

PROFESSOR MARY JEAN WRIGHT

photocopy
code1929.
=

#1A MYERS: This is part of the Oral History of Psychology in Canada for the Archives of the Canadian Psychological Association. I have Mary Wright with me and we are in Philadelphia, attending the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association. It is April 13, 1969. We had an interview yesterday. However, after an hour and a half of reminiscing we discovered, to my dismay, that the microphone had not been turned on. So we now have to try and recapture some of the things that Mary told me about her history yesterday.

Well Mary, now that we are reasonably sure that I have the machine operating, let's go back again to the beginning, as far as you are concerned. Where were you born?

W: In Strathroy, Ontario, Canada.

M: Where is Strathroy?

W: About twenty miles the other side of London, the biggest little town in southwestern Ontario between London and Sarnia.

M: And into what kind of a family did you arrive?

W: I arrived in a family where there were already four boys. After five years I arrived. My oldest brother is ten years older than I, and my youngest brother is five years older than I am, so I had a very big adult family to bring me up.

M: What kind of a family was it? What did your father do?

W: My father was a man who made pianos. He had a piano manufacturing factory and he also had a store downtown where he showed these pianos and musical instruments. This store was always a very important part of our lives as children because we used to be able to go

down and try out all the new instruments and try out all the new sheet music and bring the sheet music home and get scoldings from my father for taking home music and not returning it. So we had a very musical family. We were brought up on music and pianos and the music store and everything. We loved it.

M: Your father had had something of an entertainment or musical career, or he had done a lot of it, anyway?

W: Yes, his family were all interested. In those days, in southwestern Ontario, well, in any part of Canada, I suppose, there was no telephone, no television, no radio, and no electric lights even, I guess, until what--1910? My parents remembered the arrival of the first electricity, the arrival of the telephone, and the arrival of the motor car and of course, the arrival of the radio and television. So they had a very active dramatic company and that type of thing in Strathroy. They were quite well known actually for this sort of thing and have been written up in several places. Father came from a family in which he had a sister who played such parts as Katisha in the Mikado and he played the part of Koko. They did all of the usual Gilbert and Sullivan things and some of Shakespeare, and so he was very interested in dramatics and music. When he was bringing up his children he turned to this kind of thing, I think, to build a good family. He couldn't have avoided it. But Father was concerned about raising children and he did a lot of interesting things such as starting the Boy Scout Troop in Strathroy and raised money to take all these boys camping by putting on minstrel shows. His talents came out in the minstrel shows they put on

every year and which were a big success. They put on Humpty Dumpty circuses which were gambling things and my father would work his head off. They had an Egyptian mummy and, in all the tents, different shows-- Hawaiian dancers and so forth. And a bugle band that paraded the streets. And so he really did a great many things with children too, as he used his entertaining talents. Then my mother played the piano very nicely too, and she had a dear little contralto voice so that she was a mother that was just the right kind for my father's idea of a mother of a family.

All of us were brought up on music--the family singing and playing etc.

M: I remember once, after you had been a Toronto graduate student for some time, I worked up enough nerve to tell you that I knew all about your brothers who formed an orchestra that was very well known in my college days.

W: I remember I was pretty disgusted that anybody had discovered about my brothers. I didn't want anybody in Toronto to discover about my brothers.

M: You wanted it kept secret so that you wouldn't get any advantage out of it.

W: Yes, I had been my brothers' sister for so long that I was rather anxious to find out what I could do on my own.

M: Well now, let's go on through your schooling. Did you go to school at Strathroy?

W: Oh yes.

M: Have you any idea when you first encountered the word "psychology"?

W: Yes, I encountered the word, at least to my knowledge the first time I had heard about it was in late August or early September, 1935, when I was about to go off to university. There had been some discussion in my family about what I should do, what kind of courses I should take, or what kind of a program of studies I should take. I didn't want to be a school teacher. That was the one thing I knew I didn't want to be. Even though I subsequently ended up being a university professor, at that time it was the last thing in my mind. So the logical thing for me to do was to go into the things that I had done well in at high school, which were English and history. These were the things I always got quite high marks in. But during the last year or two in high school I had begun to think that I wanted to go into medicine. There was a little West Indies fellow who ran the book store that thought I should go into medicine. So anyway I don't know whether it was a real interest in medicine or not. I often look back at it and think that it was glamorous and different and something, but I remember that I was a little bit worried about it because I didn't know how I would manage about dissecting corpses. I worried about that part of it and I was frightened of funerals. So at that point I was going to every funeral I could and standing as close to the casket as I could and trying to get over this feeling I had in case I was going into medicine. My parents didn't object. Whatever we wanted to do we did.

My brothers took it upon themselves to say, "This isn't appropriate for a girl", and all that sort of thing. So I thought about it, and I didn't want to oppose them for fear I would fail. My oldest brother who

has always played the role of guide, leader and authority figure in the family, was worried, I suppose, about his little sister who was being dissuaded from medicine. He was in Ottawa that summer on an equestrian training programme with the Army. He had been very interested in the Army as a young fellow and by this time he had attained his majority and was down there on some officers' training program. While there he had a very good friend, a chap who was a history professor at Western, and they were talking about all the new things that were happening on the scene. This man told Clark about psychology and how exciting a thing this seemed to him. For example, they had developed tests for sorting out children's school abilities and he thought that would be a very exciting thing for young people to go into. Clark thought right away, "This is something for Mary," and he came and talked to me about it. It hadn't been taught, as far as he knew, at Western when he was there in 1922. He graduated in 1929. I think it may have been, but I guess he didn't know about it. So when I went to university I started off in the program that would lead into English and history and I took Psychology 20 extra. Within a few weeks, even though it was an early morning class, I would have missed anything but that. I found it very, very interesting. By the end of that year I got permission to transfer into the Honours Philosophy and Psychology program the next year.

M: That was Roy Liddy?

W: Yes, he was the one from whom I took my Introductory Psychology.

M: Using Woodworth's text?

W: Yes, a little old pale blue book.

M: The introduction of the 'U' between the 'S' and 'R' that we all went through at that stage. Well now, you said something yesterday to the effect that you couldn't go into Honours Psychology until you got to your third year.

W: Oh, it was just the way it was set up. They hadn't very many students in it, so they had a combined course. It was interesting. I have often thought that it was probably quite a good thing. In the second year, anybody in philosophy and psychology, or whether they were interested primarily in philosophy or psychology, took exactly the same set of courses and then in the third and fourth years you could take more psychology and less philosophy, or vice versa.

M: Well now, you started off in English and history. When did you change to philosophy and psychology?

W: At the end of the first year--I had to complete the year first. And some of the things that were required, like economics and Business 20, of all things! Liddy let me off Business 20 altogether but he said I ought to take Economics 20, or at least audit it. But they accepted my Latin and all the other courses I had taken. I didn't last very long in Economics 20. That's the story of how I got into it.

M: One of the things I want to hear you tell about is your first honours class in psychology.

W: That was really funny. This brings us to one of the interesting characters of Western when I went there first--Douglas J. Wilson. He taught an awful lot of things. In this big honours program with three or four people, you had three or four courses from Roy Liddy, and four or five, maybe five or six courses from poor Doug Wilson--I never stopped to

count them out. On this particular day this was the first introduction to laboratory work in psychology--the first experimental course. There were three of us--one Honours student heading for philosophy and two for psychology. We three went into this class all eager to learn. There were several students in the room--40 or 50 maybe--which was quite a good size class in those days. Dr. Wilson whipped in with a pile of books, put them down, and started to lecture at a great rate on the aesthesiometric index, and he had big words and he had formula on the board and he had everything up there. Libby Harvey, who was the other would-be psychology student and I looked at each other and said, "My Lord, can you understand what this is all about?" "No, I can't follow a thing he says. This is far too complicated for me." It went on and on until finally the class was over and we went off down the hall deciding that we had better not get into this course--we'd better change right away back into something we could understand--whereupon pelt, pelt down the hall after us came Doug. He said, "Are you the two girls who are going into Honours Psychology?" We said, "Yes," and he said, "Well, don't pay any attention to that class. There were so many students in there I couldn't possibly handle them in the lab because we haven't nearly enough equipment. I had to scare some of them out so I tried to give them a lecture that no one could understand."

Doug was really hilarious at times. We sat and shook with laughter. We came out of his classes, on occasion, with really sore sides, and no fooling, really sore sides. He'd have a sort of manic flight of ideas. He'd start into a class and it would be really funny. One thought would lead him to the next thought and it would go on and on for a whole class. He was quite a character.

M: Was he very popular as a teacher?

W: I don't know. I don't know anything at all about whether he taught General Arts students who thought he was popular. I wouldn't know. I think he was so busy teaching us all these umpteen courses that he had to teach, that that was about all he probably did. I really can't answer that question.

M: Well, he was there from when to when--do you know that?

W: He was there the whole time I was there, but he went into the Navy. Wasn't it the Navy that Doug went into? He went into the armed forces, anyway, quite early in the War, and that was the end of it. He didn't come back to Western. He went to the Montreal Star.

M: He went into newspaper work.

W: He was at Western all the time I was there and that was 1935 to 1939.

