THE EDUCATION OF NON-CATHOLIC ENGLISH-SPEAKING PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN MONTREAL

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts

Department of Education

McGill University

by

Chesley Boyd Milley

Montreal, Quebec

April, 1957

PREFACE

This thesis attempts to survey the conditions under which the education of Non-Catholic English-speaking children with serious physical handicaps, the deaf, the blind, and the crippled, is conducted in Montreal and the extent to which provision is made in the Protestant school system for children with less serious handicaps. An effort is made, by comparison with educational provisions for similar children in Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, Kansas City, Missouri, and Toronto, Ontario, to determine to what degree acceptable modern standards are met by the program in Montreal.

The author is greatly indebted to Dr. G.W.H. Townsend, Principal School Medical Officer, Aylesbury, Mrs. Nelle Dabney, Director of Special Education, Kansas City, and Mr. T.H.W. Martin, Inspector of Special Education, Toronto for their co-operation in providing information pertaining to the education of physically handicapped children in these three centres, and to the principals of the Mackay School for the Deaf, Hearing Handicapped Inc., the Montreal School for the Blind, and the School for Crippled Children for their assistance in the study of conditions in Montreal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problems

It is proposed to examine the facilities existing for the education of blind, partially-seeing, deaf, hard-of-hearing, speech defective and orthopedically handicapped Protestant English-speaking children in Montreal. Where deficiencies, if any, in provision for the education of these children may be shown to exist, it is proposed to show what would be involved in taking steps which would raise conditions to the level accepted elsewhere. Due to the difficulty of obtaining information relative to the situation in the entire province of Quebec, this study is being restricted to the area in which education is administered by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Significance of the Study

It is generally agreed in the Western democracies that public state supported education should provide equality of opportunity; that education, at least until adolescence, should be equally accessible to all capable of profiting thereby. Dr. I.L. Kandel, an outstanding authority on comparative education, discussing educational reconstruction in the post-war period stated: "The general framework of a modern system of education is now universally recognized; the principle that the reconstruction of systems of education must be founded on the provision

of equality of opportunity."[1]

If it is true that equality of opportunity is an aim of modern educational systems its achievement presents considerable difficulty. That this difficulty has long been recognized in Canada and some steps taken to remove inequalities is shown by the following statement by Dr. J.G. Althouse, then Director of Education in Ontario, concerning Canadian education before 1939.

> Increased concern for the individual pupil led inevitably to growing resentment at manifest inequalities of educational opportunity. These existed as between province and province and as between community and community within the same province. Similar remedies were sought everywhere but with varying degrees of success. The enlargement of the local unit of school administration was eagerly sought in British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Alberta. The use of provincial grants for equalization was a common device. Notable strides towards greater equality were taken in the county units adopted in the Maritimes, the cooperation of the Protestant Boards of School Commissioners on the Island of Montreal, and the township areas of Ontario.[2]

Physical disabilities may deny this equality of opportunity to large numbers of children unless special classes are organized to compensate for their handicaps. The Canada and Newfoundland Education Association when asked by the Federal Department of Pensions and National Health in 1943 to report on the most urgent educational needs of Canada stressed the necessity of providing such special classes.

> Five thousand special classes should be provided for exceptional children that all may have the opportunity to advance at their right pace.[3]

---

[1] Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers' College, Columbia University, Ed. I.L. Kandel, Bureau of Publications, Columbia Univ., 1944, p.10.

[2] Ibid. p.38.

[3] Report of the Survey Committee of the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association, 1943.

The situation in Quebec differs from that in most other areas in that the principal burden of providing this specialized and expensive form of education is borne, not by the Protestant school authorities, but by charitable organizations dependent upon public subscriptions for their financial support. This thesis attempts to determine whether this system at present constitutes a satisfactory means of providing educational opportunities for physically handicapped children in Montreal.

Organization of the Thesis

A survey will be presented of facilities existing, both under the jurisdiction of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal and provided by other agencies, for the education of each type of handicapped child being considered. The situation in Montreal will be compared with that in selected centres elsewhere to determine how far Montreal conditions may be considered satisfactory by the best modern standards and to indicate what steps may prove beneficial in remedying any defects shown to exist. Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, England, Kansas City, Missouri, and Toronto, Ontario, centres which have programs of special education that have been in operation for some time, have been chosen for comparison with Montreal. These have school populations approximately the same as that of the Protestant schools of Greater Montreal. Since the laws and regulations under which these centres conduct special education differ greatly it was felt that an examination of their methods of dealing with the problem might yield useful information applicable to

Montreal.

Sources of Data

Information regarding the situation in Montreal was obtained by a series of interviews with those officers and teachers of the Montreal Protestant School Board who are concerned with special classes in the school system; with directors or principals of other institutions providing education for handicapped children and from a study of annual reports of the School Board and other institutions concerned. Facts concerning the other centres used for comparison with Montreal are based on a study of their laws and regulations pertaining to special education and on correspondence received from the officer of their Board of Education responsible for administering classes for the physically handicapped.

Definitions of Terms Used

There are certain terms used in this discussion of the education of physically handicapped children which need definition. The following definitions convey the technical sense in which these words are used in this thesis and which is, in general, more restrictive than their ordinary connotation.

Blind: A child whose visual acuity is ordinarily 20/200 or less according to tests made with a Snellen E chart, or one afflicted with progressive loss of vision.

Partially sighted: A child whose vision is more than 20/200 and less than 20/70 in the better eye after correction has been made;

a child affected with progressive myopia; a child requiring great care to conserve his remaining vision.

Deaf: A child whose hearing, even when supplemented by a hearing aid, is useless for the ordinary purposes of schooling.

Hard of hearing: A child who has more than a mild handicap in hearing but is not totally deaf to speech sounds; any child with impaired hearing who misrepresents speech sounds; any child who requires help by means of lip-reading or hearing aids, or both to understand and imitate speech sounds.

Speech defective: Any child whose speech is not easily audible and intelligible to the listener; any child whose speech is vocally or visibly laboured in production; any child whose speech development is below the level appropriate to his age, sex and physical development.

Orthopedically handicapped: Any child who has a defect which causes a deformity or an interference with the normal function of the bones, muscles or joints to such a degree that he is unable to attend school, or to make progress in school, without special consideration in matters of transportation, equipment and instruction.

Special education: The education of the deaf, the hard-of-hearing, the blind, the partially-seeing, the speech defective, and the orthopedically handicapped instead of the usual connotation of education for all types of atypical children.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since investigation reveals a lack of research on the education of physically handicapped children in Canada, and since there is a close parallel existing between the development of educational practices in Canada and the United States, this review will be principally of those aspects of research conducted in the United States which appear to be pertinent to the problems considered in this thesis. It is proposed to examine the literature dealing with the intelligence and academic achievement of various types of physically handicapped children and the administrative organizations under which their education is conducted. The organization of special education for physically handicapped children has, in most of the research studies examined, been treated as a part of the problem of organization of education for all atypical children. However sufficient evidence is available to establish the general pattern of administration by which education for the physically handicapped is conducted in most states.

PART I

INTELLIGENCE AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Visually Handicapped Children

Dr. Samuel P. Hayes,[1] director of psychological services and research at the Perkins Institute and Massachusetts School for the Blind, reported in 1941 on what is the largest survey of intelligence ever attempted in American schools for the blind. A total of 2,372 pupils in seventeen schools for the blind were tested using the Hayes-Binet Intelligence Tests. The mean I.Q. of individual schools ranged from 108.1 to 92.0 and the mean I.Q. of all the children tested was 98.7. Of the 2,372 pupils tested 10.3 per cent had an I.Q. above 120 while 9.2 per cent were reported as 70 and below. In this study Hayes found no correlation of general intelligence with the age at which sight was lost.

In a more recent study Hayes [2] made a comparison between the mental ability of 654 blind children and 2,904 seeing children in their first year of school and found the average mental age of the blind children significantly lower. However a comparison of 447 blind and 2,900 seeing children who were in their fifth year showed no such difference. Hayes gave two possible explanations of this situation: (1) more blind children of low mentality are admitted to school because of the possibility

---

1 S.P. Hayes, Contributions to a Psychology of Blindness, American Foundation for the Blind, New York, 1941, p.p. 16-48.

2 S.P. Hayes, Annual Report, Perkins Institute and Massachusetts School for the Blind, 1955.

that their apparent retardation may be due to poor environment in early childhood and many of these had left school before their fifth year; (ii) the stimulating effect of school environment caused an acceleration in the mental development of blind children. Hayes concluded from these findings, which he stated were duplicated many times in the preceeding twenty years, that the inherent intellect of blind children is comparable to that of the seeing. In this study Hayes also found the functioning of the minds of those born blind, as measured by tests, shows no difference from those of other groups of blind.

Similar results have been found by other investigators. Goodenough,[3] after surveying blind children in New Jersey, found that the intelligence distribution among blind children in residential schools did not differ markedly from that of seeing individuals. These findings were qualified to some degree by the fact that, of the total number of cases registered with the New Jersey State Commission for the Blind in 1947, 11 per cent were described as mentally deficient. This fact, together with Hayes' findings relative to children in their first year at school indicates there may be a higher incidence of mental deficiency among the blind than is found among the sighted population. Goodenough states that this greater incidence may be the result of the generally observed higher incidence of physical and mental defects among children at the lower socio-economic levels.

---

3 F.L. Goodenough, Exceptional Children, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc, New York, 1956, pp. 323-38.

Tests of academic achievement show a definite retardation among the blind. Hayes [4] found two basic changes necessary in adapting achievement tests for use with blind pupils: (1) Greater detail in preliminary instructions, and (2) an increase of three times the time allowed for seeing pupils. With these adjustments Hayes found that blind pupils show grade by grade about the same achievement as seeing pupils but, he noted, blind children average at least two years older than seeing children in the same grades. Similar results were reported by Lowenfeld [5] who examined the age grade relationship of 481 children in four grades of twelve schools for the blind. She found that in the third and fourth grades pupils were retarded by an average of 2.5 years, in the sixth grade by 2.9 years, and in seventh grade by 2.8 years. Lowenfeld found that grade by grade blind pupils showed about the same achievement as seeing pupils, with the exception of arithmetic, in which their scores were generally lower.

Both Hayes and Lowenfeld conducted their investigations in residential schools and it may be possible that some of the retardation is due to institutional life. This possibility, together with the slower acquisition of knowledge due to lack of sight and slower Braille reading, may account for the age grade retardation among the blind. No recent data have been published on age-group relationship, but it may be possible that such findings would show a change due to the increased use of aural sources of information such as the talking book and the radio, and to the greater integration of

---

[4] S.P. Hayes, Contributions to a Psychology of Blindness, American Foundation for the Blind, New York, 1941, p. 291.

[5] B. Lowenfeld, Braille and Talking Book Reading, American Foundation for the Blind, New York, 1945, p. 11.

blind with seeing children.

There are no data available on the results of intelligence tests given to a representative group of partially-seeing children and no adequate report exists on their educational achievement.[6]

Children with Impaired Hearing

Accurate measurement of the innate intelligence of deaf children presents an even more difficult problem than that of the blind because of the difficulty of communicating with them. The majority of deaf children in the United States are educated in residential schools and any available studies have been based chiefly on children in these schools so that it is difficult to determine where a difference in intelligence and achievement as measured by standardized tests exists, how much of the difference is a function of impaired hearing and how much is the result of institutionalization.

Meyerson [7] has compiled a summary of the results of thirty-nine separate tests, administered to various schools for the deaf, in which the instructions were given in pantomime and did not require the use of language either from the examiner or the subject. No conclusive results as to the intelligence of deaf children were shown by this compilation since four of the thirty-nine studies reported a mean I.Q. above average, sixteen

---

6 B. Lowenfeld, "Problems of Children with Impaired Vision", Psychology of Exceptional Children and Youth, (W.M. Cruickshank ed.) Prentice-Hall, New York, 1955, p. 274.

7 L. Meyerson, "A Psychology of Impaired Hearing", Psychology of Exceptional Children and Youth, (W.M. Cruickshank ed.), Prentice-Hall, New York, 1955, p. 132.

a mean I.Q. that did not differ from the average and nineteen a mean I.Q. that was below average.

Meyerson also found that investigations of hard-of-hearing children point out that on verbal tests these children obtained slightly lower I.Q.'s than normally hearing children. The median difference from a number of studies was 5.4 I.Q. points. [8] This difference may possibly be due to the hard-of-hearing not acquiring equal facility with normally hearing persons in the understanding of language rather than to deficiencies in innate intelligence.

The most enlightening contemporary evidence on achievement in residential schools for the deaf is presented by Fusfeld [9] who, in 1944, administered the Stanford Achievement Test, Advanced Battery, Form J, to 134 candidates for admission to the Preparatory Class, (twelfth grade), associated with Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C. These students may be considered to represent the intellectual and academic elite of students graduating from residential schools for the deaf.

---

[8] Ibid. p. 134

[9] I.S. Fusfeld, "A Cross-Section Examination and Evaluation of the Academic Program of Schools for the Deaf," Gallaudet College Bulletin 3, 1954.

Table I

SCHOOL GRADE ACHIEVEMENT OF APPLICANTS TO GALLAUDET COLLEGE ON THE STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

Section of Test	Median Score
Language	11.6
Arithmetic Computation	10.5
Spelling	10.5
Social Studies	9.9
Arithmetic Reasoning	9.4
Study Skills	8.4
Paragraph Meanings	8.2
Science	7.7
Word Meaning	6.7
Grade Equivalent for the Test	9.2

Fusfeld's subjects were tested before entering the twelfth grade and their median grade achievement therefore should have been at least 11.8. Furthermore the mean age of this group was 18.9 years and they had spent an average of 12.8 years in school. Thus in terms of subject matter mastered this group was retarded by 2.6 years, and, since a grade equivalent of 9.2 is reached by the average child at age fifteen, in terms of age they were retarded approximately four years.

No recent comparable study has been made of the achievement of deaf children attending public school classes but it is interesting to note that in 1929 Upshall [10] reported that children who attended day schools for the deaf made significantly greater educational gains than children who attended residential schools.

Meyerson [11] reports that when hard-of-hearing children were matched

---

[10] C.C. Upshall, Day School vs. Institutions for the Deaf, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, 1929, p. 89.

[11] Meyerson, op.cit. p. 135.

for verbal intelligence with normally hearing controls and achievement was measured by the Stanford Achievement Test, the difference was not statistically significant. However investigations have shown that children with defective hearing were more frequently retarded in school progress than normally hearing children. Conway [12] found that in Toronto Public Schools pupils with an average hearing loss of more than twenty decibels were retarded in achievement by 12.2 months.

