorship rank. This was after Yale. I was ^{first} a lecturer, this was my status for the three years, from 1939 to 1942. Then in 1942 I went to Yale and finished there in 1944 and came back as a full professor in psychology, to UNB.

M: Now, Yale.

W: When I went to Yale I still had thought of continuing in the education field. In other words, I was not, at that time, directing my career toward clinical psychology, although by this time it had become a

much more popular field. When I got to Yale I wanted to continue the contact with education and get as much training as I could in dealing with individuals. I combined some of the courses in education there. This could, I think, all be grouped together under "educational psychology." I did the complete clinical course which was offered at that time.

M: You were a Ph.D. candidate?

W: A Ph.D. candidate. This was all on testing projectives and--

M: But Yale didn't have a department of educational psychology, did it?

W: Not as such, although there were people on the staff and they had an Education Department, but they had psychologists on the staff there.

M: Was it in the Education Faculty that you mainly did your work?

W: That is where I was registered, but for all the psychology courses which were labelled "clinical" I went down to the Institute of Human Relations. That is where Mark May had his office and he, in fact, was the director of my thesis. So it was like other places. There are lines but people cross them. So I guess I was one of those who tried to work it out.

M: Was this a Ph.D. or an Ed.D.?

W: No, this was a Ph.D. There was no Doctor of Education.

M: What kind of a teacher was Mark May?

W: I think it is correct to say that he is another Godfrey Thomson, looking a little different. He had the same characteristics. A tremendous vitality and able to get people to do things. He was inspirational, in the same way. He could get you going. I think this is a tremendous asset in a teacher.

M: Did you know that the one time when Ned Bott was most tempted to leave Canada was when he was offered the Directorship of the Institute of Human Relations when it first opened? We thought he was going to go but he didn't. It is interesting to speculate what else would have happened if he had.

W: I would have been working with him, presumably. I remember one of the early occasions when the departments all got together that simply by chance I was sitting between Harthorne on my left and Professor May on my right. For some reason this amused me terribly. There are so many references to Harthorne and May, and there I was sitting in the middle

M: You would have to try to be honest under those circumstances, wouldn't you? Studies in Honesty.

W: Mark May was a great influence in that whole department, both in psychology and education. I remember that one of the education people, Professor Tilton, whom I liked very much, was also in the early days of my thesis giving me some help, and we were discussing it. Then I would also see Professor May and I was beginning to feel a little uncomfortable about this, because they were quite different people and naturally they were steering me in slightly different directions. I remember, one day, confronting Professor Tilton with this and I said, "When I talked with Professor May a few days ago he suggested maybe we might think of this--" And he said, "Well, go ahead. He is the doctor." So that answered my question, because I was wondering what I was going to do, trying to work with two such different people.

M: Students often get caught in this and the people advising them aren't aware of the fact that they are being torn apart and the student doesn't like to say, "So and So told me to do something else."

W: After that I had sessions mainly with Professor May and he was really wonderful in giving his time. We would have fixed sessions of no less than two hours, once a week, in the early days of planning the thesis. Later they were less frequent. I remember, one day, we were talking about getting sound equipment because I wanted to record the responses that children were giving me as they were working and we had some things to clear up. I think we had started at 11:00 and it was going on to 1:30 and I said, "Well, I think I should go now. It is your lunch hour." "Oh, we're not even going to think about lunch," he said, "We are going to finish this off." He was that kind of man. So we got in his car and drove over to one of the other buildings where some of the recording equipment was and--it was a disk recorder in those days. I think it was called a "sound scribe". We got that and some stop watches. The things that I needed to get going on the work. I always look back on that and think it was very fine of him to give me his time when he must have been tired and hungry. But when he got on a project he didn't stop until it was completed. He certainly made it very easy for me to get any of the materials I needed. I had working space. In the second year I had an office to myself in the Education Building and we had the facilities of the Yale Library (which ^{was} just tremendous). After I finished my thesis that second summer I just stayed on for three or four months to use the Yale Library, because all through the previous year and

the one before that I had been reaching out for books that I really didn't have time to read. I spent these three or four months just taking down the books that caught my eye.