M: Do you know when he arrived?

W: I don't know how long he had been there.

M: It was sometime in the early 30s I think.

W: One fascinating thing that I discovered, not from Doug Wilson, or from Roy Liddy, but from Bob MacLeod, was that Robert MacLeod was interested in the job at Western, applied for it, came down for an interview, and that Roy Liddy had selected Doug Wilson over Robert MacLeod.

M: Just shows the misleading effect of interviews.

W: You can check that out when you are talking to Bob MacLeod.
Are you going to do an interview with him?

M: Oh yes, I think so.

W: He was at Queen's wasn't he, before that?

M: No, he was at McGill. Was he at Queen's?

W: Where did he get his degree?

M: I thought he got his Doctorate over in Europe somewhere, but I don't know. All right now, you entered Western in 1935, and who else was on the staff beside Roy Liddy and Doug Wilson?

W: That was about it. Roy Liddy was, of course, the Department Chairman, and Doug Wilson was the other psychologist. There was another philosopher, Allison Johnson. I am pretty sure that he came in 1936 or 1937. I think he was a Freshman instructor that first year, and for that reason I enjoyed his courses. But that was philosophy, not psychology. There was another man in philosophy, Fraser, a lecturer, but it must have been a bad-paying job because they came and went. There was always a new one. It seemed to be a one- or a two-year appointment, and that was about as long as they lasted. Then there was Leola Neal who had, at this time, I think, a Master's. She was around as a general assistant. She got her Master's at Western and taught clinical methods. George Stevenson used to come in and teach. They utilized the community to help swell the staff. George Stevenson taught one half of abnormal psychology--in the Senior year you got abnormal--and Liddy taught the first half. In those days it was such a small staff that honours students and pass students were taught together. They weren't able to afford separate sections.

M: The honours students just had to make a higher standing?

W: The courses were harder, in many respects, and therefore students didn't take them. So you had an honours course and maybe one or two people in it. There weren't many in it, although in child psychology there would be a class of about 50. The honours students had to do extra work.

I wrote millions of essays. In the main they would send us off to the Library to work things up and then come back and talk about them. Abnormal, for example, was open, and perhaps there would be about 40 people in that. Social psychology was open.

M: Was Leola Neal already working with George Stevenson on that book they published, or did that come later?

W: She worked with him on that at some time in that era, but then I went off to Toronto as soon as I got my B.A. in 1939. I think she probably did that work after that. I remember now that Penrose came to London during that time. Leola was very interested in his work and I think she was very much involved with the Ontario Hospital at that time. When did she come back to Toronto for her Ph.D.? Oh I know, she came back right away, that's right. I went down in 1939 and got my Master's in 1940. I had an apartment on Breadalbane Street. Leola came and had a post at the United Church's Whitney Hall as a Don. We used to go over to the Toronto Psychiatric together on one morning a week to sit in on a conference. So Leola was there in 1940-41. Then I think I went off to Ottawa to the Children's Village and then on to the War with Bill Blatz and his crew. Leola completed her Ph.D. there in something like 1942. Does that sound reasonable? She will be able to tell you all about that. I think that book came out after I was out of the picture. Also, the Penrose era was really more that wartime period when I was overseas, and you were too.

M: Well, Lionel Penrose never had a teaching appointment in the Department of Psychology at Western, did he?

W: Not while I was there. He never taught me.

M: In retrospect, could you give a general description of what psychology was like at Western, or what the Department was like, to an undergraduate?

W: One thing you asked me about the other day, and I talked quite a bit about it, and we both enjoyed talking about it, was Roy Liddy himself. You asked me what kind of a teacher he was and I said that the thing that impressed me most was the care with which he expressed himself--the preciseness. A favourite phrase would be "And I use this term advisedly," and he would try to communicate the need to be careful about your selection of terms. He was a very good teacher. He was so clear and so easy to understand, from my point of view, that he often seemed simple. I often think that Blatz was like that. Because everybody could understand him they thought he didn't have anything to say, and I think that's a mistake. So anyway, he was a good teacher. It may be that he didn't know that much psychology, but maybe that much psychology wasn't known at that time.

I took a philosophy course from him too. It influenced my interests and thinking at that time. I had come from a smaller community where I had belonged to a church and was expected to adhere to certain ideas, and then come away to university where I had to think about all this. I think that philosophy course was excellent. You'll never believe it, but Roy Liddy was a heretic in London. For some time I never realized this, but he was regarded with a great deal of suspicion by the London community, because of the way he taught students not to believe in God. In all the years I knew him he was a devoted member of the United Church

but he was thought to be a heretic. He used to talk to us about this and about God. He had a lot of ideas about determinism and indeterminism, but he was excellent from the point of view of a teacher, I thought, in those days. He drew this sort of thing out of the students during discussions. I went on and took a course in social psychology with him, but I think, in retrospect, that there wasn't as much to be said in social psychology. In any case, I didn't get much out of social psychology except a high grade, but I did get a lot out of philosophy. The introductory course was good and he also taught the abnormal.

To summarize the set-up at Western, at the time that I was there as an undergraduate, we had three key persons: the Head, a full-time person in philosophy, a full-time person in psychology--that's Doug Wilson--and we had Leola Neal and George Stevenson. Also, I remember old Archdeacon Sage who used to come in to teach ethics. As I said before, they used people in the community. The flavour of the Department, in terms of what the students were going to be and were inspired to be were clinicians, I think. Leola Neal, I think, did that. Roy Liddy had that kind of interest too. He was "mission oriented", to use the modern phrase, and George Stevenson was interested too. Though people suggested he was pretty negative in his attitude toward psychology it seemed to me he was very positive in his attitude to psychology, and we were very welcome in the Hospital.

Right after I graduated I undertook an internship at the Ontario Hospital, London, and that was a really interesting, good summer. They treated us with respect, and they tried to teach us a great deal.

M: Both you and Libby?

W: Yes, the two of us. I felt that we were enjoying a lot of acceptance that, probably Leola Neal had earned over the years with her work there and the contribution she had made. The year after, in 1940, I went to Whitby. I must say that the attitude towards psychological interns at the Ontario Hospital, London, was as different as day from night, compared to what we got at Whitby. Now, Elsie Stapleford was at Whitby.

But to go back to London, Ed Hobbs was the Director of the Mental Health Clinic, and that was really what we were attached to when we were at the so-called Mental Health Clinic as interns, although we did a lot of things in the Hospital too. With our big keys we wandered around and did pretty much what we wanted to do in the Hospital. We had to go and witness an autopsy, of course, which was great fun for the medical interns--to have these two psychological interns, girls at that, on this autopsy. That was Ed Hobbs trying to teach us psychologists something about the brain. I think this is a nice commentary on modern psychology at Western, because they certainly do know something about physiology now. In those days he undertook to teach us the brain, and that is how he spent his time with us, more than in any other way, teaching us what he knew best. So that was the internship in London. And that, as I told you in the interview yesterday, was the first time that I really had an encounter with Professor C. Roger Myers.

M: Yes, tell about that.

W: That was because he was responsible for the interns around the Province, I believe, as Consultant to the Department of Health of the Province of Ontario. So there came the day when he was to arrive to talk

to us about what we were doing and about what we ought to be doing. This was when I told you about the feeling that we had at Western that we had had no research training. When I went down to Toronto I felt inadequately trained even though I had been through an honours program, because I hadn't done any research. There was a course in our program that was supposed to be a B.A. research course. We still have the course, 459, and they do a baby M.A. thesis. But Doug Wilson had that course on top of six or seven others that he had to teach and so he said, "I haven't got time to work with you kids on anything, so what we'll do when we meet for this course will be that we will go over Allport's new book." (This was Gordon Allport's first big book on personality, not Floyd Allport's book which he brought out not very long after that, on perception.)

1B

M: Now, you said you expected when you went to Toronto you would be sadly lacking in what Toronto would require in research training.

W: No, we were talking about Roger Myers at the Ontario Hospital in London. So I went over frightened to death. Part of my fear was based on the thought that, "He's going to expect me to do research. Every psychologist does research, and I haven't got a problem and I don't know how to do it anyway, and I feel very insecure." Sure enough, when we met he did talk about research, but fortunately he also suggested that what he was particularly interested in this summer was having the young interns talk about their impressions of the mental hospital. He wanted us to write up our experiences and what we thought about the whole thing, as much as possible--from the first of the summer, right at the beginning when we had first arrived, and what we expected and what we found and how

we felt about it. So we did that. That was the first time I had met Roger and the next year, in Toronto, I took a course from him.

So much for that. Then I went to Toronto to take an M.A. That was as far as I meant to go. My father thought I was going to get married and he thought it was pretty silly for me to go on. He said, "I'll give you the \$1,000 to go on with your M.A. or give you the \$1,000 for your sheets and pillow slips." I said, "I want to go on," and I went on. I had an assistantship with Bott. Now those were the gems of things that got washed out. Do you remember me as Bott's assistant?

M: No, you weren't Bott's assistant, you were the assistant to the assistant.