Crippled Children

Cruickshank states that statistics prior to 1952 show crippled children to have a mean I.Q. lower than the national average. Witty and Smith [13] reported a study in 1932 involving 1,480 crippled children which found the mean I.Q. of these children to be 84.5 with a range from 50 to 130. Pinter [14] in a study of 300 crippled children obtained a mean I.Q. of 88. However these studies included cerebral palsy cases as well as children with other types of crippling defects. That the inclusion of cerebral palsy cases may have weighted unfavourably the findings of these investigators is shown by the following compilation of results of studies of the intelligence of five groups of cerebral palsied children. [15]

---

12 C.B. Conway, The Hearing Abilities of Children in Toronto Public Schools, Ontario College of Education, Toronto, 1937, p. 80.

13 W.M. Cruickshank, Psychological Considerations with Crippled Children, Prentice-Hall Inc., New York, 1955, p. 324.

14 R. Pinter, Psychology of the Physically Handicapped, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1941, p. 306.

15 Cruickshank, op.cit. p. 320.

Table II

COMPARISON OF INTELLIGENCE TEST RATINGS OF CEREBRAL PALSIED CHILDREN FOR WHOM RATINGS WERE DETERMINED IN FIVE RECENT STUDIES

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Total
Number of children	261	90	340	133	178	1,002
Per Cent Mentally Defective	49	43	47	36	47	45
Per Cent Borderline Dull	25	30	28	38	30	30
Per Cent Average and Above	26	26	25	26	23	25

Apparently the intelligence rating of children with cerebral palsy is considerably different from that of the normal population and may also be different from that of other types of crippled children. Hence it is apparent that crippled children cannot be considered as a homogeneous group in any consideration of their intelligence and academic achievement.

Children with Defective Speech

The American Speech and Hearing Association at the Mid-Century White House Conference [16] reported that surveys conducted with children in regular school classes, which excluded the mentally deficient and other special groups such as the deaf, blind and hard-of-hearing, show a slight educational retardation among children with speech defects. This Association also reported that speech defectives fail to take advantage of opportunities for college training out of proportion to expectations based on their intelligence.

16 American Speech and Hearing Association Committee on the Mid-Century White House Conference, "Speech Disorders and Speech Correction," Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1952, p. 129-137.

Summary

It appears from the evidence examined that, except in the case of children with cerebral palsy, the intelligence of the physically handicapped does not differ greatly from that of normal children. It is also apparent that the very seriously handicapped, the blind and the deaf, are retarded in their educational achievement from two to four years, and the less seriously handicapped from one to two years.

PART II

THE ADMINISTRATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

The Expansion of Public School Classes

McDonald, in tracing the development of education for exceptional children in the United States prior to 1914, found the following pattern common to all types of classes for the physically handicapped:

> (1) The movements appear to have been initiated through private or philanthropic agencies. This was followed by (2) the development of state institutions having complete custody of the child; and later (3) the city school systems established special day classes.[17]

McDonald also found, in the two decades preceeding 1914, a distinct movement away from segregation and a pronounced effort to train the variate so that he could assume his place among normal people. While, in 1914, the greater number of defectives was still being educated in state or philanthropic institutions, McDonald lists the following classes and their dates of organization as evidence of the new trend in special education.

Table III

NUMBER OF CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES OPERATING CLASSES FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN 1914

Type of Handicap	Dates of establishing such classes	No. Cities operating classes
(1) Deaf	1869 - 1913	80
(2) Blind	1900 - 1912	20
(3) Cripples	1899 - 1913	7
(4) Speech Defectives	1909 - 1913	17

17 R.A.F. McDonald, Adjustment of School Organization to Various Population Groups, Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, 1915, pp. 104-115.

The continuation of this trend towards greater participation by public school authorities in the education of physically handicapped children is shown by Heck [18], who, in 1938, found classes for the deaf in 148 city school systems, classes for the blind in 27, classes for cripples in 233, and for speech defectives in 151 city school systems. Heck also traced the growth of classes for the less seriously handicapped and reported that the number of sight-saving classes had increased from thirteen in 1913 to 319 in 1928, and that the number of classes for the hard-of-hearing had increased from one in 1916 to forty-four in 1928. Frampton and Gall [19] in 1955 reported 306,747 speech defective, 17,813 crippled, 11,932 hard-of-hearing, 8,014 partially-seeing, 3,935 deaf, 839 blind and 11,455 delicate children enrolled in special public school classes for handicapped children. Frampton points out that a comparison of these figures with the enrolment in 1947-48 shows that gains in special education enrolments were 2.7 greater than the rate of increase in public school enrolment.

Russel and Tyler [20] published, in 1942, a survey of special education in Canada in which they reported classes for partially-sighted children in eight cities, for hard-of-hearing children in seven, and for speech-defectives in seven. They found that special provisions for crippled children existed only in Ontario and Quebec and that the deaf and blind

---

18 A.O. Heck, The Education of Exceptional Children, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1940, pp. 115-117.

19 M.E. Frampton and E.D. Gall, Special Education for the Exceptional, Porter Sargent, Boston, 1955, p. 35.

20 D.H. Russell and F.T. Tyler, "Special Education in Canada", The School, Ontario College of Education, June 1942, pp. 882-887.

were educated solely in institutions. They state that a comparison of these findings with a previous study conducted by Russel [21] in 1932 shows the intervening period to have been one of steady growth in the field of special education. Since 1942 this growth in the number of special classes has continued and in 1949 twenty-two cities reported sight-saving classes, eighteen reported speech and hearing classes and thirty cities reported classes for other physical handicaps.[22]

Typical State Programs of Special Education

McIntire[23] describes special educational services in the State of Ohio as a typical state program in the United States. Basic legislation in Ohio recognizes the provision of schooling for educable handicapped children to be a function of the state and the local school district, not the responsibility of related agencies such as health and welfare. The state program is administered by a Director of Special Classes who establishes policy, prepares budgets, distributes funds and co-ordinates special education with the work of other state departments. The Director is assisted by supervisors in each field of special education. The local district is responsible for organizing classes and meeting the normal costs of education for handicapped children. Since special education is expensive, the state assists in meeting the

---

21 D.H. Russel, "Special Education in Canada", Mental Health, April 1932, p. 29-31.

22 Survey of Elementary and Secondary Education 1948-50, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa, 1956, p. 87.

23 H.G. McIntire, "A State Program of Special Education", Special Education for the Exceptional, (Ed. Frampton and Gall), Porter-Sargent, Boston, 1955, pp. 182-193.

excess costs, paying $400 per child per year in all cases except classes for speech defective and hard-of-hearing children. The state contributes $1,000 per annum for each itinerant speech and hearing teacher and for each psychologist employed by a local school district.

Martens[24] found in 1948 that forty-one states had laws authorizing or requiring local school systems to provide special educational services for children deviating seriously from the normal in physical characteristics. Thirty-four states included in such laws financial assistance to local school systems in setting up special classes. Furthermore in thirty-four states persons on the staff of the state department of education were designated as responsible for the state program of special education.

City Programs of Special Education

Chicago is described by Mullen[25] as representing one of the better city programs of special education. Among American public school systems, Chicago claims one of the first public school classes for the deaf (1875), the first class for crippled children (1899), the first class for the blind (1900). Public school teachers were sent into the hospitals to do bedside teaching in 1900, and speech therapy was begun in the schools in 1910. From these early beginnings Chicago has developed, as is shown in Table IV, a comprehensive program of special education.

---

24 E.H. Martens and C. Harris, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1947-48, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 1950, p.22.

25 F.A. Mullen, "A Metropolitan Area Plans for Special Education," Special Education for the Exceptional (Frampton and Gall Ed.) Porter-Sargent, Boston, 1955, p.p. 194-200.

Table IV

SPECIAL EDUCATION IN CHICAGO - AS OF NOVEMBER 1954

	No. of Pupils Enrolled	No. of Teachers	No. of Special Schools	No. of Regular Schools Housing Special Classes
Orthopedically Handicapped	1,343	182	4	-
Hospital Instruction	400	36	-	-
Homebound Instruction	125	12	-	-
Blind	113	14	-	14
Partially Seeing ...	414	45	-	45
Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing	602	76	-	76
Speech Defective ...	8,000	70	-	419
Total	10,997	435		
Total for Chicago Public Schools ...	400,000	14,600		

Mullen also reported that these classes were operated at a cost of over six million dollars in excess of what it would cost if these pupils could be educated in regular grades with no special services.

The increased per pupil cost in special classes is largely due to the small number of pupils which can be cared for in each class. Wallace[26] found that in 1951-52 per pupil costs in New York City special classes were: braille 3.4, deaf 3.2, sight conservation 2.2, orthopedic 1.9, and cardiac 1.7, times the per pupil costs in normal classes. These costs are in

---

26 H.M. Wallace, J.W. Wrightstone and E. Gall, "Special Classes for Handicapped Children", American Journal of Public Health, Vol. 44, No. 8, August 1954.

almost inverse ratio to the number of pupils per special class, ranging from 8.8 in the braille group to 16.2 in the cardiac group, compared to a city wide average of 31.5 children per class.

Table III shows that special education in Chicago is organized chiefly as special classes in ordinary schools, and only in the case of orthopedically handicapped are classes housed in a special school. Martens[27] in 1940 noted a distinct trend away from isolation for handicapped children towards greater planned opportunities for work and play with normal children.

In Chicago[28] and New York[29] departments of special education administer the school board's educational services for the physically handicapped. Framptom,[30] listing seventy examples, states that this has become the usual administrative practice in American city school systems.

Summary

Special education for physically handicapped children has become an integral part of the public school systems in most American cities. State legislation recognizes the responsibility of local boards in providing this type of education and assists boards in meeting the increased costs incurred. The program of special education, both on the state and local level, is usually under the direction of a department of special education.

---

27 E.H. Martens and E.M. Foster, Statistics of Special Schools and Classes for Exceptional Children 1939-40, U.S. Office of Education, Washington D.C., 1942, p.7.

28 Mullen, op.cit. p. 194

29 Wallace, op.cit. p. 208

30 M.E. Frampton and E.D. Gall, Special Education for the Exceptional, Porter-Sargent, Boston, 1955, p. 62.

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

PART I HISTORY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

The Legacy of the Past

One indication of the development of civilization is its changing attitude towards its unfortunates. The modern idea of habilitating disabled persons represents a profound change in the attitude of humanity towards its handicapped fellow beings. Age after age has shown a record of neglect, of active maltreatment or of ineffectual palliatives in the dealings of society with the disabled.

The two cultural streams having the greatest effect on Western civilization, the Greek and the Hebrew, were both hostile to the disabled. The author of the Iliad, endeavouring to depict a depraved character, could think of no better example than that of a cripple.

> None so base as he,
> Squint-eyed, with one lame foot, and on his back
> A hump, and shoulders curving towards the chest.[1]

The Hebrew attitude, as embodied in the Bible is expressed in the following quotation from Leviticus:

> Whomsoever he be in their generations that hath any blemish, let him not approach to offer the bread of his God. A blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose, or anything that is superfluous, or a man

---

[1] Iliad, Bryant's Translation, Book II, p. 265, as cited by A. Sullivan and K. Snortum, Disabled Persons, Their Education and Rehabilitation, Century Co., New York, 1927.

> that is broken-footed or a crookbackt, or a dwarf, or hath a blemish in his eye, he shall not come nigh unto the altar, because he hath a blemish.[2]

The attitude of these early peoples seems to be inspired by two ideas, that the handicapped person was an economic incompetent and therefore a burden to society, and that the possession of a crooked or abnormal body meant the possession of a crooked or an abnormal mind. Underlying the latter idea was a belief that the congenitally deformed were the work of evil spirits and that similar disabilities occurring in later life were punishment for wrong doing. While overt cruelty toward the handicapped tended to decrease with the development of modern civilization, the prejudices and misconceptions that marked earlier times persist and still show their traces today.

The unfavourable psychological environment created in the past for the disabled person was further emphasized by the giving of alms. Giving for the welfare of the donor's own soul has been an important factor throughout the history of the Christian religion, and since the crippled and defective were most commonly the recipients, the concept has come down to us of the handicapped as a being apart from normal society, the responsibility of charitable and religious organizations.[3]

The more rational attitude, that the rehabilitation of handicapped children is a more worthwhile task than merely isolating and caring for them, developed from the success of charitable schools in attempting to give these children some education. Together with the spread of democratic

---

[2] Leviticus: xxi, 17-22.

[3] O.M. Sullivan and K.O. Snortum, Disabled Persons, Their Education and Rehabilitation, The Century Co., New York, 1927, p. 9.

and humanitarian ideas during the nineteenth century, the realization that most physically handicapped children could be trained to lead useful and productive lives led most states to accept a large measure of responsibility for their care.

Development of Education for the Deaf

In order to understand the present situation regarding the education of deaf-mutes some consideration must be given to the development of present day methods of instruction. The Greeks believed that those who were deaf from birth were also incapable of speech. To them speech seemed a faculty inborn, not acquired by means of ability to hear. If, therefore, the child did not develop speech, he was also dumb and consequently incapable of being instructed. The deaf were frequently classed with the insane and denied the rights of citizenship. Roman law considered the deaf and dumb as being without intelligence. These ideas influenced thinking concerning the deaf to such a degree that apparently no efforts were made for their education before late in the fifteenth century.

The first instance in history of a deaf-mute who learned to read and write was that recorded by Rudolphus Agricola (1443-1485).[4] Agricola's success was questioned by some writers of the time, since it seemed impossible that anyone without hearing could have the ability to learn to read and write. However, by the next century, the principle upon which

---

[4] A.O. Heck, Education of Exceptional Children, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1940, p. 233.

such education depended was clarified when it was shown that, without hearing, people may be taught to associate ideas with written words.

During the next two hundred years, various sporadic efforts to educate the deaf were made, but the honour of founding the first school for the deaf belongs to Charles Michel, Abbe de l'Epee who founded a school in Paris in 1775. Almost at the same time, Samuel Heinicke at Hamburg, Germany, and Thomas Braidwood at Edinburgh, Scotland were establishing schools of a very different type. De l'Epee's school was open to rich and poor alike, and apparently so many pupils were attracted that there was difficulty in maintaining an adequate staff of teachers. For use in his school de l'Epee devised a mimic or sign language which became the basis of the present manual method of instructing the deaf. Heinicke and Braidwood on the other hand conducted their schools by an oral method by which children were taught to understand the speech of others by reading their lip movements, and to use their own voices as their means of communication. Both concealed their methods carefully and were thus able to charge substantial fees. The oral method became the most commomly used in Europe so that by 1900, eighty per cent of all children in European schools for the deaf were taught by this means. In Germany, Holland, Norway and Switzerland all pupils in schools for the deaf were taught speech and lip reading only. In the same period only twenty-two per cent of deaf children in the United States and twenty-six per cent in Canada were taught in this way.[5]

---

5 Harry Best, The Deaf, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1914, p. 120.

This divergence in practice between American and European schools was produced by the attitude of the Braidwood family who controlled education of the deaf in England until approximately 1830. The first permanent school for the deaf in North America was founded at Hartford, Connecticut, by Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet in 1817. Gallaudet went to England to study methods of teaching the deaf in 1815 but was, "utterly unable to gain an entrance to their schools or any information as to their methods".[6] In France he was given all the information he desired. Thus the first American school was modelled after de l'Epee's school in Paris. Sign language and finger spelling were used almost exclusively to instruct the deaf in the United States during the next fifty years.