M: A wonderful thing to do, after you were already teed up. You were already excited and interested and that is the time when it is a wonderful thing to do. Some people either don't make the chance to do it or don't think of it. They just sigh with relief and think, "Now I have done that, I will be on my way." During your three years at UNB before Yale, had you had any contact with CPA?

W: Yes, I joined the CPA at that time. I think I became a member in either '41 or '42.

M: Do you recall any meeting that you went to?

W: I think that there was an early meeting in Montreal or Toronto. I think it was probably the '42 meeting and I seem to connect Toronto with my first meeting.

M: What Canadian psychologists did you meet at that time and what was your impression of them?

W: You, I saw you. And Karl Bernhardt and Professor Bott, Bill Blatz. And George Ferguson, who I think was instrumental in my getting my membership. He was at OCE in Toronto and sent me out the forms or mentioned it to me in some way and got me interested.

M: Which of these Canadian psychologists was the most intriguing character, as you recall your initial impressions of Canadian psychologists?

W: I think that Professor Bott was. Dr. Blatz for different reasons. I mean, you know, he was a character. But I think I was more drawn to Dr. Bott and when I think of early psychology in Canada I think of him.

M: He, incidentally, is still alive and well and tinkering with his carpentry and having a wonderful retirement. I am afraid I have to get down to that meeting and here we are, we have just got out of Yale. Isn't that terrible?

W: This is the second half of the account which we started in Winnipeg last year. I had intended, of course, to send you the rest long before this but anyway here is the second half. I think we finished where I had left Yale and this was August 1944. Before leaving, Professor Mark May had asked whether I would like to stay and do research at Yale. He said to me: "You know that Yale is a male strong-hold so there probably won't be anything in the teaching line here for you, but a research appointment could certainly be made available if you are interested". I thank^{ed} him and I said^d that I really wanted to go back to Canada to my own country. And he said: "I thought that might be the case. You Canadians seem to feel that way". Then he went on to tell me that they had wanted Professor Bott to come from the University of Toronto to be Director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale. But he also declined and stayed at Toronto, and as we both know has made^d substantial contribution to Canadian psychology. He is a person too that I think of with affection as well as admiration. In September 1944, I joined the Faculty of the University of New Brunswick as Professor of Psychology and Education. Doctor Keirstead, whom I mention^d to you previously had just retired as Head of the Department. But he continued on the Faculty and taught courses in Philosophy. So that I had his friendship and helpful guidance in the early months of my professorship at UNB. I am sorry to say that this happy state of affairs did not continue because he died soon after that and for a while I did some teaching of philosophy courses as well as those in Educational Psychology. This was during a few months period when they were searching for a replacement on the staff to teach Dr. Keirstead's courses.

The next few years, this is from '44-'45 up to 1950-51, were extremely busy years. I had a heavy teaching load as you can imagine, and in addition to all this, I started a Psychological service for students. Since these were the immediate post-war years, the University population was greatly increased by the returning veterans. I found them especially appreciative of any help that the department of psychology was able to give them. They were glad to have any psychological data that we could help them select either their college courses or their subsequent careers.

Several research papers were done during these hectic years: one I remember was in an area which specially interested me, - the role of language in forming attitudes. And I was interested especially in the practical application of how language served the purposes of propaganda and 'image' building in the war situation.

During several of these years, Ernest Poser was on the psychology staff at the University of New Brunswick. He then went to England and began his Ph.D. study with Eysenck at the University of London. Following that he went to McGill.

In September 1950, I joined the Faculty of Graduate Studies at Dalhousie University. My special task was to promote the M.A. course in clinical psychology. At Dalhousie, I had the privilege of working closely with two fine people: Professor Hilton Page and Dr. Frances Marshall. Our department there had a close affiliation also with the psychologists at the Victoria Hospital. Dr. Mary Laurence and Mrs. Joan Morris were on the hospital staff during those years.