W: I know, but I was Bott's assistant. I was just the lowest on the totem pole. I had really not taken to experimental psychology at that stage. Not that I ever have since. You see, medicine was the thing I was going to go into. I went into psychology because as a clinical psychologist I could do all the things that I really wanted to do in medicine. Everything I studied as an undergraduate was in terms of: there I'm going to be in a clinic and somebody is going to want to know how they can help their child that stutters, or something like that, and so these are the things I have to know--useful things--to help other people.

M: Sorry now, we'll have to keep on track.

W: Yes, this had to do with Bott, with getting to be Bott's assistant.

M: Yes, but before we go on to the experimental side, a thing that we lost that I want to recapture is: the last time we did this I asked you what there was about that first course in psychology that you took from Roy Liddy that grabbed you. Why did it grab you?

W: Oh, I don't think I want to tell you that. I said I was in love at the time with a man that...

M: It is enough to say that you had a personal reason, that this was relevant to your personal problem, but you also said that your interest in going into medicine had been to help people who needed help and that here was another way, perhaps, that you would be able to help people.

W: That's right.

M: That's important to record because there are all kinds of myths around about psychology. One is that most psychologists are disappointed medical students (you fit that category), or they are misled, would-be clergymen, or that they go into psychology for the purpose of solving their own personal problems. So I think it is interesting to document this kind of thing, where any of these factors are involved.

W: Yes. When I look back on it, I think that medicine was, to some extent, a will-o'-the-wisp kind of thing. I don't think it was really my idea. I don't think I really knew what I wanted to do. I think that the idea of service to other people appealed to me, and being able to do a useful piece of work in the enterprise--this kind of contribution to people rather than being a good seamstress or nurse. I never wanted to be a nurse. I didn't want to be the little dog under the wagon. I was hoping to be something. I was always the kind of kid that was president of this and president of that. I was willing to work, and I liked running things. I liked people, O.K., but I really did like running things.

M: That should make you a good Chairman! All right now, here you are, a would-be clinical psychologist, arriving in Toronto, and of all things, you find yourself an assistant to Professor Bott, in experimental psychology which he was teaching to medical students.

W: That's right. Poor old Doug Wilson had taught us the lab courses. He had stolen as much equipment as he could from the University of Toronto because they didn't have any money at Western, and he had made things out of bits and pieces. He taught us what he could and we did mirror drawing and all those usual things. We worked with mazes that were made in the carpentry shop and we smoked drums and took recordings and measured the distance with a ruler.

M: Young people won't know what smoked drums are. They'll think you smoked pot. You'd better explain that.

W: Well, they know how you keep timing things on a polygraph now. In those days you had a smoking thing. You had to take a drum with a piece of paper on it, and roll it around in the smoke until it got all black. You would smear the smoke if you put your finger on it, like having steam on the window and running your finger across it to write your name on the window. The Lab stank and smoked through all this horrible performance and you had dirt all over everything and you. After you had smoked this dirty thing you put it on the Kymograph. They know what a Kymograph was, don't they? No, they probably don't. Two drums, one at each end, and you strung this paper, and you stuck it with glue. You got it tightened up because if you didn't it wouldn't run, or if you got it too tight it wouldn't run, because of the little motor that turned the Kymograph and kept it going. Then you set your little stand with your little pointers. You tried to get these pointers working every time you would press a button if you were doing reaction times. The time would be... you'd try to synchronize it with a clock. You can imagine all the accuracy and the intensity of the pressure on this thing. After you got all your

recordings done you had long strips of dirty paper which you gingerly and carefully put in a fixing solution and then hung up to dry.

M: So the whole thing wouldn't just rub off.

W: After you had done that, you took it home to write up your lab. You got a ruler and you measured the distance between the blips, and that had to be translated into time in terms of the speed, and you hoped the damn thing was running at the right speed! That's all it was. Ah, when you think of the crude techniques and devices we had for measuring responses!

So this was my background in experimental psychology. I really did try, and I think this is to my credit, that I really thought I should go and study in the States. I had applied to one of the places in California-- that was big and brave because that would be a real stride out into the great world. I received a letter from Edward G. Tolman accepting me as a student if I could find my own financial support. Imagine that in this day and age when people are all interested in getting graduate students. I also wrote to Columbia and my father tried to pull strings there by writing to a friend of his, Shotwell, who was the United Nations guy. Shotwell said he was in history and he really didn't have any influence in the Psychology Department, whatever that was.

But in any case, there was I and one day Roy Liddy came to me and he said, "Mary, my good friend Professor Bott at the University of Toronto is prepared to offer you an assistantship." I think that is how I got the word. I don't think I got it from a letter, although maybe I did in the end. He offered \$200, and by God that was quite a lot of money, or it may have been \$300, because I was a straight A student which helped. I had the gold medal as I told you. I guess Roy said, "You had better take this student."

The assistantship I had was to assist Professor Bott. Yes, I did have a letter. I went around with this piece of paper and said to Doug Wilson, "You know I don't have enough experimental psychology to be a good assistant to Professor Bott. I'd die at the thought!" "Oh, don't worry," Doug said, "you'll be all right, you'll be all right. Go on down there. Everything you've had here is just exactly the same thing they teach at Toronto. You'll know most of it." So off I went.

There was Bott, and Bott had Mary Salter as his first assistant, and then she had an assistant which was me. The following year I had an assistant. But in any case, I had to go and sit in Bott's classes, and I also had to go and take his lectures--Psychology Ia over in that Medical Building, and it was the worst experience. He taught medical students, and he must have taught two courses. That's how I first got to know Jack Griffin, because he used to have Jack Griffin come in and do some teaching in that Ia course. I had to listen to his classes because I had to mark all the Ia assignments. I can't remember much about that Introductory course but I used to compare it with Roy Liddy's course. Roy Liddy's was every bit as good as Bott's.

M: As good as, you really mean that it was better.

W: Oh yes, I think that it was. But in any case, it was that lab course with the medical B and M group, and this was the cream of the crop in medicine, wasn't it, and all these handsome fellows, and there was I. But the thing that I always remember most about Ned Bott was how he would get so enthusiastic and excited in his classes, and whenever he got excited over his subject he would get confidential with you. He'd sort of

begin to talk quietly, and just as if he was all wrapped up in you and in his subject and he was conveying to you a confidence. Do you remember this? Is this a way of describing it?

M: Yes, his voice would disappear so you couldn't hear what he was saying.

W: He'd sort of chew his words and talk through his nose and I can see him yet. And just in the middle of one of these enthusiasms he would ask me for something. I wish I could remember some of the things he would ask for, because I had never heard of them! I'd sneak out and run around and try to find it and I'd think "What the heck is that?" I'd grab my two tomes that I had sitting ready for every emergency, and I'd look to see --because Mary Salter had told me that everything was well ordered and all I had to do was look in this and I'd find the thing and then it would be in Cupboard No. 6 in the little room at the back. I told you in the other tape where I had my little room back there at the back of 71 St. George. Or I'd find Mary Salter, or something, and by the time I got back usually he had passed on to something else anyway and he didn't want what I had gone after. Except the little homely things like the pincushion. I'd think why the heck do they have pincushions and all these homely objects? And Mary Salter would say "Leave them there, leave them there, he'll want them some day." Sure enough, and this was of course demonstrating tactile stimulation--going back to that old aesthesiometric index again. He'd have them blindfolded and put pincushions in their hands to see if they could identify these objects. Well that was my experience at Toronto as an assistant in the first year.

Now I'll tell you an interesting thing. I got the Master's that year. As you know, you were kind of on your own at Toronto, and I have told you that I didn't know how to do research. I went down to Toronto early because I wanted to be right on the bit. Boy it was exciting. I was going to Toronto and I was going to learn all these things that I hadn't learned at Western and I was really, now, going to get right into it. So I went down early and got my room and got set up and all the rest, and for two weeks I was as lonesome as could be. I kept thinking, "I've got to get at that research. I've got to do some research. That's what psychologists do, they do research."

So somebody said, "Go and see Bill Blatz." I think I wanted to know the developmental problems in connection with schizophrenia. I walked over to 98 St. George where the Institute was, and I wandered up through those dark alleys and I came up the north side of that place, and as I was coming along that dark alley by where you go up to the attic, if you remember that place, I encountered a man right in the hall. He was right there in front of me and he said, "Who are you?" I said, "I'm a new graduate student." "Oh. What do you want?" I said, "I'm looking for the office. I'd like to make an appointment with Dr. Blatz." "Oh, come in! I'm Dr. Blatz. What do you want?"

I don't know what I said but I conveyed the message that I knew I had to do an M.A. thesis, and the sooner I got started on it the better and I didn't have any ideas about what to do but I had been thinking about some things and I needed to talk to somebody. So he said, "All right, tell me what you want to do." So I told him. "Wonderful ideas. Good ideas."