One of the pioneers in introducing lip reading and speech training in American schools for the deaf was Alexander Graham Bell. In 1871 he introduced a system of voice development devised by his father at a school for the deaf in Boston. Bell was associated with the Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass., from 1871 until his death in 1922 in the various capacities of teacher, researcher, consultant, and president of the Board of Governors. In 1886, using funds he received from the invention of the telephone, he founded the Volta Bureau for the Increase and Diffusion of Knowledge Relating to the Deaf, which has become the primary centre of information concerning the education of the deaf in North America. Bell's interest in the education of the deaf

---

6 A.O. Heck, op.cit. p. 235.

continued until his death at which time he was serving as president of the Board of Governors of the Clarke School.

While there are in common use at the present time two basic methods of instructing the deaf, the oral and the manual, actual practice in schools for the deaf shows four clearly defined procedures:

The Manual Method

This consists of teaching signs, gestures or bodily movements to symbolize ideas. This system is very expressive and can be clearly and rapidly understood by those trained in its use. The use of finger spelling and writing are also used as additional means of communication.

The Manual Alphabet Method

Here signs are eliminated and finger spelling and writing are used exclusively as means of communication.

The Oral Method

This method bases communication on the ability of the deaf-mute to read speech from lip movements and on his acquiring the ability to speak intelligibly. It is the most difficult way of instructing deaf children.

The Combined Method

This is a combination of the oral and manual alphabet systems of instruction. The aim is to teach by oral means all who can profit thereby, but to use the manual system for all others. There is disagreement among schools using the combined method as to the proportion of pupils who need manual instruction. In practice the more difficult oral method becomes a classroom device to be used for a time and then discarded to permit the pupil to progress more rapidly without attempting to develop the ability to speak.[7]

There are two important aims in the education of the deaf which have to be considered in any evaluation of methodology. The first is to provide them with a means of communication, and the second is to develop their thought processes by means of a general education. An

---

7 Ibid. p. 240.

undue stressing of any one of these aims at the expense of the other is not in the best interests of the deaf person. In theory, the oral method provides the best means of communication with other people, but the mastery of speech and lip-reading is very difficult and time consuming. For some it seems to be impossible. However, in view of the success reported by schools using the oral method exclusively, it appears that all deaf children should be given an opportunity to receive good instruction of this type.[8] Oral instruction is successful only when the child can be isolated from all other methods of teaching, otherwise the child will tend to use the easier manual means of communication and neglect the oral. While all deaf children should be given the opportunity to begin their education in oral classes, at some point in the pupil's career an evaluation of his progress must be made, and if his development is unsatisfactory some other type of instruction should be substituted in order to insure the best possible mental development. This opinion is expressed in the report of a sub-committee of the Study Committee on English-Speaking Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing in Montreal, established by the Health Section of the Montreal Council of Social Agencies, which recommended:

(i) that the education of the deaf be oral only for the first two to four years of each pupil's attendance;

(ii) that pupils start school as soon as possible -- at age three where conditions permit;

---

[8] Lillian Grosvenor, "Deaf Children Learn to Talk at Clarke School", National Geographic Magazine, March 1955, p. 379.

(iii) that at the end of the oral term, pupils be divided into three groups: (a) those whose prognosis for the oral approach is very poor; (b) those whose prognosis for the oral approach is excellent; (c) a middle group for whom the evidence one way or the other is not clear cut;

(iv) that instruction for group (a) will now switch to manual methods only. Group (b) will remain on oral methods only. Group (c) will be taught manually but with continued instruction in oral communication until the non-wisdom of further work in this method is definite. The possibility of oral communication should always be kept open.[9]

Although many factors outside the scope of this thesis enter into determining whether oral instruction will prove successful for any given pupil, it would seem that intelligence, age at which deafness occurred, and the degree of residual hearing are the principal factors in determining the best mode of instruction for any pupil.

In the last analysis financial necessity more than any other single factor may be the determinant in deciding the kind of education offered to a deaf child. Oral instruction is more costly because it demands more highly trained teachers, a smaller pupil teacher ratio, and more expensive equipment than any other method. Therefore without adequate finances an institution finds it difficult, if not impossible, to offer good oral instruction.

The Development of Classes for Hard-of-Hearing Children

The problem of providing suitable education for the hard-of-hearing

---

9 Methodology in Teaching the Deaf, Report of a Sub-Committee of the Study Committee on English Speaking Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing in Montreal, Montreal Council of Social Agencies, May 1956, p. 20.

differs greatly from that of educating the deaf. The hard-of-hearing have learned to speak and therefore do not have to acquire a new means of communication with others. They need only training which will make it possible for them to understand more readily the speech of others and to retain and improve the speech they have. These pupils are likely to require instruction in lip-reading, the use of hearing aids, and in perfecting their own speech. This can be done without undue expense in the public school system.

Special educational provision for the hard-of-hearing is a recent development. The first of such classes in the United States were opened at Rochester, N.Y., and in Lynn, Mass. in 1916.[10] Because of the short history of this type of special education no generally accepted standards have been established for the admission of pupils to special classes for the deaf. Most American writers on the subject group the hard-of-hearing as: (1) mildly deafened, (2) moderately deafened, (3) very deafened, (4) hopelessly deafened. While categories one and four are easily defined, divergence of opinion exists concerning classification and treatment of persons who may fall into the other categories. This is well illustrated by communications received by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal on this subject from Vancouver, Winnipeg and Rochester, N.Y. In correlating the information received from these cities for the guidance of officers of the Board, their consultant makes the following observations.

---

10 A.O. Heck, The Education of Exceptional Children, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1940, p. 271.

(1) They do not share a common system of classification.

(2) Because of their vague terminology their placement service is not clear.

(3) There is no agreement on the grade of children to be screened.[11]

However, the programs for the hard-of-hearing in these cities do show a certain common pattern. Pupils in a certain grade are screened to ascertain which children need educational provision of a special nature because of hearing loss. Pupils having a moderate loss of hearing are placed in regular classes and receive special instruction from an itinerant speech therapist. The more seriously handicapped are grouped in a special class under the care of a specialist in the instruction of the hard-of-hearing. This class is located in an ordinary school and the pupils are treated as much as possible like ordinary pupils. This is the pattern generally accepted in most American cities providing this type of special education.[12] A similar plan is followed in Britain but there a definite system of classification of hearing defects, formulated by a Committee set up in 1938 to study problems relating to children with defective hearing, is in use.

Development of Education for the Blind

It was not until the close of the eighteenth century that any real attempt was made to educate or train those without sight. Valentin Hauy had his attention attracted to the problem by the contrast afforded by the public performance of a blind Austrian pianist and the spectacle presented

---

11 C. Finnet, Memorandum to the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, Dec. 1955.

12 Heck, op.cit. p. 273.

by some untrained and illiterate blind persons who were trying to attract customers by making mock music. Hauy opened the Institution National des Jeunes Avengles in Paris in 1785 and a philanthropic society sent him twelve blind children as his first pupils. He devised a system of raised print by means of which he was successful in teaching these children to read. In 1806 Hauy was invited to St. Petersburg to establish a school on similar lines. In the same year he also established a school in Berlin. Great Britain had opened its Liverpool school in 1791 and in the United States three schools for the blind were opened in the early 1830's.[13]

Before 1900 schools for the blind were entirely residential institutions but during the present century many classes for the blind have been organized in public schools. As early as 1907 many large towns in England had established day classes for the education of blind children. Chicago was the first American city to organize such a class in 1896. This successful attempt encouraged other cities to begin similar classes so that by 1927 there were twenty-two cities reporting such classes.[14] The enrolment in state schools and city school systems since 1927 appears to indicate a trend away from residential state institutions. In 1927 there were 5,245 pupils in fifty-one state schools for the blind, in 1947 there were 5,150 pupils in fifty-four schools. During the same period the number of day classes increased from twenty-two to two hundred and sixty-five with an enrolment of 8,261 in 1947.[15]

---

13 Ibid. p. 157

14 Ibid. p. 161

15 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1954, p. 140.

Classes for blind children have not as yet become accepted as part of the responsibility of local school authorities in Canada. In this country there are six schools for the blind, two in Quebec conducted by philanthropic organizations and four in other provinces operated by provincial governments. The 1946 enrolment in these schools is shown in the following table:[16]

Table V

SCHOOLS FOR THE BLIND IN CANADA

School	Enrolment
Halifax School for the Blind, N.S.	169
Institution des Jeunes Avengles de Nazareth, Montreal, Que.	106
Montreal Association for the Blind, Que.	19
Ontario School for the Blind	165
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, Winnipeg, Man.	20
Provincial School for the Blind, Vancouver, B.C.	30
Total	536

Exponents of central schools for the blind point out that the number of blind children in any one area is not usually large enough to permit the organization of classes by grades as in sighted classes. Furthermore, the equipment and texts needed for the education of the blind are very costly and there is danger that a city school system having only a small class may fail to make adequate provision because of the expense

---

16 Elementary and Secondary Schools in Canada 1944-46, Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1949, p. 60.

involved, whereas a central school with a much larger enrolment would provide equipment more readily. It is argued that the larger central boarding school, having more pupils in each age group and grade level, allows a blind child to be accepted as a peer among his fellow students. A small class, distributed throughout the grades, and ranging in age from five to sixteen and over, does not provide such an opportunity. Advocates of this type of school also state that the central institution is more likely to provide a superior trade and industrial program. On the other hand advocates of day school classes for blind children point out that the normal home life of the child can be preserved and, by associating with sighted pupils, the blind child develops a proper attitude towards the people of the community in which he must live.

Educational Media for the Blind

Early attempts to teach reading to the blind were by using raised letters of the conventional alphabet which, however, could not be easily written by blind persons and was therefore not very satisfactory. Louis Braille (1809-1852), himself blind, and a teacher at the Paris National Institution for the Blind, realizing this shortcoming, developed a dot system which could be easily written with a simple instrument, and which was adopted by this school in 1854. The use of Braille's system spread slowly at first. In the United States another dot system known as New York point was used in most schools for the blind until 1916 when Braille's alphabet and a series of contractions was officially adopted. Representatives of agencies for the blind in Great Britain and the United States meeting in London in 1932 agreed upon the adoption of

a universal Braille code for the English-speaking world known as Standard English Braille Grade 2. A number of mechanical devices have been developed to assist the blind in writing and solving mathematical problems. They also learn to operate the standard typewriter efficiently and use this machine for private and business purposes.

Development of Classes for the Partially-Sighted

The history of the movement to provide a special program of education for partially-sighted children is of short duration. Classes for such children originated in England in 1908. The first class in the United States was organized in 1913.[17] Previous to the establishment of special classes, partially-sighted children were either ignored in the regular classroom, with whatever loss of sight or failure to pass school-work this occasioned, or sent to schools for the blind to learn Braille because of their inability to read ordinary print. Since their inception, sight saving classes have spread rapidly and classes, equipped to instruct children of low vision, exist in most city school systems.

Development of Education for the Orthopedically Handicapped

The fight for existence was too strenuous for primitive peoples to carry their cripples with them and even among some peoples with a more advanced culture, such as the Spartans, there existed an active policy of extermination of the physically imperfect. During the Middle

---

17 Heck, op.cit. p. 190

Ages some of the deformed came into their own as jesters and, because the greater the deformity the greater the mirth provoked, parents are reported to have maimed their own children to enhance their value.[18]

Not until the nineteenth century were organized attempts made to provide such children with physical care and education, and during that century, education occupied a minor place in any program for cripples, the major emphasis being placed on physical care. The modern attitude towards the education of physically handicapped children was expressed by the Executive-Director of the Montreal School for Crippled Children in a brief presented to the Tremblay Commission:

> Public opinion under the weight of factual studies has swung from the attitude that the maimed and helpless were useless, that nothing could be done for them, to the realization that almost all can be made self-supporting, and hence not a charge on the state. The public can also learn that the remainder can be so improved in outlook and morale and physical ability, that a person or persons formerly tied down to their care can be released, and hence become productive citizens again raising the wealth of the community.[19]

The first public school class for crippled children was organized in London, England in 1899 and by 1927 England had sixty-two schools for the orthopedically handicapped with a capacity of 6,000 pupils.[20]

---

[18] M.E. Frampton and E.D. Gall, Special Education for the Exceptional, Porter-Sargent, Boston, 1955, Vol.I, p. 9

[19] A Submission to the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Constitutional Problems by the School for Crippled Children, Montreal, 1954.

[20] E.S. Solenberger, Some Agencies and Institutions for Cripples in Various European Countries, International Society for Crippled Children Inc., Elyria, Ohio, 1931, p. 18.

The second public school class came into operation in Chicago, Illinois in 1900. The responsibility for educating crippled children gradually gained acceptance among American Boards of Education so that by 1928 orthopedic classes with an enrolment of 10,000 had been organized in eighty-eight cities. By 1948 the number of cities reporting such classes had risen to 959 with an enrolment of 30,500 pupils.[21] Four Canadian provinces, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia have organized classes for orthopedically handicapped children in their public schools which in 1948 reported a total enrolment of 1903 pupils.[22]

Physically handicapped children, other than those suffering from defective vision, hearing or speech may conveniently be divided into four groups to facilitate a consideration of what constitutes adequate educational provision for this type of pupil.

(i) Children having mild acquired or congenital deformities who can still attend regular classes and participate to some extent in most activities of the ordinary pupil.

(ii) Children who because of the seriousness of their handicap are unable to attend regular classes but can attend classes where facilities are provided to compensate for their handicap.

(iii) Children confined to hospitals for an extended period of time.

(iv) Home bound children.

The first of these groups presents no great difficulty to the

---

21 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1954, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., p. 140.

22 Survey of Elementary and Secondary Education in Canada, 1948, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa, 1956, p. 112.

educational authorities and can usually, with some minor adjustments in their school program, benefit as much as normal children from attending regular classes. To insure co-ordination of effort when two or more authorities act in conjunction in dealing with any child the Authorized Manual for Special Education in Ontario, 1933, presents a scale showing the gradient of responsibility between the Public Health, Public Welfare and Educational Authorities. This scale classifies hospitalized and home bound children as cases of minor educational responsibility with the major responsibility lying with the health authorities.[23] This appears to be a reasonable assumption and absolves the school authorities of any responsibility for the care of these children other than insuring the services of a competent teacher when a resumption or continuation of formal education is deemed in the best interests of the child.

