

5

(on the "destinies" of the department, with him as a factor in the making of those destinies.

treatment by the late Principal and so on and so on. Had he been made professor he would have stayed on probably. In that case however I would in a moment have petitioned for a complete autonomy for all three of us, with perhaps a yearly rotating chairmanship for the department - a very good expedient and one that is adopted in Harvard and many other places, with which a young man is often made the chairman for the time being.

As for Dr T. he is making a fight, and he is a man who believes in fighting for his ends in one way if not in another way. I do not object to his making an issue, and holding that the departmental outlook would be dark if he and his future department and assistants and policy and the psychological tendencies of to-morrow were to be tied up to me. Dr T. is also a very difficult man to get along with, brusque, headstrong, domineering, unreasoning ready to take offence. (Dr Nicholson knows about this to and I would feel strengthened if you would speak to him as one of the older men about McGill about this) I am told that other men have found it very difficult to get along with Dr T. I know that he and his intimate friend Macmillan had a bitter quarrel when returning to McGill. Macmillan said to me once that I had been very good and very patient with T., and that he sympathised with me in my difficulties in this connection.

Your knowledge of men, Sir, will tell you that we three men have probably now seen enough of each other, at least as a team. There have been poison gases accumulating about the department and now the explosion has come, when a new order and a change have become imperative. Let Dr T. get his psychology department, and let us advertise in the Medical School and elsewhere that McGill has now an independent department of psychology in which all kinds of students can get a little work or much work. This will make him a new man. He will be enthusiastic and choose his own assistants and make a life career for himself and not be tied up to an older man or to the opinions of philosophers about psychology. You will get me back enthusiastic about philosophy and ideals as at the very basis of civilisation, as imperative for the new order of society if the world is to be saved and if we are to build up a fine free civilisation in Canada etc. etc. In a year or so we will get an enthusiast for Logic and Metaphysic, a man who believes in a Metaphysic, in a higher view of things than that of the descriptive Natural Sciences, as Dr H. did not believe at least in his teaching. He was negative to this and quite unnecessarily antagonistic to theology and the churches and to social philosophy ect. etc. He looks askance at my standing with the churches etc

I see no objection to its being said to those who require to know that Drs H. and T. and C. had probably been tied in a team long enough, all men of a different cast, different approaches of life and thought and to a university. Now they are free or freer to follow

to
His ideals are scientific. He would almost close the University to theologs