He talked to me for a long time and he said, "Now, the thing to do is to...". I don't know what it was, but in any case I started off to do something that when I got through with it, Roger Myers said that wasn't what I had done at all. But I did try to find out--I started off to find out--I remember now--that children showed this bizarre behaviour in which they fantasy a playmate and they had hallucinations and characteristics that later on appeared in the schizophrenic. I wondered whether there was any similarity between these people and their behaviour. Well he thought that was a very exciting thing. Somehow or other that was my M.A., which turned out in the end to be negativism. I finally picked on one of these behaviours--negativism--and I went out to study schizophrenics and children on this one particular thing. That was what I was out to find out about, but I had to get a situation in which you could test this negativism. We had to have something that would give rise to it. I had to talk to somebody. Nora Loeb was a graduate student then too, and I used to talk to her up in that little attic of hers. I always felt that Nora was my greatest helper in my struggle for a procedure.

What I devised finally, was to "push them" in terms of difficulty, so I had to have screening, and I had to find out what was difficult. Then later on I tested them. I used the two different forms of the Binet--Form L and Form M,--so that there was an equal difficulty involved here for these different people. Then I would go out with a new set of games for them to play and I would push them to give them the equal degree of difficulty to see how they behaved and how they reacted, and so on. I did a whole developmental study of this. I had kids at Windy Ridge and at the Nursery School (that's when I got to know Margie Fletcher). I had them at every

age level including high school (Morgan Parmenter was out in one of those high schools). I would travel by bus. I went over to the Psychiatric and I had them going away to the bathroom and putting soap in their ears, real catatonic episodes induced by my performance.

This is what I set out to find out about. I wrote up my M.A. thesis and I took it into Professor Myers who was one of my advisors, and I took it into Dave Ketchum and I took it into Bill Blatz. Bill Blatz said: "Good, good." I got it back from David Ketchum with a few notes in the margin. But when I went in to see Roger Myers I could find hardly anything of what I had written. He had marked it all up with red pencil. He said, "Will you kindly sit down there and tell me what it is that you have done." I told him about this difficulty thing, and he said, "Well, why don't you say that?" Well, anyway, Roger told me--he was really the first person who did make me think about this whole thing. I thought I knew what I was doing, but anyway the M.A. thesis did come out which was in line with what Roger Myers convinced me I was really trying to say and do. I got an A-on it, which wasn't too bad considering that I was in competition with other people who I was sure had far better training than I had. Really, you were on your own at Toronto! Now that's one thing, good or bad, for better or worse (and maybe this is one of the reasons why so many of your people didn't get degrees), that by God, you had to have a lot of enterprise to get your degree at Toronto. I think that our students get more training and they get involved with people, and I'm sure your students do too, they learn more, and there's more to learn, but somehow they are swept on into a degree by their advisors. They are

all wrapped up in a program of studies, but with us, you really had to pull something out of the hat and you had to put it together and you had to submit it.

M: This is very much in the British tradition and still is characteristic of, especially higher degree work, at British universities. Nobody chases you. Nobody pushes you.

W: But the only trouble with all that is that some of the stuff that comes out is really kind of drivelly, in the sense that I wonder if the students are too much on their own to pick up something and then they are not really working on what you like to call the cutting edge of knowledge.

M: I'm not suggesting it's good. I'm sure it's bad. All I am saying is that if it was true at Toronto, it was true because that was the general philosophy we got from people like Bill Line and others who came to us from the U.K.

W: Well, I think the way it is now when somebody is apprenticed to somebody, they are specializing. They really have to know that whole area and know it well, so that they are really finding where there are gaps in the knowledge, instead of saying "I'd like to work in this field," and they are supposed to read the literature. If they are not with somebody who is already working in that field they may be working on something that somebody has already done or it is an unsophisticated thing. Anyway that is water under the bridge. That was how I got my M.A. I took a clinical course from Professor Myers too.

M: Did you? What was that like?

W: Oh, it was all right. It wasn't as good as his course was subsequently, from what I have heard, when he started taping his interviews

and stuff. We pretty much went through the literature and had a seminar in which various people reported on various topics.

M: What did you pick to work up a bibliography on?

W: Hysteria. An annotated bibliography on hysteria. That was what got me off on that kick of religion with Bill Line. I told you about that course in the History of Psychology. I was looking then for a theme for a Ph.D. thesis.

M: You didn't tell me anything about Bill Line's course in religion.

W: No, it wasn't in religion, but he was going to take me on and we were going to have a course in the History of Psychology--I don't know why. I think he just picked that out of a hat and he'd give me a course that I could count for credit. That was the year that I had finished my Master's and I didn't intend to go on to a Ph.D. When I got my M.A. in that year, 1940, there weren't any jobs. I couldn't get a job. This was how I stopped being Ned Bott's assistant because I went out to Whitby. Elsie Stapleford was there making I think \$100 a month or something. There weren't any jobs any place. My father said, "Well, if there aren't any jobs, make a job. Create a job." By this time I had become very interested in the Institute. At a party I had played the piano and Marg Fletcher thought I was, not like Margie Dennison, but I was at least pretty good with the kids, so she was quite excited about this and she wanted me to come in and play at the Nursery School. Well I had a real hang-up on this, because of my brothers and the musical family we had. They expected me to do so well that when they'd show me off, they'd sit there, and all they'd say was, "Oh, you made a mistake, you made a mistake." So it got so that I was so

anxious about playing the piano that I just couldn't do it in public, even though I had been through the usual recitals. So I said to Marg Fletcher, "I can't do it. I can only play the piano when I have had a few drinks and then I don't care what anybody thinks about me, and so I couldn't possibly go into your school." She said, "Oh, come on now," and I always give Margie credit for having gotten me over that to some extent. I used to go over and practice "Bah, Bah, Black Sheep" late at night, because I knew I could use the money, as lunch money, you know, like an assistantship. I had gotten interested in the Institute of Child Study by this time, through that M.A. thesis, and being in there, and Margie having had to tell me how to work with kids. I thought this was exciting. I couldn't get a job anyway--the War was on--people were beginning to leave to go to the War. I went in to Karl Bernhardt and I said, "Now Karl, I would like to take a course. I want to stay on here as a student, I hope, if I can find somebody to work for enough to survive." I thought to myself, "I'm just going to take what I want to take. I'm not going to go on for a Ph.D. degree so I'm going to take everything I can in the child area for fun."

M: What had you taken in your M.A. year?

W: Oh, I'd taken this thing from Bill Line, and a course in measurement, and I'd taken your course in clinical. Did you have to take anything else? I can't remember.

M: Usually three courses. Did you take a course from Bill Blatz?

W: I did take a course with Bill Blatz, but I'm not sure whether I took it that year or the next year. I didn't take Ketchum. Apparently I did take Bill's, but of course, Bill only met us six times and he gave

us all Bs except Magda Arnold, who insisted on an A. Magda was so mad at him. But he said, "I'll give everybody a B. I don't grade anybody." So maybe I did take Bill Blatz's course. He said "Go and read my books and find out about security." So I did do that. That was Bill Blatz's.

Then there was Roger Myers's course. I remember at that time, if I recall correctly, he was very interested in demographic variables, or maybe that's not the right word. Well, you still are, you know. One of the things I remember is some of the studies that showed the deterioration that took place within a city.

M: Yes, the Chicago study....

W: Well, anyway, I did that thesis. I went over to Karl Bernhardt and I said, "Karl, what I think I would like to do is to go into this parent education stuff. I would be glad to work with you. I would like to be your assistant. In trying to explain to you that I think I could do a good job, I would like you to know that I have had some experience at public speaking. I've been president of this and that, and I think I could talk to parents. I think I could do this sort of thing, and I think I would like to do it." So it was arranged that Karl would take me on as his assistant, and this gave me a job to do. I think I got up to \$300, but it was enough for me to share an apartment with somebody and I was able to live, although my father had to put up some money. At that time you got a waiver of fees. Do you remember that? If you had enough to pay your room rent, then all you had to get from your father was money for clothes and some lunch money. We used to eat over there at Macdonald's and for 25¢ you got a good lunch. But that's neither here nor there.

That's how I got into the Institute. That year I took nursery education from Dorie Millichamp, and I went down to the Toronto Psychiatric. In fact, I just bummed that year, really, but I took lots of things that I liked. But that's how I got into the child thing.

Then I went overseas. The University of Toronto Department just went right down the drain because you went away, Bott went away, everybody went away--to the War. So I decided it was time for me to get out too, and I went down to the Protestant Children's Village in Ottawa and worked with Elsie.

M: Tell us about that. That must have been really something.

W: Well, I thought after a while, "By the time I get through with this...I've got to get out of this." I hated to fail. I was saved by the bell. Bill Blatz started this thing of his in England, and they invited me to go with them. I left about the end of March because we expected to get away in April. I can't remember the exact dates, but I know we were expecting to get away earlier than we did. We didn't get away until mid-June. We opened the School at Garrison Lane the first of July. We were held up for a whole month.

2a M: Before you go on with that tell us something about your experiences in Ottawa at the P.C.V.

W: The Protestant Children's Village in Ottawa, dear God! I had gotten to know Elsie at Whitby and Elsie had gone to the P.C.V. (they paid her so well at Whitby!), and she took on the job as Superintendent of the Protestant Children's Village. The P.C.V. (it has changed its character so many times), was really a receiving home for children from the Children's Aid Society at this time. They had school-age children from five to twelve

or thirteen, and then a pre-school group and about a dozen infants. My job was to look after the school-age children along with another woman who had been there. She got mad not long after I came there, and went off to the War as a WAC or something. I think she always resented somebody coming in with all my education, but she shouldn't have because we had exactly the same job to do, which was putting kids to bed and getting kids up.