It is with the second of the four groups listed above that the major educational problems arise. When the necessary compensations for their handicaps are provided, these children are able to attend school and it becomes the duty of the community to see that adequate provision is made for their education. In addition to the facilities found in schools for normal children Heck lists four other provisions which are necessary in any school for crippled children: (i) special features in the construction of the building such as elevators, ramps, wide corridors, and greater floor space per pupil in the classroom in order to facilitate movement for these children. (ii) Transportation

---

[23] Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, 1950, Baptist Johnston, Toronto, Ont., p. 372.

must be provided. (iii) Care must be taken that all pupils are provided with an adequate and suitable lunch. (iv) Provision must be made for any necessary therapy, preferably in the school building or in conveniently located institutions to which the pupils may be transported without too great loss of school time.[24] It is also necessary that adequate nursing supervision be available at all times in schools for crippled children. These additional services greatly increase the cost of education, the cost per pupil in such classes in the United States in 1939 being 3.8 times that of a pupil in ordinary classes.[25]

The Education of Children with Defective Speech

The first school to be organized in Europe for speech defectives was established in 1887 at Potsdam, Germany. In the United States the first schools were private. In 1874 the Americal Vocal Institute was organized in New York to treat stuttering and other speech troubles. The first public school class was also organized in New York in 1908. From this beginning speech therapy classes expanded rapidly so that in 1931 the United States Department of the Interior found that of all cities over 100,000 population, forty-one per cent provided speech classes in their public schools.[26] In 1949 it was found that forty-one states

---

[24] A.O. Heck, The Education of Exceptional Children, McGraw-Hill Co., New York, 1940, pp. 120-124

[25] Ibid. p.117

[26] Kunzig, Robert W. Public School Education of Atypical Children, Bulletin 1931 No. 10., U.S. Dept. of Interior, Washington, 1931, pp.63-66.

had legal provisions authorizing or requiring school districts to provide special speech correction classes for those pupils requiring them.[27] There were 306,747 pupils enrolled in such classes in 1953.[28]

Speech therapy has not developed very extensively in Canadian public schools, possibly because there are fewer large urban centres in which such programs usually originate. In Ontario, which has the most extensive program of any Canadian province, the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario reported in 1950 that, while there were 3,873 pupils receiving speech therapy in public schools of the province, there were an additional 9,500 needing such instruction.[29] The Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, operated under the joint auspices of the Manitoba Provincial Department of Health and Welfare, and the Winnipeg School District No.1, provided speech therapy in the schools of Greater Winnipeg to 449 pupils during the year 1954-55.[30] No provision was made in Manitoba for speech therapy in schools outside the Greater Winnipeg area. The Annual Reports of the Departments of Education in other provinces show no indication of an active speech correction program in their schools.

In Britain the education of pupils with speech handicaps is the specific responsibility of the Local Education Authority. Regulations issued by the Ministry of Education include among those requiring

---

27 State Legislation for Exceptional Children, Bulletin 1949 No. 2, Office of Education, Washington, 1949, p. 63.

28 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1956, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, p. 176.

29 Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, 1950, Baptist Johnston, Kings Printer, Toronto, p. 368.

30 Annual Report, 1954-55, Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, p. 23

special educational provisions:

> Pupils suffering from speech defect, that is to say, pupils who on account of stammering, aphasia, or defect of voice or articulation not due to deafness, require special educational treatment. [31]

Almost all other physical handicaps make great demands on public sympathy but the child with a speech defect often finds himself treated with antagonism. The physical stigmata associated with defective speech are generally not so striking as other kinds of physical handicaps but the effect upon the child may be greater. A defect that destroys his self-confidence can be worse than one which cripples him for life.

> Rather than subject themselves unnecessarily to the many difficulties arising out of group situations they often isolate themselves and develop serious personality and emotional problems. [32]

On entering school the speech-handicapped pupil finds himself in a system which places a premium on oral expression. In addition to the frustration and embarrassment caused by the difficulty of making himself understood, he may be ridiculed by his classmates and treated as retarded by adults who have to deal with him. Such a child, having more than average difficulty in learning to read, may become a behaviour problem and a complete educational misfit. Surveys conducted in the United States have found that speech-handicapped children are retarded, on the average, one grade at the eighth grade level. [33]

---

31 Regulations Prescribed by the Minister of Education under Section 34(5) of the Education Act, 1944.

32 Re-establishment of Disabled Persons, the Montreal Re-habilitation Survey Committee, Montreal, 1949, p. 102.

33 Wendell Johnson and others, Speech Handicapped School Children, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1948, p. 4.

Most speech disorders of children fall into the following general classification: (i) faulty articulation, (ii) stuttering, (iii) retarded speech development, (iv) cleft palate, (v) aphasia, (vi) defects from impaired hearing. Because speech disorders stem from a great variety of causes such as physical defects, disease, and emotional, neurological or functional disorder, experts in many fields may be necessary if therapy is to be provided for all cases. Since some cases may require the services of surgeons, psychiatrists, dentists, orthodontists, and social workers in addition to those of the speech therapist, it can be argued that speech training has no place in the school system but should rather be confined entirely to hospitals or clinics where the services of these experts may be more readily available. This view was most strongly expressed by the therapist who conducts the speech clinic at both the Montreal General and the Montreal Children's Hospital.

PART II MODERN TRENDS IN THE EDUCATION OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

The Influence of Modern Aims of Education

Changing concepts of the aims of education have also influenced society's attitude towards the handicapped. While all schools are expected to impart to children the basic knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for living in modern society, their more fundamental task lies in developing the child's mental powers and personality to the fullest possible extent. The Regents of the University of New York in their inquiry into the character and cost of public education in the State of New York suggest the following as the basic principle underlying their educational system.

> What boys and girls now need is a broad general education which will give to all alike the same minimum tools of intercommunication and thinking, the same minimum up-to-date scientific acquaintance with the world in which we live, both natural and social, an appreciation of the culture and standards of our civilization, the beginnings of the ability to work well with others, a common understanding and belief in the democratic process, and the desire to preserve and defend self government. In addition to this, boys and girls need as individuals some understanding of their own minds and bodies, and the opportunity under proper guidance and stimulation to develop their individual capacities, interest and possibilities for growth.[34]

Thus the primary function of education is to promote the fullest development of each individual as a human being, to prepare for enlightened citizenship, and to cultivate interests which can be continued

---

[34] Education for American Life, Report of the Regents' Inquiry, New York, The McGraw-Hill Co., 1949, p. 12.

throughout life.

Broader Aims of Present Educational Programs for the Handicapped

In the nineteenth and early twentieth century education for physically handicapped children was narrowly conceived as a training which would assist them to become self-supporting.[35] While this conception is still held by some segments of society, modern trends indicate that the education of physically handicapped children should be governed by the same philosophy as the educational program for normal children. This applies to all categories of physically handicapped.

> The days are past when special education for exceptional children was synonymous with isolation. Special classes for the handicapped are no longer separated groups kept in little compartments of their own. Schools and classes for the handicapped are a part of the total school program and need to take their places along with all other schools and classes as an integral part of the community educational program.[36]

The Harvard study of the education of the blind concluded that:

> Education for blind children should be revised thoroughly in accordance with the best theories and practices in the education of the seeing.[37]

That this is practical has been borne out by the experience of New Jersey which makes wide use of its public schools for educating the blind and which reports, "By the time the child reaches high

---

35 Harvard Studies in Education, The Education of Visually Handicapped Children, Cambridge, The Harvard University Press 1933, p. 26

36 Ibid., p. 209

37 Ibid., p. 211

school level he is usually able to dispense with the special class".[38]

The success of the Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass., shows the feasibility of a similar policy for deaf children.[39] The policy of this school is:

> To provide an educational program for boys and girls who, because of profound deafness, are unable to profit by the instruction given in schools for hearing children. The course of study is intended to fit graduates for further study in schools with hearing children, usually at the high school level. Whether such study is pursued in classical, vocational, trade or business school is influenced by a number of factors including interests, aptitudes and academic achievement. An active guidance program assists pupils and parents in arriving at the ultimate decision.[40]

Thus modern trends, while recognizing the need of special educational treatment for physically handicapped children, emphasize the needs and interests which the handicapped have in common with normal boys and girls. Segregation is avoided where possible and when used is maintained only as long as is necessary to fit the child to return to normal classes.

Recognition of the Necessity of Special Treatment for Atypical Children.

In addition to the change in the aims of education for handicapped children there has been a growing recognition of the extent of the need which exists for such education. Early attempts to educate the handicapped had their origin in private enterprise and were operated

---

[38] Florence Goodenough, Exceptional Children, Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc., 1956, p. 27.

[39] Lillian Grosvenor, "Deaf Children Learn to Talk at Clarke School", National Geographic Magazine, March 1955, pp. 339-385.

[40] Annual Report, 1954-55, The Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass., p. 89.

as charitable organizations. Although their work was restricted by inadequate finances and lack of trained staff to a small proportion of those actually needing their services they did demonstrate the value of an educational program for the handicapped and showed the extent of the existing need for such education. As a result public state supported institutions were organized to carry on and expand the work begun by these private organizations. Further developments in the twentieth century have been the establishment of day classes for the seriously handicapped and greater efforts by the public schools to meet the needs of the less severely handicapped.

> Excepting the education of the deaf, seriously begun a little earlier, all effective work dates from the first half of the nineteenth century. At first the feasibility of all such instruction was doubted, and the work generally commenced privately. Out of the success thus achieved, public institutions have been built up to continue on a large scale what was begun privately on a small scale. In consequence the compulsory attendance laws of the leading states of the world require that defectives, between certain ages at least, be sent to a state institution or be enrolled in a public-school class specialized for their training.[41]

The expansion of classes for the physically handicapped in school systems has been most noticeable in the United States where the first of such classes were organized in Chicago and New York during the 1890's.[42] By 1938 there were in the U.S.A., 7,846 blind and partially-seeing, 10,848 deaf and hard-of-hearing, 124,840 speech defective and 13,738

---

[41] E.P. Cubberley, A Brief History of Education, Houghton-Mifflin Co., New York, 1922, p. 450.

[42] A.O. Heck, Education of Exceptional Children, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1940, p. 275.

crippled children receiving special educational treatment in public schools.[43] The expansion since 1938 has been equally rapid.[44]

The extent of this problem in Canada was outlined by Dr. C.C. Goldring in his presidential address to the Canadian Education Association at Toronto in 1953.

> There are children in all provinces and in most communities who need special care and individual instruction. The following statement based on age groups five to nineteen indicates the extent of this problem:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Blind or partially-sighted | 0.2% |
> | Deaf or hard-of-hearing | 1.5% |
> | Crippling defects | 1.0% |
> | Delicate | 1.5% |
> | Speech defective | 1.0 to 2.0% |
> | Mentally retarded | 2.0% |
> | Behaviour problems | 2.0 to 3.0% |
>
> If these percentages based on experience and actual surveys in other countries are reasonably accurate, for Canada, it means there are 300,000 girls and boys in Canada who can be classed as exceptional children. Some of them no doubt are receiving adequate instruction in ordinary classes with normal children, but many of them need instruction as individuals or in small groups which require the use of specialized equipment that can be provided only in special classes. Of this number only 29,600 or some ten per cent are receiving attention in special classes or units throughout the country. [45]

If the percentages quoted by Dr. Goldring are presumed to be applicable to Montreal, then there are approximately 6,000 children among the Protestant English-speaking population who may be expected to require special education.

---

[43] Biennial Survey of Education 1936-38, United States Office of Education, Bulletin 1940, no. 2.

[44] Statistical Abstract of the United States 1956, p. 463

[45] C.C. Goldring, "Presidential Address", Canadian Education, Dec. 1953, p. 26.

Handicapped Children Accepted as Primarily a Charge on Educational Authorities

Since problems in welfare and health as well as in education arise in any program for the handicapped, only an examination of the aims of such a program can determine where the major responsibility lies. If the physically handicapped are to be considered as incurable deviates to be permanently cared for at public expense then they should be a charge in the field of health and welfare rather than education. But if the primary purpose is conceived of a preparing the physically handicapped, as far as is possible to fill a normal place in, and make a real contribution to society, then the problem is educational and should be recognized as such.

An examination of the situation elsewhere indicates that the trend is towards accepting the problem as one lying primarily within educational jurisdiction. This is clearly recognized in Britain where special education is the responsibility of the Local Education Authority.

> If the Authority decides that the child requires special educational treatment, they shall give the parents notice of their decision and shall provide such treatment for the child.[46]

The British Education Act also places the responsibility for discovering such pupils with the Local Educational Authority. The Minister of Education is empowered to make regulations defining the categories of pupils requiring special educational treatment and the special methods of education appropriate to each category. The Minister may also make

---

46 Education Act 1944: Section 32; 4.

provisions for the requirements to be complied with by any school before it is approved as a special school.[47] Thus the Local Education Authority is responsible for the education of handicapped children in its area and the Minister of Education has the powers to see that this responsibility is met in a satisfactory manner. The situation in Scotland is basically the same.[48]

In the United States as early as 1931, twenty-five of thirty representative states surveyed had accepted the principle that educational authorities were responsible for the care of physically handicapped children.[49] Missouri may be taken as an example.

> Missouri has formulated a very comprehensive set of regulations for the guidance of school administrators in establishing special classes in the General Rules and Regulations Applying to Special Public School Classes for the Feeble-Minded, Deaf, Blind, Backward, Crippled and Speech-Defective Children 1921.[50]

An examination of the situation in Canada shows that in all provinces except Quebec and Newfoundland, the Provincial Department of Education accepts financial responsibility for the education of the physically handicapped. The degree to which educational provision is made for all types of handicaps varies, but the principle of responsibility by the educational authorities is accepted. In Newfoundland the Department of Public Welfare meets the expenses of educating the blind

---

47 Ibid., Section 40.

48 Bill to Amend the Laws Relating to Education in Scotland 1945, Section 40.

49 Public School Education of Atypical Children, U.S. Dept. of Interior Bulletin 1935, No. 10, p. 48.

50 Ibid., p.49.

and deaf-mutes at institutions on the mainland.[51]

In contrast to the other eight provinces the Department of Education in Quebec accepts no responsibility for the special education needed by the physically handicapped. Commenting on this situation the author of the Hepburn Report said:

> Generally speaking school authorities consider it to be their duty to care for the blind, dumb, and the crippled and public opinion is right in demanding that they should. The Protestant Boards of the Province of Quebec would appear to be a striking exception to this rule, were it not that certain institutions, founded by public charity, have come to the assistance of local authorities.[52]

The Hepburn Report goes on to say that in Montreal the Protestant Schools offer no specialized opportunities to handicapped children except in one sight-saving class established in 1931. The Report made certain recommendations in this matter which will be considered later. In reply, the Protestant Committee of the Council of Education stated, "The fact is Quebec prefers to maintain institutions for these children, rather than have them mingle freely with ordinary children." [53]

---

[51] Nova Scotia: Manual of Public Instruction Acts and Regulations, p. 104. Halifax, N.S., 1921.
New Brunswick: Annual Report of the Dept. of Education, 1951, p. 186.
Ontario: Report of the Minister, Ont. Dept. of Education 1954, p. 39.
Manitoba: Report of the Dept. of Education 1953, pp. 127-8.
British Columbia: Annual Report of Public Schools of the Province 1953-54, p. 98.
Saskatchewan: Annual Report of Dept. of Education 1954, p. 36.
Alberta: Annual Report of Dept. of Education 1954, p. 45.
Prince Edward Island: Annual Report of Dept. of Education 1953, p. 18.