In December 1951, I was married to William Willard Welch, a Halifax Business man. I continued to teach at Dalhousie until 1957. At that time I retired in order to have more leisure for my two children and for my husband and home. During the next few years, however, I kept my finger in the pie by acting as psychological consultant to the Children's Hospital in Halifax. There was no staff psychologist at that time, although I am sure that they have added a psychologist since then. This particular assignment fitted in well with home duties. My time table was flexible; after all, the children were a captive audience in the hospital! They couldn't get away and I was able to go and see them at irregular times; my schedule naturally was much more flexible than it could possibly be in almost any other job you care to name. I mention this only because sometimes career women, when they begin a home and family, feel that they must give up their professional activities. They may have to give up the particular professional activity that they are involved in but if they look around carefully, they will always find alternatives which can fit in with the demands of the domestic life.

In 1962, my husband was transferred to Toronto and our whole family moved there in August of that year. We lived in Willowdale for the next two years and I really enjoyed life in Toronto. Now that I am in Omaha, Nebraska, we look back on those Toronto years as golden years. I am sure that distance lends a certain enchantment but in any case, my luggage is ready to be packed for Toronto at a moment's notice, - and I know that my husband and children feel the same way. We are more than eager to get back. And we feel when we do get back to Ontario, that we will be home.

The first year of our Toronto stay was taken up with getting our children placed in school, finding a pediatrician, doctor, dentist, hair dresser, etc., and for this year, I was not professionally involved. I remember it of course as a wonderfully carefree year, very carefree. The following September, I joined the Psychological Services Department at York University and did a small amount of teaching. It was a half-time working arrangement and I chose it partly because I liked the people that I was working with; but I am afraid I must say it was for more practical reasons that I could drive down Bayview in 10 minutes and arrive there. In other words, not very much of my day was taken up with commuting. The half-time working arrangement which I had there, I enjoyed very much because it gave me an interest in keeping up with professional activities, but it also gave me plenty of leisure time for enjoying Toronto, taking our children on educational tours, and so on. During the year at York, I got to know Mort and DecAppleby very well, and they were the two whom I saw most on the psychology staff.

In 1964, my husband was transferred again, this time to Omaha, Nebraska. When we first arrived, we really felt we were coming to the "wild West" and after living here for six years, I haven't altered that original impression by very much. I feel, in a way, as though I have stepped back a century. I know that in Canada, we tend to think of the American as up-to-the-minute in everything. But, when it comes to the area of ideas, of thinking and ^{of} culture, the mid-West is certainly lagging. I suppose it's not fair for me to make sweeping statements like that, I am only telling you what my own impression is. After working here professionally, I can say that being a psychologist in this part of the country, is not easy because you do not have the supporting sub-structure

of^{a)} reasonably good cultural level to work with.

The first year or two that we were in Omaha, I made no effort to get involved in professional activities. There was no University that I wanted to be affiliated with so we spent a good part of our leisure time in travelling around, touring to the various scenic spots. I should say that living in this part of the country has one advantage in that you are at the center and can go out on a radius in almost any direction and find a different scene, interesting geographical changes, and so on.

When we first came here, we had been told that this would be a short stay. I think this is part of the reason that we didn't make any effort to put down roots and I made no effort to get involved in professional activities. The following year, however, a pediatrician friend of mine, Matilda MacIntire, asked if I would join a project that she and another pediatrician were doing on the 'Sequelae of Childhood Poisoning.' We were to follow up children who had been admitted to the Children's Memorial Hospital here and do a complete examination, physically and psychologically, social background, etc., of each of these children. They were to be divided into^{a)} children who had been very ill on admission, and^{b)} children who had maybe just swallowed a couple of aspirin and the parents brought them in to be checked. We tried to find whether there were any major differences in these two groups of children. This was an interesting research^{project} and probably gave me a better picture of professional life in Omaha, because I had a chance to meet, if not other psychologists, certainly some very fine medical people.

The following year, Dr. MacIntire was appointed Director of a Children

and Youth program, a federally financed program, which was designed to bring comprehensive health services to children in poverty areas. Omaha has about 30,000 children who would qualify as being in the target population. The poverty designation for this area was taken from the OEO guideline and they stated that any family of 4 with an income of less than \$2,500 a year, would be considered^d in the 'poverty' group.