I was trying to use all my modern psychology to work out a program for them, but we didn't have any equipment. It was a really pitiful thing, that whole experience. I was washing socks, or covering off for the cook or something. But it was an interesting experience and I learned a lot. I learned there something about infants. One night a month we had to take our turn covering off for the night nurse who came on. That meant that from seven to twelve one of us would go around and we'd have to give the babies their ten-o'clock feeding and "potty" the pre-schoolers. Later on when all the interesting stuff came out about infants without families--Burlington and Freud, and babies' institutionalization and so forth--I thought the experience I had there was great because they taught you how to get through all this work efficiently. The thing you did was, you'd go into the nursery, and you'd have all the bottles with all the labels on them. Then you started with the guy that got through first. You never changed them, whether they were wet or dry or anything else, because that would be a waste of time. If you did you would have to do it twice because they would all be wet afterwards, and that was silly. So you went in and propped these bottles in their little mouths, and if you put in the fast eater first, by the time you got them all propped you could start taking them out and then you could change them. I'll never forget the smell of that place where you cleaned them up!

Anyway, I learned how you did this, and it certainly does result in an absolute minimum of contact for an infant, as far as physical contact is concerned. But even then, without any of the knowledge we had later, we were holding infants who couldn't eat or wouldn't eat otherwise in that kind of a setting. Alice McGee was the nurse and she loved kids and babies. She was a real breath of fresh air in that place. We roomed together and we were both terrible, you know. Alice was a nurse who wanted to break all the rules and of course I, as a child psychologist, wanted to let these children learn how to wash themselves and so on. Alice was great at breaking rules. She'd cart these kids--the Mortimer twins--she'd cart them around because she felt that babies should have contact with older children in this sterile... And she was smart, not because she knew any psychology, but that was just her . . . Elsie Stapleford let her do it. She couldn't stop her anyway. So those babies were much better off with Alice. But she couldn't stand me waiting around for these pre-schoolers. I wasn't supposed to work with pre-school kids, but I did of course, because I couldn't stay away from it.

M: Do you mean Elsie?

W: No, Alice McGee, because as a nurse she got things done. "How can you people stand around and wait for those kids to do things by themselves?" I was supposed to be working with school-age children. Oh, the time Elsie and I spanked a child! Oh dear, all these poor mixed-up children. They were really emotionally disturbed children, that's really what they were. They were soilers. I washed dirty pants and tried to work with these kids. I'd take them to school when they wouldn't go to school. I got my legs frozen one day. That was an exhausting experience.

M: When did you know that you were going to go to Garrison Lane?

W: Well of course, the War was on and I felt I wanted to be in it. I'm not sure--I think it was Karl Bernhardt who said to me before I left Toronto, "If things come up--are you interested in anything?" I said, "I certainly am." Well, I had a phone call from Bill Blatz and they asked me to go over on that junket along with that crew of Margie and Dorie. I was only supposed to be going for the summer. They wanted to set up this training centre. As far as I know I went under false pretences, because I really did think, and so did my family, that I wouldn't be any more than six months over there.

M: When did you first hear of this?

W: They phoned me while I was working at the Protestant Children's Village. They asked to have me go mainly because Margie Fletcher didn't see how they could run a nursery school without somebody to play the piano, and she knew I could play the way she wanted, to follow the kids, and so forth. They also wanted to do some continuing studies on these youngsters, to see what happened to them, and they thought I could do that. And I did, though I had no training as a nursery-school teacher. Margie, with her black book, taught me all the way over about how you work with children in a nursery school. But my job was really to play that piano. However, before I knew it, Bill had me teaching. When I'd come down all flush-faced he'd say, "You liked that, didn't you?" I'd say, "Well, I don't know. It scares me," and he'd say, "You look as if you are excited and flushed." So before I knew it, he said, "I have to go back now and you are going to do all this teaching." That's how I started teaching.

I had all the responsibility of the teaching of that whole program really. I did all the lecturing--Dorie's lecturing, Bill Blatz's lecturing, all of it. I taught everything. "But," I said to Bill, "I don't know all these things." He said, "Come up to Oxford. Anne and I are going up to give lectures, and I'll talk to you. I'll teach you everything you need to know. I'm not worried about you."

He used to test me out. We had visitors one day and this woman was trying to say that all we had was behaviourism--John B. Watson. And of course, this used to drive me up the wall because I didn't think we were John B. Watson. I had taken systematic psychology, which I loved, as an Honours student. (I don't know who taught that, probably Doug Wilson, or maybe it was that philosopher.) It was such a help when we got to it because it made so many things make sense to me. So I took a flyer this day and said, "No," though I didn't really know, because nobody ever really said. I really had to do some fast thinking, and it's surprising that I didn't know, but I hit it right on the head from just listening to Bill teach, that it was functionalism. I was trying to say that it is not reactivity but rather that the child in this is making decisions. He is future oriented. He is adapting to his world. He is not just reacting to stimulation in the sense in which Watson . There's a vast difference between this. So that night when he was up with us, when we were staying at the Cadbury's, I said, "These people were there to-day and I don't know whether I said the right thing or not, but they were accusing us of being behaviourists and I was denying it. They said, 'What's the difference?' and I was talking about the Chicago group and was trying to explain in terms of functionalism and the activity of the child, that this

was a view in which the child was active about making decisions and adapting and selecting goals, and so forth."

M: Bill would be so delighted!

W: He was so delighted that after that he would hand anything over to me. He said, "That's perfectly right"(wide-eyed, you know).

M: You mean Bill and Dorie left the place?

W: They had to come back and run the Institute of Child Study.

M: Did Margie leave?

W: Yes, Margie went back, Dorie went back, and there was nobody left but Mary Smith (Mary McFarlane she was), and myself. And then they brought over a second wave toward the end of August, which included Marg Hinks and Eleanor Hamilton, and this gal who became the Headmistress of the place, with a double-barrelled name. I have repressed her completely. (It was Allison Mock.)

M: Why, did you not like her?

W: Well, not much. But she was to run the School and I was to run the training program. In that last period of time I went and listened to everybody's lectures. Also I was taken off on a couple of weekends with Bill and Anne. I had sat at the Master's knee and I had asked him everything I could think. Once I had fitted things in a bit this gave me an orientation and I had a basic idea of his philosophy. To some extent I think that what I have taught of Blatz was my interpretation of what Blatz was saying, but I have never been too sure that he really was saying what I thought he was saying.

M: Yes. But my goodness, what a maturing experience! Can you imagine anything that would make a young person mature faster than having to do what you had to do?

W: I was 26 or 27.

M: You sure must have grown at a hell of a rate!

W: Well, I grew up after Bill had gone and we didn't have any money and I couldn't pay my rent.

M: I remember you saying something once about a bottle of gin. What's that story?

W: Oh, that was my brother Billie. My brothers thought that I was going to be shipwrecked and they had a big send-off in the Park Plaza--and my father owned the Park Plaza before we got off! They were worried because not even any of my brothers had gone overseas at this point. So they all brought up their gifts. My two oldest brothers gave me a Movado watch (and doggone it, I lost it in Calgary a year ago), that was supposed to be water proof, shock proof, and everything else, and this was supposed to be because if people were on a raft they could survive anything if they knew what time it was! So this was to keep my morale up. I can't remember what Donald did. I don't think he did anything. He was too in love with Lily. But my brother Bill had a custom-built thing, which I would have drowned with, and this was what I was supposed to take on a raft. It was all fitted out with pills--every kind of pill that would keep you alive--and also it had a couple of mickies of gin and something else. He told me when I left with this custom-built thing (had I had it strapped to my back, as I was supposed to have, it would have drowned me for sure!), he told me that I was not to use those

"medicinal" bottles because I might need them on the way back--maybe it would be on the way back that I would get shipwrecked. So being a well-mannered and well-behaved little girl, I left these mickies--one was rum. Some time during the course of the summer when everybody's liquor supply was running out (and of course I didn't take a liquor supply because I didn't drink--that was the first real drinking I ever did--I learned to drink with those guys, and it must have been awful for them giving me--I'd have been mad if I'd handed it out to somebody who didn't drink--I didn't drink very much) and it was impossible, unless you knew somebody in the military, to get anything. So I told this story and Bill said "Somebody's hoarding rum around here." I felt like a heel so I went and got out one. I think I kept one of those bottles, and I don't think he ever did know that I had the other one.

M: I thought it turned out that...

W: No, that was another time, about the mint julep, when Bill wasn't there. Or maybe it may have been the summer when Bill came back. We got that bottle from some of the mothers that we had at the School. Some of the parents of the children were publicans (this was the highest of the social strata we reached--bus drivers and publicans). This was an advantage because once in a long while Lucy Ingram or somebody could persuade them to give us a bottle. We had planned to have mint juleps and we had the mint and we had sugar and everything, and we were doing up these mint juleps. Mary Smith was doing them--she was married by this time--and we had all these girls around, and Lucy Ingram, that English nurse was there, and we got them all fixed up and they looked so beautiful and we said, "Cheers, here we go". But we had put salt into these drinks instead of the fine granulated sugar and we couldn't drink them. It was oh...!