[52] Hepburn Report 1938, p. 105.

[53] Statement Concerning the Report of the Quebec Protestant Education Survey by the Protestant Committee of the Council of Education 1939, p. 50.

The Committee further stated that part of the cost of maintenance of these institutions is met by the Protestant Board of School Commissioners of Montreal. The fact that the Protestant Board of School Commissioners of Montreal was the only educational body giving support to these institutions and that it contributed only a fraction of the cost of maintenance indicates that educational authorities were prepared to take little responsibility in the problem of educating handicapped children.

It appears, therefore, that in Quebec, neither the Provincial Department of Education nor the local School Board accepts much responsibility for the education of the physically handicapped. This fact was emphasized by the Montreal Rehabilitation Survey Committee in 1949. While deploring this situation, the committee further stated:

> Fortunately for those children who happen to be eligible, Montreal has over a period of years developed several well-equipped schools and institutions for certain groups of disabled children. Most of these were founded by enlightened charity and operate as religious or private schools.[54]

This is still the situation in Montreal although it will be apparent in later chapters that the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal is showing an increasing acceptance of responsibility in this matter.

Local Educational Authority the Organization Best Fitted to Provide Special Education.

Other than Quebec, all provincial governments in Canada accept responsibility for the education of deaf-mutes and the blind, usually in provincial institutions or, where none exist, by paying the expenses

---

[54] Re-establishment of Disabled Persons, A Report by the Montreal Re-habilitation Survey Committee, Montreal, 1949, p. 75.

incurred in having such children attend suitable schools elsewhere. Where special day classes exist for the handicapped as in Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, they are conducted by the local educational authorities with some financial assistance from the provincial government.

The British Education Act 1944 placed the responsibility for providing suitable education for the physically handicapped with the Local Education Authorities but these are assisted financially by the central government in doing so. A similar plan was proposed for Quebec schools by the Protestant Committee which, in 1929, drafted a Bill authorizing School Boards to set up classes for the physically handicapped and insuring continuous financial aid from the provincial government for such classes.[55] The amended Bill (Appendix I) as passed however was merely permissive and has produced no effect on educational policy in this field.[56]

A Brief presented by the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers to the Hepburn Committee in 1938 suggested that School Boards be not only authorized but required to accept responsibility in this matter. This Association recommended:

> (i) A well organized system of discovering and listing children suffering from various forms of physical handicap which would make them ineducable in ordinary classes, and that School Boards be charged with the responsibility for the education of all such children.
>
> (ii) That in particular School Boards should be authorized and required to make provision for the education of the deaf, the hard-of-hearing and for those with

---

55 Brief Presented to the Quebec Protestant Education Survey Committee by the P.A.P.T., March 1938, p.18.

56 Special Classes Education; Statutes of Quebec, 19 Geo.V, 1929.

> defective vision and speech defects, and to provide transportation since these classes would necessarily be far apart.[57]

The Hepburn Report further stressed the need of School Boards in Quebec accepting greater responsibility in educating handicapped children.

> Classes in which appropriate methods of instruction can be adopted should be organized in certain schools of Greater Montreal for pupils who are delicate, or suffer from defects of vision, speech or hearing. The necessary arrangements for their conveyance to and from school should be made by the Board.[58]

For the blind, deaf, and orthopedically handicapped the Hepburn Report suggested that, provided reasonable safeguards are adopted to insure economy of management and efficiency in the education given, the Montreal School Board continue its support of existing institutions and that payments should be revised from time to time in the light of actual cost per pupil.[59]

The principle that School Boards are the agency best fitted to carry out an adequate program of special education was also endorsed by the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario 1950 which stated:

> The attainment of adequate provision for handicapped children seems to be impossible without decentralization of administration and supervision and mandatory legislation requiring local education authorities to provide special educational treatment for those children.[60]

Thus experience elsewhere and recommendations by competent investigators in this province indicate that School Boards are the agency

---

57 Brief, op.cit., p. 22

58 Report of the Quebec Protestant Education Survey Committee 1938, p. 108.

59 Ibid, p. 108.

60 Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario 1950, Toronto, Baptist Johnston, 1950, p. 380.

best fitted to provide the specialized type of education required by the physically handicapped. The local authority is closest to the educational problems in its district and is thus best fitted to assess the existing need for special classes. Modern trends indicate that classes for the handicapped should be integrated as far as possible with those for normal children. This is most practical when both are administered by the same organization.

The size of the population of a local administrative area may have an influence on this solution to the problem of special education. Where numbers of handicapped children are not sufficient to warrant setting up classes it may be argued that some agency other than the local Board should be made responsible. However, while special arrangements such as placing children in schools outside the jurisdiction of the Board are made, areas having compulsory attendance laws for the physically handicapped leave responsibility for discovering such children and placing them in suitable classes with the local Boards.

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATION OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN AYLESBURY, KANSAS CITY AND TORONTO

These three centres, Aylesbury, Kansas City and Toronto, having approximately the same school population as the Protestant Schools of Montreal were selected as representative of school programs in the three major English-speaking countries. Special education in these centres will be examined, for comparison with the situation in Montreal, to determine the amount of state control and assistance, the extent and type of educational services provided for handicapped children, and the costs involved in this program.

PART I AYLESBURY

Laws and Regulations Governing Special Education in Britain

The British Education Act, 1944, laid upon every Local Education Authority the general duty to provide a sufficient variety of primary and secondary education to suit the different ages, abilities and aptitudes of all the children in its area. A specific charge is further placed upon the Local Education Authority to find out what children in their area need special educational treatment because of a disability of mind or body and to provide this treatment for them.

> It shall be the duty of every Local Education Authority to ascertain what children in their area require special educational treatment and for the purpose of fulfilling that duty any officer of a Local Education Authority may, by notice in writing served upon the parent of any child who has attained the age of two years, require him to submit the child for examination by a medical officer of the Authority for advice as to whether the child is suffering from any disability of mind or body and as to the nature and extent of such disability.
>
> If after considering the advice given with respect to any child by a medical officer in consequence of any such medical examination as aforesaid and any reports or information which the Local Authority are able to obtain from teachers or other persons with respect to the ability and aptitudes of the child, the authority decides that the child requires special educational treatment, they shall give the parent notice of their decision and shall provide such treatment for the child.[1]

Much of the pioneering work in the provision of education for the physically handicapped in Britain has been done by voluntary organizations, some of them, such as the Royal National Institute for the Blind, being national societies, others being smaller bodies set up for the specific

---

1 Education Act 1944: Section 32; 1,4.

purpose of operating a particular school.[2] While most of the new provision for special education is being made by Local Education Authorities, the 1944 Education Act recognizes the importance of the contribution made by voluntary organizations and not only makes provision to enable Local Education Authorities to assist such schools but empowers the Minister of Education to make grants to such bodies in aid of expenditure which they have incurred or may incur in the establishment and maintenance of special schools.[3] The Minister of Education may by regulation make provision as to the requirements to be complied with by any school as a condition of its approval as a special school.[4] Section 31 of the Education Act also empowers the Minister to make regulations defining the categories of pupils requiring special educational treatment and making provision as to the special methods appropriate for the education of pupils in each category.

The School Health Service in Great Britain

While the School Health Service, established in 1908, has been closely co-ordinated with the National Health Service, it continues as a separate entity organized by the Local Education Authorities and is designed to develop and maintain the physical and mental well-being of children in its area. Discussing the function of the School Health

---

2 Education in Britain, Central Office of Information, London 1955.

3 Explanatory Memorandum by the President of the Board of Education, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1943.

4 Education Act 1944: Section 31; 3.

Service, the Principal School Medical Officer of Aylesbury stated its functions to be twofold:

> (i) The prevention of illness so that children have the best possible chance of growing up healthy in mind and body.
>
> (ii) By special understanding of their needs to ensure that children who are mentally or physically handicapped can be given education commensurate with their disabilities.[5]

The School Health Service accepts a large measure of responsibility for the education of physically handicapped children, not only by discovery and examination of cases but also by operating child guidance and speech therapy clinics. It will be shown that the educational program for physically handicapped children in Aylesbury lies almost entirely in the hands of the School Health Service.

Provision Made for Physically Handicapped Children in Aylesbury

The care of handicapped pupils in Aylesbury is under the supervision of a Senior Medical Officer appointed by the Education Committee. This officer has full responsibility for recommending special educational treatment for a handicapped child and for keeping the child's case under review. The Buckinghamshire Education Committee have no special schools for physically handicapped children so that all the serious cases are placed in residential schools in other counties. Where moderate or minor degrees of handicap exist efforts are made, provided the teaching staff are able to spare the time involved in giving additional assistance to these children, to have these pupils continue their education in ordinary schools.[6] On receipt of a report from the Principal School Medical Officer

---

5 Annual Report, Principal School Medical Officer, Buckinghamshire Education Committee, 1954.

6 Ibid.

recommending special educational treatment for a child the Chief Education Officer, after consultation with the parents, makes the necessary arrangements to have the child placed in a suitable school. The following table shows the number of pupils involved during 1955-56. These children, with the exception of speech defectives, were placed in over sixty different schools chiefly in the Midlands and the South of England. Speech therapy, under the direction of the School Health Services, was conducted during 1955-56 at two clinics. Two full time therapists assisted by four student therapists treated a total of ninety-four children during the year. The work of these clinics appears to be hampered by lack of staff. The 1955-56 Annual Report of the Principal School Medical Officer states:

> A formidable waiting list has accumulated at the Aylesbury Clinic. It is hoped to reduce this by the assistance of students from one of the London Training Schools. [7]

Table VI

HANDICAPPED PUPILS REQUIRING EDUCATION AT SPECIAL SCHOOLS, AYLESBURY, JAN. 31, 1956

Category	Registered in Special Schools	Awaiting Placement	Total
Blind	14	2*	16
Partially seeing	12	5	17
Deaf	33	2*	35
Orthopedically Handicapped	45	15	60
Speech Defective	94	117	211
Total	210	133	343

Total School Population: 57,658

*Under five years of age.

7 Ibid., p. 14.

The total cost of providing education for these children during 1955-56 was £75,000. The entire cost was initially met from the funds of the Local Authority but the central government refunds 50 per cent of the expenses of all approved cases. When parents are notified that their child has been classified as a handicapped pupil they are not asked to contribute anything towards actual school expenses but are, however, expected to clothe the child and pay travelling expenses.

Because of the wide differences existing between the administration both of health services and of education in England and in the province of Quebec it is felt that not much would be gained of practical value in an evaluation of the situation in Montreal from a further study of the situation in Aylesbury. While Aylesbury can make wide use of state approved and supported schools in counties other than Buckinghamshire, Montreal is unable to make use of any facilities in other parts of Quebec. While some Canadian provinces arrange to have their handicapped children educated in other provinces or in the United States, the fact that no Quebec public authority, local or provincial, accepts responsibility for these children makes this an unfeasible solution in this province.

While no direct comparison will be made between special education in Aylesbury and Montreal it is worthwhile to note that in a more highly socialized state, such as England, education of the physically handicapped is compulsory, and half the expense of such education is borne by the central government.

PART II KANSAS CITY

State Laws and Regulations Governing Special Education in Missouri

Before July 1955 legislation governing special education in Missouri, while providing state aid to Boards of Education conducting classes for the physically handicapped, was permissive. However, new legislation enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri during the 1955 session now makes it mandatory for Boards of Education to provide classes for the physically handicapped.

> Whenever in any school district there are children between the ages of six and twenty years who are physically handicapped, including the blind or partially seeing, the deaf or hard-of-hearing, the crippled and the mentally retarded or mentally deficient, who are capable of instruction, educable or trainable, but who cannot safely and adequately be educated in the public schools with normal children, the board of education or board of directors shall provide appropriate instruction in special classes for such children and shall provide transportation to and from school for such children as cannot otherwise attend school. Instruction which is adapted to the varying physical and mental capacities and handicaps of the children shall be provided in accordance with regulations prescribed by the commissioner.
>
> Where any school district does not maintain special classes the board of education or board of directors shall contract with some other school district in the state for the establishment of special classes and shall furnish transportation.[8]

Except for making Boards of Education responsible for providing special education for handicapped children this legislation introduced no new principles. The state commissioner of education retained the right

---

[8] House Bill 27, Sections 1, 3, 68th General Assembly of the State of Missouri 1955.

to inspect and approve all special classes established under this Bill and to make regulations governing such classes. Detailed regulations, which are summarized below have been issued governing all types of classes for physically handicapped children.[9]

Admission to Classes

The speech correctionist in consultation with the classroom teacher and administrative officer of the school shall determine the eligibility of pupils for the speech correction program. It is advisable that the speech correctionist make a survey of the primary grades and new pupils entering the school each year. It is the duty of the administrative officer of the school to see that the child needing speech correction shall have definite periods with the speech correctionist.

Regulations governing classes for hearing, visually, or orthopedically handicapped children state that admission to such classes should be predicated on a complete study of the child, his needs, his interests his abilities and his disabilities. Final decision for admission to a special class is made by the administrative officer of the school, whose decision must be based upon records and information received from a competent otologist, ophthalmologist, or from other medical sources, and from the school authorities.

Number per Class

The numbers per class shown in the following table are the permissible but not recommended maximia in the case of orthopedically handicapped, hard-of-hearing, and partially seeing children. The recommended maximium is fifteen pupils per class.

---

9 Regulations Governing the Securing of State Aid for Special Classes for Exceptional Children, Dept. of Education, State of Missouri.

Table VII

MAXIMIUM NUMBER OF PUPILS PER CLASS FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, STATE OF MISSOURI

Type of Handicap	Pupils per teacher
Speech defective	150
Blind	8
Partially seeing	18
Crippled Children	20
Hard-of-hearing	
(a) one grade level	20
(b) two grade levels	12
(c) three grade levels	10
Deaf	
(a) one grade level	10
(b) two grade levels	8
(c) three grade levels	6

Equipment of Classes

Detailed lists of the equipment required for each type of class are included in the regulations governing such classes. (Appendix II) The amount expended each year for such approved instructional supplies provided by the school district may be included in calculating the cost of instruction to be used as a basis for determining the rate of state reimbursement.