The program was designed by the Children's Bureau so the personnel who would be doing all the services was decided in Washington. Having a psychologist on the staff was laid down as part of the total health program in all of the areas. I mention this because I am not sure whether in each community, there is any particular urgency about having a psychologist on the health team. I think now that I am in it and am working with the rest of the team, that the role of psychology is accepted as essential but I don't think this was the approach locally in the beginning. Further evidence of this I think is in the arrangements ^{within} the city itself. There are very few resources, very few places to which children can be sent for any kind of evaluation, follow-up, etc. The population of this city is very close to 400,000 people and I can tell you there are only 2 ^{child} psychiatrists practicing for private patients. There are two psychologists who are in private practice and others who do some private work in addition to being affiliated with another organization or institution. I sometimes take an odd case, an odd referral, - by that I mean as infrequent as possible, - from some pediatricians I know. But at this point I do it more as a personal favor because the job I have is full-time and demanding. I work with people

who are deprived and who have multiple problems and terribly complicated lives. And so I don't like really to use any leisure time for private cases, but occasionally I do.

For the past two years, I have been a member of the Douglas County Mental Health Advisory Board and some forty of us are on that Board have been trying desperately to get more services in the Mental Health field for all ages, but the top priority has been labelled as Services for Children. The school system has a psychological department, but I feel it is inadequate in numbers and perhaps in the training and orientation of some of its staff. This is part of a larger picture of neglect of children. I don't mean neglect in the physical sense, but a kind of ignoring that they are around. There are not nearly enough playgrounds, not enough is done to insure children's safety in, say, walking to school. And I am thinking now of the walkthroughs that existed between houses on private property in Toronto which enable children to take short cut to school. And this seem so sensible, -everybody realized they were going to take the shortcut anyway, so why not build a sidewalk fenced in and properly arranged for the safety and the protection of the children and of others. But this kind of thinking hasn't reach^d here yet. And I find that working as a practitioner in Psychology can sometimes be very discouraging because you are trying to work with adults who can hardly grasp what it is that you are trying to get across to them. They feel because they were beaten as children that they should beat their children in turn - that there is nothing else, that this is the only way. But I think this is just part of a larger picture of neglect of children. Now some of the papers coming out of

the Children's Bureau would imply that this is true across the country. I can't tell you about that, but I do know that the papers make sense to me when I compare what I have seen with what is printed. In fairness, again, I should say that I get, I am sure, a distorted picture because my work take me into the area of the very poor. But the poor here are not poor so much in material goods, - they are poor in living habits and in suitable models, and in their own estimate of themselves. They feel impoverished and they are impoverished. I've known ^{in the past} a lot of poor people with a very independent spirit. They didn't have much, but they had a terrific regard for themselves and a good solid outlook on life. This is not the kind of poverty that I have seen here here's a kind of hopelessness about it. ^{here} But I think the number one job that should be done here, to pay more attention to children, to give them a better chance in life, not more things, but to give them more time, more parental guidance, a more substantial home life and certainly a lot more guidance and direction. This is part of what I am trying to do and this is part of my present assignment. That's why I've spent a little time on it because this is my great concern as of now, May 1, 1971.

Just a word or two about our personal life. Now our two sons are 17 and 16 years of age. The 17 year old is attending private school in New Brunswick. This is a college preparatory school, situated at about 10 miles from my home city of St. John, New Brunswick. This is his second year there. He will have one more year and then will be ready to go on to college. The school recently, during the Easter vacation, took some of the boys of whom our son was one on a cruise in the Mediterranean. They visited Greece, Italy, Turkey, North Africa, Malta, Gibraltar, Spain, Portugal, then back to England for a day ^{or} two, and then they flew from London to Montreal. This has

been, I am sure, an interesting educational experience. He says that it was well worth it and he enjoyed it tremendously. Our younger son is in grade 11 at West Side High School here, and will probably, if we stay here for another year, finish off his high school years at that school. He intends to go to a Canadian university and of course we have encouraged him in this because we want to get back ourselves to Canada and we would like our children to feel that they are Canadian. They certainly have a great love for everyone and everything back home and they are eager to get reestablished in our own country again.

(Well, Roger, I have done a lot of rambling. I needed you here with your questions to kind of keep me on the track; but I thought I would send this along to you and if you want to make use of it, fine. I am also sending back the corrected copy of the first tape).