M: Wasn't that awful! Oh, gee!

W: Do you think we should turn that thing off? Do you think I have told you everything that's important and the kinds of things you want to hear about?

M: You haven't even got to your Ph.D.

W: Oh, you wanted to know about the U. of T. when I went there first as a student. Well you heard about my first introduction to Bill Blatz, and Dave Ketchum, and you heard about the Institute and those old houses.

M: I didn't hear much about Dave Ketchum. What did you have to do with him?

W: I never had much to do with him and I felt that so much, at the end of the first M.A. year, that the next year when I was hanging around there I ...

M: You were doing something with Karl Bernhardt in parent education, how did you...?

W: Well it never really turned out. I did work over there and I got an assistantship somehow or other, because I wasn't working for Ned Bott the next year, but I can't remember much what I did at the Institute to earn that money.

M: What puzzles me is, if you were in the parent education program...

W: I wasn't, I was a Ph.D. student.

M: Didn't you say that you had seen Karl Bernhardt and told him that you would like to do parent education, and he worked out something for you? That was the year after your M.A.

W: I don't remember if I was assigned to him in the end or not. I

never did get into the parent education. I took his course. It was parent education and child psychology. This is how I got the whole theory, in that course, from Karl Bernhardt. It was a one-term thing and then I took the thing from Dorie Millichamp, at the Institute, on the theory of practice. And I had had Bill Blatz's course the year before.

M: So that you did, really, have some background.

W: Before I went overseas with that crew I had all the theory. I knew the theory up and down, but nobody had ever translated the theory into the level of functionalism, structuralism, behaviourism. And I would not have been able to handle that at all had I not had an Honours course in psychology, with systematic psychology.

M: I don't think even Bill Blatz realized how much that...

W: It was that Harvey Carr...

M: But he was a product of Harvey Carr and so was Karl.

W: But it was almost a complete steal of the sensory consequences they used to talk about. I shouldn't, maybe, say a "steal" but it was an elaboration of exactly that set of ideas and it was anything but behaviourism. It was the opposing school to behaviourism. He must have realized it, and he realized I was right, and of course he just...

M: Now look, you got your M.A., and then you did a year as a Ph.D. candidate, and then you went to the Protestant Children's Village.

W: Because there still weren't any jobs, you see. No, I shouldn't say that, because by the end of that first post-M.A. year there were jobs all over the place, because the War was very serious by this time. This was 1941,

and you and Bott had already gone and Dave Ketchum had written his songs about
"Bott and all his brainy boys, are hurrying off to war"

(Something missing)

I've always been sorry that I wasn't one of the charter members
of the Canadian Psychological Association. I should have been, because I
was at the first meeting. I remember the CPA meeting, the one that Humphrey's
rats ran around. That was 1938, because I was a student at Western and Roy
Liddy brought us students down. I remember my first introduction to the
Institute of Child Study was that day when somebody took us around.

I'm sure it was then, because what else happened that time? He
was demonstrating his psychotic rats or something, and all of a sudden one
of them got out in that old McMaster laboratory and ran around.

M: It was in Room 8, University College.

W: Don't you remember that McMaster red brick building up on Bloor St.,
wasn't that McMaster?

M: That used to be McMaster.

W: Wasn't that what they still called it? Wasn't that where that
rat got out?

M: Nope. I think it was Room 8 in University College, in the theatre,
and I can still see George Humphrey reaching down under the table trying to
grab this rat, while going on with his speech. He was the funniest guy.

W: No wonder the poor rat--I remember the buzzes and the bells and all
hell broke loose, and the poor little rat, oh dear! But anyway, I really
should have been a charter member. I think that that first meeting....

M: I think you are a charter member in the sense that you are in the
first membership list which is 1942.

W: Oh, I guess it was a closed sort of select group that met in 1941, because your date of membership is not the same as mine. Well anyway, I was at that early inaugural meeting, Humphrey's meeting, the one that the rat got out at, which was the first meeting wasn't it?

M: I think so, yes.

W: And then the War came along and I think I may have missed something because I was overseas. But then, I don't know how, if I missed it you didn't miss it too, because you were overseas and a whole lot of other people were overseas. Now where were we before I got off on that kind of a tangent?

M: You stopped there when you really shouldn't have, because you have just got to come back to Toronto to finish your Ph.D.

W: But that was after the War.

M: I know, but that doesn't matter.

W: Well, as I say, when I left to go into the Protestant Children's Village, you had gone off, Bill Line was in something, Dave Ketchum went off to the Ottawa communications thing, and there wasn't really anyone left around much, but Karl Bernhardt. But this is the way things were going. So I left thinking that I wanted to get into something and get overseas, but there wasn't anything for women at that time. Later on there was the WACs thing, but it didn't get started until we had gone over with Blatz and his girls. So that was that, and that was the end of that era. This is how I had the background, and this is how I got into the child area.

We came back in the Fall of 1944 and it was too late then to go to school. In the meantime I guess I had decided that I had better finish that Ph.D., even though I had bummed back there and just taken things I wanted.

I needed to get the languages and in those days you had to have two languages. So while I was over in England I started in on the German. Now this is the way I got a Ph.D. I didn't intend to get one at all. It was the last thing in the world I was going to get. But when I talked to you after the War, I said something about this and you said (I think I conferred with you because when I came back it was too late to go back to school anyway and I had that peculiar aftermath--several people talked about this-- I was sure I couldn't have gone back to school anyway, there was a sort of flattened lack-of-ambition type of reaction for a while).

M: Yes, almost a shock apathy kind of thing.

W: I don't know what it was, but anyway I went out and worked in the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton. Bill Blatz wanted me to go out to Vancouver and run a school or do something out there in a nursery school. It's a good thing I didn't do that. That would have been an awful thing to do. The reason I didn't want to do that was because I had just come back to my friends, to the people I loved, and I had a personal problem to see to, and so I said, "No." Then he said (now this will be an interesting bit for history), "Well, make sure they pay you enough." I said, "I am equipped to go and do a clinical job, that is the one thing I am qualified to do, and so I guess I had better go over and see Montgomery." Bill Blatz said, "Make them pay you \$1,800. They are only paying \$1,600 but make them pay \$1,800." I was the first to get \$1,800, because Bill Blatz said he called them up. In any case, they were desperate for somebody. So I went out to the Ontario Hospital in Hamilton. That's when I got to know Anna Martins and that was when Kay Walters was directing the Mental Health Clinic. They didn't have a Director.

Then she got sick and I used to really work. On Tuesdays, every week for weeks, I had Juvenile Court work and I did everything. I was the psychiatrist, I was the tester, I was the conference leader, I talked to everybody who knew the kids, I dictated the reports and then I went and caught a train to go to Toronto to teach an evening class. Those were pioneer days at the Hospital.

M: Wasn't there a McCormick social worker?

W: She was a social worker, yes. She's dead now. So that was 1945-46. Then I went back to Toronto and went and talked to Roger Myers who was back too. I think that must have been when I sat in his (were you still in that room at 100 St. George with the window at the front, or had you moved over to the side by that time? Didn't you come back to the same office you had left? I can remember talking to you about this and I know that when we talked about what I should do that I was sitting with my back to the window. You were sitting at that desk with your back to the window, in the front there, right on St. George St. You used to sit with your back to the window, which was crazy when you think of it, because where would you get the light? You faced out to the door so that when a student came to the door you could see them. I sat to your right so I had my back sort of to the window, sideways, on a straight-back chair).

M: Do you remember the red burlap on the wall then? It was ordinary potato sacking painted red.

W: I don't remember that at all, but I remember you saying to me, "You've either got to go into medicine..."(and I said, 'I thought about that years ago'), "...or you've got to get a Ph.D." I think it was then

I made up my mind, I guess, that I'd better get the Ph.D., but it may have been before that. You see, I was beginning to conclude that I was getting older and maybe I wasn't going to get married the way things were working out in my personal life, and that I'd better get qualified to do a proper job. I kept hoping that things would change. I always wanted to get married, yet I had always had a tremendous amount of achievement motivation. I was a sort of restless little beggar. God, I had to be at things and do things. So that was when I decided. I had started on the German overseas and the French was no problem.

M: You already had it in mind.

W: When I was overseas I decided, and I think this conversation we had confirmed it.

M: You were one of many I said that to because I believed it, and I still believe it.

W: So I got a job with Bill Blatz at \$1,600 and did nursery school work two days a week. I played the piano on those days-- Margie Dennison was back playing the piano on the other days--and I taught one course in research methods (and didn't do it very well), to the kindergarten groups that they used to have. So I had a course to teach and I had some practice to do in the Nursery School. This was when I began to think that I had interpreted things slightly differently. In working with the staff at Garrison Lane, we were doing things better than they did at the Nursery School. At the Institute I am afraid that Margie Fletcher was such a strong personality that the children were under her personal control.