State Aid for Special Education

Each school district maintaining special classes approved by the commissioner of education shall receive state aid not to exceed the difference between the average per capita cost of normal children in similar grades and the cost of children in special classes for the same period of time. Maximium amounts payable under this provision are shown in Table VIII.

Table VIII

MAXIMIUM PER PUPIL PAYMENTS TO BOARDS
CONDUCTING SPECIAL CLASSES, STATE OF MISSOURI

Type of Handicap	Maximum Annual Payment
Speech defective	$20.00
Blind or partially-seeing	$225.00
Orthopedically handicapped	$300.00
Deaf or hard-of-hearing	$250.00

Qualifications of Teachers

Teachers of special classes for the handicapped are required to have a baccalaureate degree and a valid teacher's certificate of the State of Missouri. Such teachers are further required to have a background of courses which will indicate adequate preparation in the subject matter and techniques required for the field of specialized teaching they enter.

Special Education in Kansas City

Special education in the Kansas City Public Schools, administered by a Department of Special Education set up in 1950, is provided for all types of handicapped children considered in this thesis. Table IX shows that the present situation is the result of a long period of growth and development in the field of education for the physically handicapped.

Table IX

DATE OF ORGANIZATION, CLASSES FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, KANSAS CITY

Type of Handicap	Initial Organization
Deaf	1914
Hard-of-Hearing	1914
Partially seeing	1914
Orthopedically Handicapped	1929
Speech Defective	1949
Blind	1955

The number of pupils enrolled in each type of class and the annual cost is shown in Table X.

Table X

PUPILS IN SPECIAL CLASSES AND ANNUAL COST, KANSAS CITY 1955-56

Type of Class	No. Enrolled	Cost per pupil *
Orthopedic, including Home & Hospital teaching	570	$970.18
Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing	76	$690.83
Blind and Partially seeing	35	$705.83
Speech Defective ...	3,531	$ 26.82
Total Pupils Public Schools	61,200	$309.67

*Exclusive of General Administration Costs

The expenditure for special education in Kansas City during 1955-56 was $730,000 or approximately four per cent of the total budget

of $17,400,000. The state contribution toward this expenditure was approximately $268,000.

Placement of Children in Special Classes

> If after careful study of the child and conferences with the parent, the principal believes that a child in his building may profit by a transfer to any special division or class he should contact the Director of Special Education.
>
> Placement will be made by the Department of Special Education in classes for the physically handicapped, — crippled, deaf and hard-of-hearing, and partially seeing as follows:
>
> (i) On receipt of information obtained by the Health Department, which includes written recommendation of the physician or clinic and the approval of the medical advisor of the special class; and
>
> (ii) information received from the Psychological Services Department indicating that the child seems to have the capacity to profit by instruction.
>
> At the beginning of the school year, a survey of speech needs will be made in each school. Speech correction will be given to all children found to have defects. [10]

The School Program

Speech correction is given by itinerant teachers in all elementary schools. The number receiving this instruction, approximately six per cent of the total school population, appears to be unusually large. The White House Conference on Special Education 1931 estimated approximately .81 per cent of children between six and eighteen years of age may require

---

10 Handbook, Kansas City Public Schools 1955-56, p. 56.

speech correction.[11] Dr. C.C. Goldring's estimate that from one to two per cent of Canadian school children may need such services was based principally on experiences of American cities.[12] Discussing the number of children receiving speech therapy the Director of Special Education, Kansas City stated:

> The number is not, I believe, higher than is usually found, if one considers the type of city in which we live. We have a large negro population in addition to three other linguistic groups -- Spanish, Italian, and those represented by displaced persons.[13]

All orthopedically handicapped pupils, apart from those hospitalized or home bound, are housed in one centrally located building which contains a wing for treatment services. Classes for partially seeing children are conducted in three elementary schools. Where possible these children are integrated with normal classes of their own grade level for activities not requiring close visual application. Pupils are transferred to regular classes at the junior high school level with helping teachers provided in both junior and senior high schools.

Classes for deaf and hard-of-hearing children are provided in two elementary, one junior and one senior high school. These groups are also integrated with other classes where possible but it has not been found feasible to pursue this policy to the same extent as with sight-saving classes.

---

11 White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, Report of Committee on Special Classes, New York, p. 357. Appleton and Co., 1931.

12 C.C. Goldring, "Presidential Address", Canadian Education, Dec. 1956, p. 27.

13 Letter, Director of Special Education, Kansas City, May 15, 1956.

The class for blind children has only been in operation since September 1955 and definite practices for this class have not been established. All classes for physically handicapped children follow the regular curriculum of the Kansas City Public Schools.

PART III TORONTO

Provincial Laws and Regulations Governing Special Education

The necessity for special classes for physically handicapped children in Ontario first received recognition in the Act Respecting Special Classes, 1911. This Act permitted elementary school authorities in any city to make a register of all children who from physical or mental causes required special training and education. It also made provision for the establishment of special classes, admission of pupils, course of study and inspection. The principles of this Act were further extended by the Auxiliary Classes Act, 1914, which more clearly defined requirements for admission to special classes, provided for medical inspection and treatment of pupils and regulated the qualifications of teachers in special classes. This Act also required the Inspector of Auxiliary Classes, when requested by a school board, to conduct a survey and report on the need of special classes in the board's area.[14]

Under this Act, and amendments thereto, the number of special education classes increased rapidly. In his first official return to the Minister of Education in 1920, the Inspector of Auxiliary Classes reported 17 classes in operation in the province. In 1926 there were 165, in 1936, 345 and in 1946, 471 classes. Commenting on this the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario states:

---

[14] Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, 1950, pp. 366-67.

> As school boards are permitted but not required to provide special education for markedly atypical children, it is greatly to their credit and to that of the Department of Education that the expansion of this type of education has been so rapid.[15]

Provincial law governing special education still remains permissive and does not place on any school board the responsibility for providing special classes for handicapped children.

> Subject to the regulations, a board may establish and conduct classes for children who, not being persons whose mental capacity is incapable of development beyond that of a child of normal mentality at eight years of age, are from any physical or mental cause unable to take proper advantage of the elementary or secondary school courses.
>
> Subject to the regulations, a board may establish day classes in oral speech and lip reading to accommodate deaf children within its jurisdiction.[16]

Provisions made by the Act and Regulations by the Department of Education[17] governing the type, organization and administration of auxiliary classes for the physically handicapped are summarized below.

Types of Auxiliary Classes for Physically Handicapped Children.

Provision is made in the Department of Education regulations for the following types of classes for the physically handicapped.

(i) Braille classes for blind children.

(ii) Hard-of-Hearing classes for children suffering from a degree of partial deafness sufficient to interfere seriously with school work.

(iii) Oral classes for deaf children.

---

15 Ibid., p. 377

16 The Schools Administration Act, 1954, Statutes of Ontario, Chapter 86, Section 47: 1,2.

17 Regulations Auxiliary Classes, Regulations 38 of the Consolidated Regulations of Ontario made under the Department of Education Act.

(iv) Orthopaedic classes for physically disabled children.

(v) Sight-saving classes for children who have a visual deficiency which will seriously interfere with their progress in school.

(vi) Speech correction classes for children who have marked speech defects.

(vii) Hospital classes for children confined to hospitals or homes for incurable children.

(viii) Home instruction classes for children who are eligible for admission to a separate or public school but unable to attend due to a disability which will confine them to their homes for at least three months.

Admission to Auxiliary Classes

Pupils may be admitted to auxiliary classes upon the report and recommendation of a board consisting of the principal of the school, the school inspector and a legally qualified medical practitioner appointed by the school board. [18] Before 1955 admission to special classes required the approval of the Inspector of Auxiliary Classes who is a provincial official. This change in regulations now places greater responsibility in the hands of local boards as was suggested by the Hope Report.[19]

Maximium Enrolment in Auxiliary Classes

The maximium number of pupils for each type of class for handicapped children is shown in Table XI.

---

18 The Schools Administration Amendment Act 1955, Section 3.

19 Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario 1950, p. 380.

Table XI

MAXIMIUM NUMBER OF PUPILS PER CLASS FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Type of Handicap	Pupils per Teacher
Speech Defective (per correctionist)	150
Blind	
(a) One grade level	12
(b) Two or more grade levels	8
Partially seeing, Hard-of-hearing or Crippled Children	
(a) One grade level	20
(b) Two or more grade levels	16
Deaf	
(a) One grade level	12
(b) Two or more grade levels	8

Qualifications of Teachers

An auxiliary-class teacher shall have taught successfully for at least two years in a public or separate school in Ontario, certified by the proper inspector, and hold an interium or permanent auxiliary education certificate. Qualified teachers may obtain an auxiliary education certificate by attending a three year summer course given by the Ontario Department of Education.

Provincial Aid for Special Education

While the Schools Administration Act states "the money required by a board for special classes shall be raised and levied in the same manner as for the erection, establishment, improvement or maintenance of the schools under the control of the board," [20] regulations governing

20 The Schools Administration Act, 1954, Statutes of Ontario, Chapter 86, Section 53.

general legislative grants do give special consideration to classes for handicapped children. Grants to boards are paid on the basis of the average daily attendance and a percentage of the approved cost of operation. This percentage varies according to the population served by the board and is sixteen per cent of the approved cost in centres over 200,000 population. If a board operates auxiliary classes regulations permit it to increase its average daily attendance according to a defined formula and to receive from the province a percentage of the costs of conducting these classes.

> Where a board operates one or more auxiliary classes or units the average daily attendance shall be increased by adding thereto
>
> (a) Twenty for each braille class for the blind, hard of hearing class, hospital class, oral class for the deaf, orthopedic class for physically disabled, and sight saving class.
>
> (b) Eight for each speech-correction and lip-reading class.[21]

Amount of Grants

> Subject to regulations the board of a public or separate school in a city, or in a town or village having a population of 6,000 or more shall be paid a grant of
>
> (a) $16 for each pupil of average daily attendance during the preceeding year;
>
> (b) an amount calculated by taking a percentage of the approved cost at the rate set forth in Column 2 in accordance with the population

---

21 Regulations, General Legislative Grants, 1956, Made Under the Department of Education Act, 1954, Section 9: 1.

set opposite thereto in Column 1 as follows:[22]

Column 1 Population	Column 2 Percentage
200,000 or more	16
100,000 to 199,999	17
50,000 to 99,999	20
40,000 to 49,999	21
30,000 to 39,999	22
20,000 to 29,999	23
10,000 to 19,999	24
6,000 to 9,999	30

Approved cost of a board is subject to the approval of the Minister of Education and includes normal operating expenditures." [23]

Regulations of the Department of Education[24] also provide that, where the Inspector of Auxiliary Classes reports that there is urgent need for special educational services for the child, or the City Inspector of Health certifies that because of a physical defect the child is unable to take advantage of the regular instructional facilities offered in a high or vocational school or collegiate institute, an annual grant shall be paid. This grant is not to exceed $250 for elementary education or $500 per pupil for grades XI to XIII both inclusive.

Since, in Ontario, the social and physical welfare of the pupil is a concern of the Provincial Department of Public Welfare, or, in some cases of the provincial Department of Reform Institutions and his health a responsibility of the provincial Department of Health, these three Departments must work in co-operation with the Department of Education

---

22 Ibid., Section 10:1

23 Ibid., Section 7:1

24 Regulations Auxiliary Classes, Section 14.

in providing special education for certain categories of pupils. To ensure co-ordination of effort when two or more authorities act in conjunction, it was found desirable to provide for the distribution of responsibility. A formula for this was laid down in 1933 in the authorized manual for special education and has brought about co-operative action among the provincial authorities concerned. The following quotation illustrates the relative responsibility with respect to specific types of special education assigned by this formula to each of the Departments.

> The gradient of administrative responsibility as existing between the Department of Education and the Departments of Public Health and of Public Welfare may be specifically represented by the following series of typical cases.
>
> (i) Classes of minor educational responsibility
> Hospital Classes
> Sanatorium Classes
> Preventorium Classes
>
> (ii) Classes of dual adjustable responsibility
> Forest School Classes
> Open Air Classes
> Visiting Teacher Classes
> Orthopaedic Classes
>
> (iii) Classes of major educational responsibility
> Sight-saving classes
> Oral classes (for Deaf Children)
> Hard-of-Hearing Classes
> Institutional Classes (for blind and deaf children).[25]

---

25 Report of Royal Commission on Education in Ontario 1950, p. 372.

Special Education in Toronto

The Toronto Board of Education conducts classes, under the direction of an Inspector of Special Education, for all types of physically handicapped children considered in this thesis except the blind. These attend the provincial institution at Brantford. The number of pupils enrolled in each type of class and the annual cost is shown in Table XII.

Table XII

PUPILS IN SPECIAL CLASSES AND ANNUAL COST, TORONTO, 1955-56

Type of Class	No. Enrolled	Cost per pupil
		$
Orthopaedic	191	1639.13
Deaf	93	2318.94
Hard-of-Hearing	33	938.38
Partially seeing	55	905.57
Speech Defective	1,114	36.05
Total Pupils Public Schools	64,240	306.24

The total expenditure by the Toronto Board in providing suitable education for these categories of pupils was approximately $600,000 during 1955-56. In addition to this the Board also provides nine teachers for 238 pupils attending the High Park Forest School for malnourished children which is under the jurisdiction of the Toronto Board of Health and also six teachers to serve sick children in Toronto hospitals.

Psychiatric and Psychological Services

The Child Adjustment Clinic, having a staff of one full-time psychiatrist, one half-time psychiatrist, ten psychologists and two psychiatric social workers, assumes, among its other duties, a large measure of responsibility for placing children in classes for the physically handicapped. However that the placement of physically handicapped children is a minor part of the clinic's work is illustrated by its 1955 report which shows that a total of 4,842 children examined only 102 were considered to determine their suitability for a class for the physically handicapped. Of this number 88 were not attending school.[26]

Classes for the Deaf and the Orthopedically Handicapped

Since 1953 classes for deaf and crippled children have been conducted in Sunny View School, a building especially constructed, at a cost of $938,000, for this purpose. Provision has been made in the building and equipment supplied for physical and occupational therapy that may be required by the children attending. Free transportation is provided and lunches served at a nominal cost. Admission to the school is on the recommendation of a consultant-surgeon or otologist appointed by the Department of Public Health, city of Toronto, and the Director of Child Adjustment Services, Toronto Board of Education. Deaf and very hard-of-hearing children are admitted at the age of three to the

---

26 Statistical Summary of Psychiatric and Psychological Work, Toronto Board of Education, 1955.

Junior Kindergarten. Children who are so deaf that they cannot be taught through their hearing remain at Sunny View School where their education continues in Oral Classes for the deaf. Other pupils are transferred to Hard-of-Hearing Classes in one of four schools where such classes are located.