Now Bill Blatz never intended that. Bill's idea was that the situation would be set up in such a way that the kids would figure out for themselves what was the smartest thing to do. One thing he said, more than anything else (and many, many people have never understood this, because they thought it was cold and distant, and it was anything but that-- it was just the opposite of that), he didn't want people to exploit the kids in terms of their affectional relationship with them. He wanted them to be free. He wanted them to be loved--no he really didn't say that very well, it came out later--but what he really meant, at least my understanding of it, was that you love the kids so much that you don't use your personal influence to manipulate their learning. They learn for valid reasons, not for the person who says (this is an extreme form), "If you love me you will do this for Mummy." "Impersonal" meant non-manipulative to those who knew what he was saying. And I felt that we achieved that. Eleanor Hamilton was another one who was herself so good with the kids that it was awfully hard...(you can always tell though, when a teacher has "personal" control of children because when somebody else takes over their class, all hell breaks loose. You know?).

My impression, as a young upstart, was that I was shocked at what I found at the Institute, going on in the School. By this time I don't think Bill Blatz bothered with what went on very much. I didn't think they were doing what he said out to be done. I think I elaborated that quite well earlier on, and I don't think I can repeat it.

M: Now, your Ph.D.

W: Oh, I know, I was trying to explain about this business of learning arithmetic. Blatz's idea was that if the child was learning arithmetic, and if he was learning it because somebody loved him and he wanted him to be proud of him, he didn't want him to be disappointed in him, and he missed the lessons (we all do when we are trying to learn, we don't always get it right), and so he goes home, and what does he do? He hasn't got the answer. He must cheat or something to get the right answer. But what Bill said was, in a teacher-pupil relationship (I always make a big distinction between a teacher-pupil--I'm not talking about a mother-child relationship, because in the development of conscience we now know that this business of control by love is important. Bill wasn't talking about that. He wasn't talking about the development of guilt.) He was discussing a child learning and if you tell him he must do it or you will be disappointed, then that child has nobody to go to when he doesn't understand. He must be able to come to you and say, "I tried to do my arithmetic last night. I couldn't do it. I guess I must have missed it," and the teacher has got to say, "Well, that's no tragedy, come on now, let's go over it again, and you'll be sure to get it this time." It was always that the child was fine but he is needing some point that is important. Now that is a good teacher-student relationship isn't it? He wasn't saying that you shouldn't like kids. I think that is the real sign of love when you can let them flub dub around and you are there to help them, and you like them too much to play around with this other kind of affective thing.

M: Now, you are a Ph.D. candidate at Toronto in 1945, right?

W: Yes, and an instructor at the Institute of Child Study, at the University of Toronto.

M: Under whom were you working?

W: Bill Line, although he wasn't my advisor right then. I was struggling along.

M: What kind of a guy was Bill Line?

W: Oh, a perfectly charming gentleman! He was a tall, good looking, soft spoken, gracious, European gentleman type of person who, when he was talking to you, was talking to you. He thought your ideas were wonderful. He could take anything you said and he thought it was a gem of wisdom. He made you feel like a real somebody. He was a lovely guy--a really lovely person. Everybody was very fond of Bill. He loved us all and we all felt loved.

At the end of that year at the Institute, when I was finishing that residence year (and I don't know why you want to know all about this for there are no implications here for psychology, to my knowledge--this is just me), I thought I should do music. I was interested in music--my family background in music--and I was interested in little kids learning to sing and what not. I was always very interested in that.

So I had started in and was reading and working in this area. Then I was asked to go to Western to take on a job. I was flattered by this. They said they would give me time to do my thesis, so I accepted this. I came up to Western as an assistant professor, believe it or not, in 1946, without a Ph.D. I couldn't do the music stuff because I had to have pre-school children to work with, so I had to find another thesis topic. So I looked around. And you know, there was still this vestige of what I had talked about in my presidential address--about this applied thing. You see I was thinking about applied problems along the line.

Another thing I was terribly interested in was the advancement classes. When I was a student at Western, John Robarts who is now the Premier of Ontario was in Arts '39 too and Libby Harvey who was with me at the Ontario Hospital, and is now Libby Murray. As a matter of fact we were the permanent executive of our year. Libby married a young fellow who's family had money in London, and she has been a dowager duchess type of affluent family leadership. She is a very able, fine woman, the President of the Victoria Hospital Trust, and very able in dramatics and little theatre. A very good person.

M: But not a psychologist?

W: No, she didn't go on. She didn't need to. She stayed in London and got married to Ken Murray who had money, and then became a leader in the community. I went on and got my M.A.

Libby had been in these advancement classes, the two experimental classes. There were several places, at this time, which had special classes for gifted children, and these people had been in those advancement classes and I was aware of them--John Roberts, Libby Harvey, and some others like Anne Walden who had beaten me out in the election for sub-prefect. (I had been everything else but Anne Walden got it by three votes.) These people interested me because they had this special educational advantage and I was very much aware of them because Western was so small when I was there. So I decided to find out whether it had been a worthwhile thing or not. I thought it had, because these people were brilliant people from my point of view. They were contemporaries with me--brought up in Strathroy and so forth. I think it interested me because it was an educational problem.

Somebody at the University of Toronto must have then decided that the problem was O.K., because that is what I latched on to. I submitted this proposal and they established a committee with Bill Line as chairman. That's how he became chairman, because it was educational. At my thesis examination I had an external examiner or outside examiner. You at Toronto don't have external examiners.

M: Yes we do.

W: You have outside-the-Department examiners but not external university examiners, or you didn't then. We do at the University of Western Ontario. We always have and we will go on having them because I think it is a good thing. We get the most knowledgeable person from some place in Timbuctoo, mostly in the U.S.A., of course, or a very eminent person. My examiner was a very nice person from O.C.E., Charley Philips. He used to go to Bill Blatz's parties.

I didn't get that comparative course at Toronto and I didn't get any statistics. I can't even remember what I did get. I flub-dubbed around. I'm a self-educated girl! Bill Line came all the way down to London to see these wonderful classes. I don't know who paid his way, but I gave him a party and he met my brothers. He was such a nice man. He met all the teachers in the advancement classes, and it was all exciting and terribly interesting.

The University of Toronto accepted this as a proposal and they mentioned a lot of things I needed to do. I went ahead and did a job of work and tried to do everything everybody had told me at my meeting.

Then I went to see Roger Myers, on a Santa Claus Parade day. I was late and he gave me heck. He said, "I want two tables, I want two tables, in order to decide whether your thesis is coming along." (You were post-war, you know, a new era at Toronto.) And I said, "Well, if you see two of my tables, you can't tell what I am doing, because there are umpteen tables. You've got to see it all together." But you wanted just two tables, and you were very abrupt with me. So I went home by train. I was mad at you--Oh, that bastard Myers. Wow! I remember so clearly writing a letter to a friend and saying, "This guy Myers,...wow!"

Anyway, I submitted the tables and then I went to see him. He had submitted it to Bill Line. Myers said to me, "I gave that stuff you sent down to two or three people for a report on whether it was good enough, and you know Dr. Line, he is a very fine man, and a very kind man, but I am sorry he said, and we agreed, that standards are standards, standards are standards.

I went back to London and I said to myself, "These bastards at the University of Toronto are going to have to read a thesis. They can turn it down but they are going to have to spend some time on me." No one had spent any time at all on this student, except that Bill Line had come down, that's true. And he took me out for a cocktail after they had the meeting to find out what I was going to do, up at that French restaurant up there, and he had come down to London and seen the schools. But I had to fall back on Liddy or talk to Gord Turner about something. I learned from Gord Turner how to do t ratios and to handle my data. I certainly didn't get it from anybody at Toronto. I learned some statistics in order to handle

my own data. So I wrote that thesis. You had said, "All right, turn in your best effort--Mary Wright's best effort." So I turned in Mary Wright's best effort, fully expecting to flunk it--to have it sent back to me. But somebody was going to have to read it. I knew enough about a department to know that if you sent down a thing in writing they were going to have to read it. Well, the next thing I heard they had arranged an examination. And the next thing that happened was that I went down and passed the examination. The only thing I had to change was the split infinitives. Now that's the kind of an education you got at Toronto. You got a Ph.D. if you had any initiative and enterprise and determination on your own. That was just about it.

M: Do you know a better way?

W: Take a look at my transcript. I haven't got a course worth a

M: Do you know a better way? What is it?

W: I think that there's a lot of...I think they should get some leadership. But that's another story. I think there isn't a student that goes through psychology to-day that gets an experience like that. Maybe in Europe, or some place.

M: It's a long task.

W: I would have given my eyeteeth to have had the training our students get now.

M: Of course, why wouldn't you? But this is many years later. So you resent that training?

W: No, no. When I went to Western Leola Neal was teaching the clinical courses so they decided "You can teach the "Child" courses. I'm

not really a child psychologist but that is how I got into the "child" field--those war years--the whole circumstances.

The bit that is probably of interest in here is probably the Bill Blatz thing, because I think Bill Blatz had an awful lot more on the ball than a lot of people thought.

M: I'm sure that's true, I'm sure that's true, but he never got the ball going in the public...