Classes for Defective Speech and Hard-of-Hearing

A Speech and Hearing Clinic has been set up at Orde St. School under the direction of a senior teacher of Lip Reading and Speech Correction. Parents are encouraged to bring children who require special attention to this clinic. An extensive analysis is made of each case and recommendations are made to the parents regarding the type of class best suited to the child. Advice is also given concerning the management and treatment of the child outside the school. Information obtained is made available to the teacher of the special class to which the pupil may be admitted. If a child is placed in a hard-of-hearing class he is tested annually to determine the success of the program undertaken and as an aid in deciding when the child may be transferred to a regular classroom.

The Toronto Board authorized the opening, in September 1955, of a class for aphasic children which is also housed in the Orde St. School. Selection of children for this class is the responsibility of the Child Adjustment Services. Children placed in this class have normal intelligence but have serious difficulty in acquiring language due to brain damage, usually at birth, or to a failure in development of parts of

the brain connected with verbal symbols. This class now consists of seven children and has several pupils on a waiting list.

Speech correction classes were conducted during 1955-56 in thirty-five of the eighty-five public schools in the city. Each speech centre admits children from the surrounding schools which are without a speech teacher for the year. The speech correction schedule is reorganized each year and while certain schools may have a speech correctionist for successive years it is the general policy to have a speech centre in a given school every second year. When a speech correctionist is assigned to a school she interviews every child in grades one and two so that all children passing through elementary school classes are interviewed, either in their first or second year of school. Seven itinerant speech correctionists are employed by the Board to carry out this program.

Partially-Seeing Children

Four sight-saving classes are conducted in public schools with a total of fifty-five children attending.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN MONTREAL

The School System of Quebec

To understand the present position of special education for physically handicapped children in Montreal some consideration must be given to the system of administration under which Protestant education in Quebec operates. In the province of Quebec there are two distinct systems of education, Protestant and Catholic, which operate under a common law. Neither is considered a separate school in the sense that it is conducted by religious organizations, but rather both are state schools established and subsidized by the Provincial Legislature. The Department of Education is administered by a Superintendent of Education, who is responsible to the Provincial Secretary, and who is assisted in his work by an English and a French secretary. These, in their capacity as deputy ministers exercise general control of the Department. The English secretary is also Director of Protestant Education forthe province.

Educational policies of the Department are to a large degree determined by a Council of Education, the members of which are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and which operates as two separate committees each dealing with schools of its own faith. Two Boards of Education, where the religion of the population differs, each representing the taxpayers of their faith in the municipality, conduct and administer

the schools on the local level.

Role of the Provincial Government in Protestant Education in Quebec

Dr. W.P. Percival, former Director of Protestant Education in Quebec, in his book Across the Years states that:

> The Education Act of 1875 definitely removed education from the political sphere and gave to Quebec education the distinctly confessional character which it has since maintained. [1]

This Act restored control of the Department of Education to a Superintendent of Education instead of a Minister, under whose jurisdiction it had been since Confederation, and also permitted Roman Catholic bishops to become members of the Council of Education. Percival further states the Act of 1875 was the charter of freedom for both Roman Catholics and Protestants in connection with the government of schools.

> Everything which, within the scope of the functions of the Council of Public Instruction respects especially the schools, and public instruction generally, of Roman Catholics, shall be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Committee of such Council. In the same manner, everything which, within the scope of such functions respects especially the schools and public instruction generally of Protestants, shall be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Protestant Committee.[2]

Since 1886 the English Secretary of the Department of Education has also been secretary of the Protestant Committee.

---

1 W.P. Percival, Across the Years, Gazette Printing Co., Montreal, 1946, p. 24.

2 Ibid., p. 25.

(1) It is a fact of history that the business of the Committee which had at one time been separate and distinct from the Business of the Department of Education gravitated naturally to the Department and was carried through by the English Secretary.

(2) This movement, which was caused or accelerated by the effeciency of a departmental secretary, culminated in 1886 with his appointment as secretary of the Protestant Committee.

(3) Directness, consistency and harmony in administration were difficult to achieve and were furthered by placing the two offices in the hands of one person. [3]

Difficulty of Obtaining Legislation not in Conformity with the Wishes of the Majority.

During the period in which special classes for handicapped children developed, while education of the Protestant minority in Quebec was in theory in the hands of Protestants, the fact remains that educational policy was influenced and regulated by the pressures of the majority in the province. While the Act of 1875 may have to a large degree separated politics and education, it is obvious that no such separation can be complete. While the schools of Quebec rely for their financial support mainly upon funds raised locally, the principle of contributions from the central exchequer is established and grants are made. Such grants are voted by the Legislature and hence funds disbursed by the Protestant Committee depend upon the government of the day. Furthermore local taxation is authorized by the Provincial Government. The government therefore retains a stake in educational policy and in this its actions are more likely to reflect the attitudes of the majority of the population.

---

3 Hepburn Report, op.cit. p. 26.

Dr. George W. Parmelee, Director of Protestant Education, 1891-1930, has stated:

> The fact that they (the Protestants) have been a minority among a people of another race, religion, and language, of different social customs, and at first of different political training and aspirations, has not handicapped them in their struggle for wealth and position, but it has put a heavy drag on their efforts to secure educational advantages for themselves and their children. In all activities of life in which co-operation is essential, minorities suffer relatively even when accorded the fullest liberty to work out their own problems.[4]

The fact that the Protestant Committee has not had an entirely free hand in regulating the policy of Protestant Schools is illustrated by the lack of compulsory education prior to 1943 despite the fact that the Protestant Committee had advocated such a policy for many years.

> The Minutes of the Protestant Committee show that consideration has been given to this problem for many years but that no solution could be found. In any case, there doubtless will be required enabling legislation applicable to all classes of citizens.[5]

Hence in a province predominantly Catholic, in which education of the majority is controlled by a Committee whose most influential members are churchmen, Catholic tradition must govern official policy for the care and education of the physically handicapped.

Autonomy of Local Boards

In addition to being circumscribed in its policy making role by majority pressures, the Protestant Committee because, particularly in

---

4 Ibid., p. 8

5 Statement by the Protestant Committee, 1939

the case of larger boards, it controlled only a small portion of the funds of a School Board, could not exert much direct influence on the actions of any Board. While the Protestant Committee has, since 1903, controlled the Provincial grants made to School Boards the amount involved, in the case of the Montreal Board, is almost negligible. A Report on the Montreal School Situation by the Junior Board of Trade in 1935 states:

> It is to be noted, of course, that the Government Grant, which is proportionately small throughout the province, has almost reached the vanishing point in Montreal. School fees provide about 6 per cent of the total revenue, Government Grants about .6 of one per cent, and school taxes provide about 93 per cent.[6]

The Annual Reports of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal shows that similar conditions still prevail. Of a total revenue of $13,062,914 in 1954-55 only $24,424, or less than .2 of one per cent, was received as Statutary grants and miscellaneous allowances from the Province of Quebec. Thus the Protestant Committee does not have the financial means to control or encourage the policies of the larger School Boards. This point has been noted by Dr. Percival:

> Under our somewhat decentralized system each municipality can maintain the kind of school it desires. If a community wishes to have schools that are inferior to none, it has merely to take measures to obtain them. On the contrary, the schools may be as weak as the public wish to have them. If any community is satisfied to have inferior schools, badly paid teachers, poor buildings and a shortage of equipment, there is no denying the fact that such is its prerogative. The inspectors of course report adverse conditions and the Department exerts the pressures that lie within its power, but the ultimate decisions rest with the Board.[7]

---

6 Montreal Junior Board of Trade, A Report on the Montreal Protestant School Situation, 1935, p. 29.

7 W.P. Percival, Across the Years, Gazette Printing Co., Montreal, 1946, p. 264.

While this statement does not explain how a poor municipality wishing to have good schools has "merely to take measures to obtain them", it clearly shows that in Quebec any progressive steps in the field of education must be initiated by the School Board. Thus it appears that under the system by which education is administered in Quebec any lack of provision for physically handicapped children in Montreal is due primarily to the policy of the Montreal Board.

Special Education Curtailed by the Financial Position of the Montreal Board.

While there is much truth in Dr. Percival's statement that in Quebec the type of school is determined by the wishes of the people in the municipality, lack of adequate finances may curtail the efforts of a Board to furnish the type of education it may wish to provide. The Montreal Board attempted, as early as 1914, to enter the field of special education by beginning a survey to determine the need of classes for mentally retarded children. This work was interrupted by the war, which made it impossible to obtain suitable personnel to conduct the survey. The first class for mentally retarded children was opened in September 1921 but was closed again in June 1922 because of the expense involved.

> The Board recognizes the need of educational facilities for feeble-minded children and regrets that the revenues of the Board do not make it possible to continue and extend classes for children so affected.[8]

This work was resumed in 1929 but the effects of the depression made it impossible to expand the number of classes to meet the existing need.

---

[8] Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers, Brief Presented to Hepburn Committee 1938, p. 18.

> Indeed in Montreal the Board was in such financial difficulties that for several years in succession the question of closing the special classes was discussed. [9]

Thus while the Montreal Board did show some realization of the need of special education, its financial position made action difficult if not impossible.

Since 1925 school finances in Montreal and ten adjoining municipalities have been administered by the Montreal Protestant Central School Board which was formed to improve the financial system of school municipalities in and around the city of Montreal and to relieve those that were in difficulty. From its inception in 1925 until 1945 the history of this Board was one of repeated financial crisis. Commenting on this the Hepburn Report stated in 1938:

> Under these circumstances any educational progress that of necessity called for increased expenditure was manifestly out of the question. In the provision of suitable opportunity to different types of scholars, as we shall show at a later stage, there is much to be done as additional resources become available.[10]

Dr. Percival, in 1946, commenting on the school situation in Montreal stated:

> As the years went by, financial conditions began to grow worse. In June 1945, the Montreal Protestant Central School Board, after reviewing its finances, declared publicly that it would have to close the schools because of lack of funds, that there was money to pay the salaries of teachers for only five months, that many buildings were in a bad state of repair and that several new schools were needed to care for the pupils, especially those in high school grades.[11]

---

9 Ibid., p. 19

10 Hepburn Report 1938, p. 36.

11 W.P. Percival, Across the Years, Gazette Printing Co., Montreal, 1946, p. 41.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the Board did not develop an active program of education for physically handicapped children.

The difficulties of 1945 were alleviated by the Provincial Government assuming the debts of the Board which left a large part of its revenue, formerly absorbed by bond interest, sinking fund and the repayment of borrowed money, free to meet current expenditure. The Central Board was also re-organized at this time, (and renamed the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal), and given administrative as well as financial control over nine of the eleven Local Boards under its jurisdiction. As is shown in a review of revenue and expenditure for ten years ending June 30th, 1955, the Board's finances have been in a stronger position since this re-organization.

> It is to be noted that during the first four years of its administrative duties the Board's revenues were insufficient to cover expenditures. But with the power to increase the mill rate granted by the Provincial Government and with its share of the special 1% Sales Tax for Educational Purposes, the last six years of its operation have resulted in a moderate surplus.[12]

Thus, while, as will be shown, the Board has not assumed the initiative in providing education for physically handicapped children in Montreal, the Board's present financial position provides the opportunity of assuming a greater responsibility in the field of special education.

The Mackay School for Deaf Mutes.

The oldest institution giving instruction to handicapped Protestant

---

12 Annual Report, 1954-55, Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, p. 74.

children in Montreal is the Mackay School for Deaf Mutes, primarily a boarding school, which was incorporated in 1869 as the Protestant Institution for Deaf Mutes and the Blind and which has been in continuous operation for eighty-seven years. The school was begun largely on the initiative of Mr. Thomas Widd, a former teacher at the Yorkshire Institute of Deaf Mutes, who became the first principal of the school.

In 1869 a committee of influential Protestant citizens was formed to organize a school, a sum of money was raised by public subscription, and the school opened in 1870 with an enrolment of thirteen boys and three girls.[13] By 1876 the enrolment had risen to twenty-seven and the annual reports of the period indicate that the directors considered the school a success. However, a larger building was required and the Institution was badly in debt.[14] This was not an unusual development in such institutions. For example a similar situation had arisen a few years earlier in Ontario when the Institution of Upper Canada was faced with bankruptcy. The government of Ontario came to the assistance of the school and in 1870 it was replaced by the present Institution for the Deaf at Belleville operated by the provincial government.[15]

In Montreal the Protestant Institute for Deaf Mutes and the Blind was saved by the philanthropy of Mr. Joseph Mackay, who donated land, and

---

13 Annual Report, Mackay Institute 1881.

14 Ibid.

15 Widd, Thomas, The Deaf and Dumb and Blind Deaf Mutes, Montreal, F.E. Grayton, 1880, p. 48.

at his own expense, erected a building to accommodate eighty pupils.[16] Thus education of the Protestant deaf in Montreal remained a private charity while in Ontario and other provinces it became the responsibility of the provincial governments.

From its founding in 1869 to about 1900, instruction at the Mackay School was entirely manual. After 1900 efforts to introduce speech training and lip reading were made. The present policy of the school is to teach speech and lip reading to all pupils until it is found that the amount accomplished does not justify the time being spent. The pupil is then changed to finger spelling.[17] No signs are taught, but it is found that children learn and use them outside the classroom. Because of this the child does not see the value of oral instruction in the classroom. Since there is no segregation, except in the classroom, between those receiving oral instruction and those receiving the manual method, the former lose interest in acquiring ability in lip reading and voice production because of the ease with which progress in communication is achieved by other means.[18]

The Mackay School offers a twelve-year course, the first four years being preparatory, and the remainder following as closely as possible the regular courses of the first eight grades in the Protestant Schools of the Province of Quebec. Occasionally more advanced work is given to the more intelligent pupil if he is not over-age. Pupils are

---

16 A.H. McDonald, "History of the School", Mackay Bulletin, 1942-43.

17 Principal's Message, Mackay Bulletin, 1942-43.

18 Interview, Mr. M.S. Blanchard, Principal, Jan. 4, 1956.

admitted at the age of six, but, at variance with accepted practice elsewhere, the school conducts no pre-school classes. The courses offered include the regular handicrafts found in public schools but, although pupils may remain until they are eighteen, no specific job-training is offered.