W: Oh, now, come off it! He did, in his heyday, as a young man. (I used to just think, when Abe Amsel was as arrogant as he was when he talked about his frustration motivation, and all the debates that went on about Bill Blatz's consistency and inconsistency and inconsistency is a better way to learn things. Without going into all the discussions and arguments that took place, I thought to myself, and I said that to Bill Blatz myself and to Ed Hall too, "You know, Abe Amsel is like you were when you were a young man. The reason you don't like each other is because you are so much alike." Abe Amsel, as sure as the Lord made little apples, is going to burn out. And the thing is, he'll burn out earlier than Bill Blatz did, because things move so much more quickly. Unless he gets on to some other junket. Right now the only thing that anybody knows about him is his frustration hypothesis.)

M: Well now, my dear, they don't know anything about you or me, because we never even had that!

W: Of course they don't know anything--but Bill Blatz had more to say and more sophisticated things to say, I think. He had all that stuff that Harlow did. Now, of course, you have to--but he said a lot of

things. Some day, somebody ought to take that stuff, not that tragic last book that he wrote, that I had to review. His friends should never have let that be published.

M: His friends loved him so they...

W: But I would never have let that be published, because I think that that is a sin against Bill Blatz, because it was an old man trying to measure up to somebody. They shouldn't have put it in print, they really shouldn't have. What I wanted to do for Bill, but I didn't have the time to do it, was to pick out the best gems of wisdom when he was light and clever and bright, from the damned old Institute Bulletin, that nobody has ever read, and put them into a book. I told Mary Northway that and she said, "Well how about you doing it?" But I haven't got the time to do it and she hasn't got the time to do it. Nobody has the time to edit it.

M: This would be a good project for you.

W: Well when I retire, yes, maybe. I'd like to do that. I'd like to burn every copy in existence of that book that was published post-humously, because that was the broken-up old man. The poor bugger had emphysema and couldn't drink or smoke. He was happy with Anne, that he was for sure, and they were good for each other, but he wasn't able to work any more. When you or I get sick, we can work now--we like working. And he did too. But I would like to see the best of Bill Blatz. I would like to put out a book called The Best of Bill Blatz.

M: Why don't you? That is a good idea.

W: He was like Piaget, he really was, in my view. I think he had just as many bright ideas, in fact, maybe more, but they were different

kinds. Right now perception is the big thing, and everybody is looking around for something. You've got to have God up there and Piaget is a great guy to refer to whenever you write. It's like me trying to get an Introduction to my Presidential Address. So Piaget has come in because he had some novel views on this thing and you can get a start from there. The Bijou and Baer stuff--they could have taken a start from Bill Blatz because he anticipated that stuff. He also anticipated a lot of stuff that Harlow said. But it's not going to do any good for me to say that he did. It's got to be some bright young guy who trips over that some day, who will find in that all sorts of ideas.

M: No, no, I think that is for you to do. I think that is a magnificent thing. You could retrieve what he failed to do by doing just what you say--the best of Bill Blatz. I think that would be good, because when you talk about what you think he meant, and that you don't think his staff even understood very well, you are very clear and that is very worth doing. That's your Post-Chairmanship job.

W: Oh good! Thank you very much!

M: I think it is. Would you tell me something about your retrospective view of psychology, as you look back over where you have been and what has happened to you in psychology? Would you tell me first, what is the funniest thing that ever happened to you in psychology?

W: Oh, for Heaven's sake, if I told you that I would be divulging...

M: Would you?

W: Do you mean the funniest or the most surprising?

M: The funniest.

W: Maybe the funniest was becoming Chairman of the Department at Western.

M: How did that happen? How did you become the first woman to become the Chairman of a really major department?

W: Because the administration of the University that made me Chairman thought that psychology was for the birds anyway, and we had a President who wanted a college system and so he had set up a second Department of Psychology. It was quite safe to solve this problem easily and appoint me as Chairman of that Department of Psychology over at Middlesex College. He asked me to do it and I figured if I didn't do it-- you know, you are either on your way up or you're on your way down, so I took it. It was only a three-year appointment anyway, so they wouldn't be stuck with me if I was too bad. So that is how I got to be Chairman of the Department. They didn't care for psychology anyway, and they wouldn't be stuck with me.

M: Now I have another question. Looking back over a long, long experience of being a psychologist, who...

W: You mean being involved in psychology. I am not any too sure I am a psychologist.

M: Oh yes you are, you are a psychological administrator. Of all the teachers you ever had (and you have had a lot of teachers and taken courses from a lot of people), in your opinion, which is the one who has influenced you most, has influenced your view of psychology?

W: I guess probably Bill Blatz. Roy Liddy used to be jealous of Bill Blatz. He used to say to me when I was a young girl, and I guess it

was because I was his student and I had been attracted, he used to say every once in a while, a little something that would make me think that he was hurt. Of course I was influenced by Bill Blatz in terms of ideas and excitement.

M: He was the brightest guy I ever knew. I don't know that I have ever known a brighter guy than Bill Blatz--brigher, faster, quicker.

W: I think he was. He was terribly well informed. He knew all sorts of things about all sorts of things.

M: No, I don't think...

W: But on the other hand, there was an awful lot of bravado there, as the years went by.

M: I don't think he was well informed at all.

W: A big bluffer?

M: No, I think he was just so fast, so bright. Nobody ever made me feel like such a fool as Bill Blatz.

W: Oh he was an exciting teacher. He did use the Socratic method.

M: No, no.

W: Didn't he? What did he do? Well he used to beat you over the head if he thought he had somebody with any wit at all.

M: He was just so bright that if you made a fool of yourself, if you said something stupid...

W: But I enjoyed that. In classes I got a kick out of that. He kept telling me off and I'd get so mad at him because I knew I was right, and the more I knew I was right the more he would ride me. You know, he would take you right down the garden path and show you you were crazy, and

the madder you got and the more he did this to you the more delighted he could get. I think he enjoyed every minute of it.

M: Oh yes he did, he did. Now, Number One is Bill Blatz. How was he as a teacher?

W: As a teacher he failed us. He was terrible.

M: He never failed anybody in his life.

W: He didn't turn up for classes. But I think his whole world was exciting for me. The other person, Roy Liddy, really tried to transmit knowledge, and he did, very well and very carefully. But of course, he didn't have the spark. Bill did have the spark. Then the guy who really made me think, or at least who was a very tough hard-working person, somewhere in between these two, was Roger Myers.

M: Oh really?

W: I don't remember him being particularly scintillating in any of his classes, but I didn't have him except for that one seminar. Certainly when I took my Ph.D. thesis, he was the toughest educationalist I ever had. He was hard on me and for those reasons he made me think harder. "Let's get down to brass tacks and reality." Roger is a down-to-earth guy. He said, "Now what are you really doing? This is great and Bill's going to think it is wonderful and Dave Ketchum is going to put a few notes in the margins but now look, chum, you have got to get a degree here and you have to produce a thing that is going to hold water with the committee that is going to read it. So let's get down to it and let's figure it out and let's say what it is you have got." He was the most helpful person because he was the most critical. There was a very permissive attitude at Toronto. It could have made you, if you were a real genius. I guess you could have

done anything in the world--been the most creative genius. But you had an awfully uncomfortable feeling that maybe nobody knew anything and that they hoped you wouldn't find out. Now that was a very uncomfortable feeling.

M: That was beautifully put. Now, one last question: Of all the things you have read--of all the authors of things in psychology, which authors of anything in psychology has influenced you most, or impressed you most?

W: Oh dear, I don't know what to say. I certainly am not going to say Freud, because he didn't. Although I was one of the first that ever taught him at Western. It certainly wasn't someone like Piaget. In fact, I'm not really very impressed with any of them, isn't that awful? I've never read anything that has particularly impressed me. The only thing that does impress me, ever, is any hard rock information that we can get, whether we know what to do with it or not. I can't get very excited about--I try very hard because I know it is very important--like fields of perception, etc. I've had phases, like the old Allport book. I've had excitements--for a while, for example, Gestalt psychology.

M: Who?

W: Kurt Lewin, and all that. Then the self concept. That was just about the time of my Ph.D. That stuff which now stinks and is lousy. Everything I ever thought was exciting burned itself out. Kurt Lewin was an awful bust after I read enough of it carefully. It was a big disappointment. It sounded as if it was going to be so good.

You know, there was a thing I was going to tell you about. Last night, in bed, I thought about it after we had done the other tape that

was washed out. I knew that that had gone and I thought "Well, anyway, in Roger's interview with me I never did get to anything about the Psychology and Philosophy Department at Western when I went back there. By this time Gord Turner had come (this was '46), and he had been there in '45. He joined in '45 at \$2,400 and I joined in '46 at \$2,400. If you ever use that tape that we did do last night, quite late, when I was three sheets to the wind, when I talked so much, I said that I had first gotten to know Don Hebb in '63. I was wrong, it was '53, in Kingston when he gave his Presidential Address. Karl Bernhardt had that little party in his room and there was Carl Williams, and Roger Myers, and Don Hebb, and Gord Turner, and Mary Wright. I'll never forget all the stories they told. I didn't know how to behave.