The educational staff during the year 1955-56 consisted of ten academic teachers, together with two full time and two part time vocational teachers. Since the number of pupils enrolled was ninety-three, this gives a pupil teacher ratio considered satisfactory by most authorities concerned with the education of the deaf. However, some concern was felt by the principal as to the teaching ability of the staff obtainable. Because of its limited budget the Institute cannot offer a reasonable guaranteed salary scale that would attract teachers from among those already specializing in this field, or induce beginning teachers to enter it. The Institute has for many years offered a scholarship for a year of teacher training at the Clarke School, Northampton, Mass., but no one has as yet accepted it. Any person with a teacher's permit from any Canadian province can become a member of the staff. He is then given special training at the Institute if this is judged to be required. It is usual for similar institutions to require for their staff members, at least one year of training in methods peculiar to the education of the deaf in addition to normal teacher certification.

The Mackay School serves pupils from outside the province as well as the Protestant deaf of Quebec. The following table shows the enrolment by origin of pupils for 1955-56.

Table XIII

NUMBER OF PUPILS ENROLLED MACKAY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF 1955-56

Pupils	Province
Quebec	22
Alberta	34
New Brunswick	8
Newfoundland	29
Total	93

From the Montreal area there were eleven girls and five boys of whom six were day pupils. With the completion of a provincial school for the deaf in Alberta, pupils from that province did not return to the Mackay school for the session beginning in September 1956.

Present Position of the School

Because of its dependence on public donations for a large portion of its income the Mackay School is experiencing difficulty in keeping abreast of modern developments in the education of the deaf. Discussing this problem in his 1955 Annual Report the President of the Board of Governors stated:

> The day of the private institution offering segregation and custodial care and education according to the child's apparent abilities is over. The deaf are a potentially useful group for whom segregation is not longer required. They no longer seek asylum. They have as much right to the love and protection of normal family life as anyone, and a greater need. Evaluation of their defect is no longer an observation of whether they do or do not seem to hear; it depends on exact scientific measurement and highly technical interpretation in many areas. And then a host of teachers; the highly trained speech therapist and the

> specialist in teaching the deaf over and above the normal teacher for the three R's. We see the problem but how to meet it?
>
> Last year I approached the Health Section of the Montreal Council of Social Agencies and told them my difficulties. That Committee gave me a sympathetic hearing and agreed that a study group should be formed to examine the whole problem.[19]

An examination of the income and expenditure of the school during 1955-56 (Appendix III) shows that its financial difficulties arise chiefly from expenses incurred in educating pupils from the Province of Quebec. While the per pupil cost was approximately $1,362 per annum, contributions from the Provincial Government, the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal and fees paid by parents of children from Quebec amounted to only $611 per child whereas fees paid by their provincial governments on behalf of other pupils averaged $1,070. The grant of $7,000 from the Province of Quebec, paid not by the Department of Education but by the Department of Youth and Social Welfare, has remained unchanged since 1939-40. The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal contributed, during 1955-56, $250 on behalf of each Protestant child, resident of Montreal, attending the school.

Since sixty per cent of the school's 1955-56 income consisted of fees for pupils from other provinces, the withdrawal of children from Alberta has increased the difficulty of operation. The President of the Board of Governors, referring to this in his 1956 Annual Report, stated:

---

19 Annual Report, Mackay School for the Deaf, June 1955, p. 5.

> It means quite simply, the loss of one-third of our annual revenue from school fees, an appreciable sum. It does not mean, however, the paring down of our staff in any field by a like amount, as the pupils who have left us have gone from every class in the school. Therefore we are faced with a significant drop in revenue and no comparable drop in expenses.[20]

Thus the problems which led the President of the Board of Governors to appeal to the Montreal Council of Social Agencies in 1954 have been increased by this withdrawal of pupils from Alberta. The Committee appointed by the Health Section of the Montreal Council of Social Agencies to investigate problems involved in educating deaf children has not yet completed its investigations, and no other body has offered any proposals for solving the problem. The President of the Board of Governors in his 1956 report states:

> This is a challenge which we meet with optimism because of an awakened interest in the subject of the education of the deaf which I am confident will lead eventually to a solution of our difficulties.[21]

However even though no provision was made in the budget for depreciation of buildings, furniture and fixtures, slight deficits occurred for both 1954-55 and 1955-56.[22]

Education for Hearing Handicapped Children Inc.

The second organization attempting to meet the needs of deaf children in Montreal, Education for Hearing Handicapped Children Inc., is of comparatively recent development. The following statement taken

---

20 Annual Report, Mackay Institution for Protestant Deaf Mutes, Nov. 30, 1956.

21 Ibid.

22 Auditor's Report, Mackay Institution for Protestant Deaf Mutes, June 30, 1956.

from its 1955 annual appeal for funds, outlines the organization's aims:

> This organization came into being in 1950 because of a conviction that deaf children, given earliest possible training in the speech-forming years could understand speech by lip-reading and the use of sound equipment, and could learn to use speech through special techniques of voice development. No longer, with voices developed, need they be called dumb.[23]

The same appeal outlines the history of the Association. The first nursery class was opened on November 6, 1950 in Aberdeen School, classrooms being made available by the Montreal Protestant School Board. The Board has since provided new quarters in Cote des Neiges School. In addition to providing space for these classes, the Board also pays the salary of one teacher on the staff. Pupils are admitted at the age of three years and are taught exclusively by the oral method. The staff have been adequately trained to use this method of instruction at the training department of Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass. During 1955-56 there were twenty-one pupils at this school, ranging in age from three to eleven. While the school is non-sectarian, all but three of these pupils are non-Catholic.

A fee of $100 per pupil per year is charged, but, if the pupil cannot pay, no charge is made. The yearly cost per pupil at the school is $700. The balance of this sum, and the additional cost for equipment and materials required as the school has grown, is met by private appeals for funds to individuals and organizations. During the first year of

---

23 Annual Appeal, Hearing Handicapped Children Inc., 1955.

operation, the Laurentide Service Organization undertook to staff and equip the Nursery Class and has continued to do so to the present.

The school conducted by Hearing Handicapped Inc. differs from the Mackay School in that it practices a degree of selection in the admission of new pupils. The Mackay School will admit any deaf child, irrespective of age or previous schooling, whereas Hearing Handicapped Inc., because of its strict adherence to oral instruction, admits only children of pre-school age or those who have received instruction deemed suitable to prepare the child to continue his education in oral classes. While Hearing Handicapped Inc. appears to be having less difficulty than the Mackay School in continuing its operations this may be due to the low average age of its pupils. Children admitted to its first nursery class at the age of three in 1951, and who are now the senior pupils of the school are nine or ten years of age. Thus the provision of expensive equipment and specialist teachers in various fields has not as yet become a necessity. Providing the facilities deemed necessary for the education of adolescents will place an increasing financial burden on the school as the average age of its pupils increases.

Hard-of-Hearing Children in Montreal Schools

No classes exist at present to assist children with serious hearing loss. A survey of hearing in seven selected elementary schools under the jurisdiction of the Protestant School Board was carried out in the

spring of 1955 by testing Grade III pupils with a Maico audiometer. Of a total of 645 children tested, 114, or seventeen per cent, showed some inability to pass the test. A review of these findings showed that, with the exception of twenty-seven children, the results of the audiometric test did not indicate a hearing loss sufficient to intefere with normal school routine. Further medical examination revealed that, with the possible exception of one child, all twenty-seven had hearing loss due to some condition that could be treated.[24] The testing program begun in 1954-55 was continued and expanded during 1955-56. Over five thousand Grade II pupils in sixty-seven elementary schools were given individual tests and of this number approximately two hundred and fifty were found to have hearing loss which warranted further investigation. This survey and the follow up on pupils tested in 1955-56 is being continued during the present school year. Officers of the Board, as a result of the findings of this survey, are giving consideration to the organization of a class for children with serious loss of hearing.

The Montreal School for the Blind

The first attempts to educate blind Protestant children in the Province of Quebec were made at the Protestant Institution for Deaf Mutes and the Blind, later the Mackay Institute, which was founded in 1870. While this institution was primarily for the education of deaf-mutes, blind children were accepted until 1917 and the words "for the Blind" were not deleted from the name of the institution until 1934.

---

[24] Annual Report 1954-55, Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal.

Although the education of the blind and the deaf-mute present very different problems it was not until 1910 that efforts were made to organize a school solely for the blind. This was done by the newly formed Montreal Association for the Blind, organized in 1908, which in co-operation with many city churches and the Protestant School Board of Montreal, by public subscription raised $100,000 for this purpose. A building to accommodate forty pupils was erected on the present site of the headquarters of the Montreal Association for the Blind, and the first pupils were admitted in October 1913. Since its beginning the school has been non-sectarian. A school circular appealing for funds in 1914 states:

> The course of instruction includes a thorough elementary and commercial course, the training of pianists, violinists etc. Technical education includes piano tuning and repairing, type-writing, machine-knitting, servicing etc. Parents or guardians pay what they feel they can afford ranging from $50 to $300 a year. Where the parents are very poor no charge is made.[25]

This quotation indicates that the founders of the school conceived an institution which would give, for that period, an excellent education to its pupils. No reference is made to academic classes of high school level. Because of the small enrollment and limited funds of the Association it was not found practical to continue such a varied curriculum so that at present the school attempts to follow, as far as is practical, the course of study of the first eight grades of the Montreal

---

25 Appeal of the Montreal Association for the Blind, 1914.

public schools.

The staff, during 1955-56, consisted of a teaching principal, two full-time teachers, one music teacher, and one part-time instructor in basketry. Attempts to continue instruction of pupils beyond the eighth grade have not proved successful because of the small numbers involved, but in certain cases arrangements have been made for promising students to complete their high school education in Westmount Senior High School. Readers were provided by volunteer agencies of the Association and in many cases this plan has proved successful. Many former pupils have completed not only high school but university work as well.

The decrease in the incidence of blindness among children during the past twenty-five years has been reflected in the enrolment of the school which, by 1953-54, had fallen to twelve pupils. This decrease led the Board of Governors to consider discontinuing operations and making other arrangements for the pupils. However, during the last eight years, retrolental fibroplasia among premature babies vastly increased the number of blind children before the cause was discovered. There are now twenty-five such English-speaking children in Montreal and the Board of Governors considers this will warrant continuing the school for some time. During the past year eighteen pupils, all boarding students, nine Protestant and nine Roman Catholic attended the school, all but three being from the Montreal area. Two of the non-Montreal pupils came from Hawkesbury, Ontario.

This decrease in the enrollment also encouraged the Board of Governors to make use of the additional space in the school as a residence for aged and homeless blind of whom there have been seventeen in residence during the past six years. This is considered unfortunate by the principal of the school who stated, "The situation is not satisfactory to the children nor to the aged and will prove to be a temporary arrangement." [26] The writer has been informed by the Montreal Director of Field Services, Canadian National Institute for the Blind, that at least one Montreal family has refused to enroll a blind child at the school because of this situation.

Financial Position of the School

The 1954-55 annual report of the Association for the Blind, (Appendix IV) shows the school and home to have an income of $8596.47 which includes fees paid by the pupils, board on behalf of seventeen elderly persons residing in the home, a contribution of $200 per year by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal for each Protestant child from Montreal, and $1,500 paid by the Province of Ontario for two residents of that province attending the school. Fees for children attending the school are $40.00 per month but the actual amount paid is left to the discretion of the parent, and present payments average from five to ten dollars per month. Beginning in September 1956, the contribution of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal was raised

---

26 Interview, Mr. T.J. Heggie, Principal, May 17, 1956.

to $250 per pupil per annum. The school receives no aid from the Quebec Provincial Government and no payments are made by the Catholic School Board of Montreal on behalf of Catholic children attending the school. From 1913 to 1923 the Provincial Secretary's Department contributed $7,000 per year towards the maintenance of the school but in the latter year the grant was increased to $8,000 and paid to the Association to be used in training blind persons for industry.

Since the costs of both the school and the home for aged blind persons are combined in the accounting system of the Association it is difficult to estimate accurately the expenses involved solely in the operation of the school. Of a total expenditure of $26,900 in 1954-55 the Secretary of the Association for the Blind estimated $15,000 or $1,250 per pupil to be the approximate cost of conducting the school.[27] The operating deficit of about $12,000 was met from the general funds of the Association which itself depends on an annual appeal to the public for about seventy per cent of its income.[28] Consequently the operation of the school is handicapped by lack of funds and in this a period of rising costs the difficulty is becoming more acute.

Difficulty of Obtaining Suitable Teachers

This lack of funds, and the fact that teachers at the School for the Blind do not participate in the Provincial Teachers Pension Plan,

---

27 Annual Report 1954-55, Montreal Association for the Blind.

28 Interview, Mr. Gilbert Layton, Secretary, Montreal Association for the Blind, June 22, 1956.

makes it difficult to obtain satisfactory teaching staff. The 1954-55 expenditure for salaries was $5,600 for three full-time and two part time teachers. In discussing this problem, the Secretary of the Association stated:

> Salaries in the past have been low and teachers more inspired by missionary zeal than financial rewards.

While the Association accepts the fact that it must offer higher salaries to attract suitable teachers, it finds that it cannot offer salaries comparable to those now paid in the public schools of Montreal. Until this can be done only those teachers who feel definitely that their vocation is teaching the blind, or those who for some reason are unable to obtain positions in public schools will offer their services to the Association. While the Association assumes some responsibility for pensions no definite plan is in operation and only $180.00 was included in the 1954-55 budget for this purpose. This amount appears in the general accounts of the Association and its application is not restricted to the teaching staff of the School.

Partially-Sighted Children in Montreal Schools

A sight-saving class, organized by the Montreal School Board at the request of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, and now located at Strathearn School, has been in operation since 1931.[29] The maximum enrolment recorded in this class is fourteen, with eight pupils from grade one to seven in attendance during 1955-56. Transportation is

---

29 Hepburn Report, 1938, op.cit. p. 105.

arranged by the School Board for all children attending this class. Admission is on the recommendation of the ophthalmologist attending the child with the average range of vision admitted to the class being approximately 20/70 to 20/200, although occasionally pupils with better vision needing conservation, or with more severely impaired vision whose parents refuse to enroll them in the School for the Blind are admitted. Pupils in this group attend regular classes of their own grade level for instruction in scripture, French, music, poetry, and some social studies. All other subjects, and assignments from subjects taken in other classes, are done in the home room under the supervision of their own teacher. This is the usual practice in most American cities having similar classes.[30]

Difficulties similar to those in educating the blind exist in providing adequate educational facilities for the partially-seeing. The number of pupils requiring this type of class is very small and books in twenty-four point type are expensive. The Winston Dictionary for Schools which is commonly used in Montreal, and which may be obtained in the regular edition for less than two dollars, is listed in the catalogue of one of the principal suppliers of large type publications at $35.00 per copy.[31] In addition to the cost a further difficulty arises regarding the availability of texts. The sight-saving class in Montreal

---

30 Winifred Hathway, The Education and Health of the Partially-Seeing Child, Columbia University Press, New York, 1943, p. 27.

31 Stanwix House, Pittsburg, Penn., 1954.

is at present fortunate in being able to obtain large type editions of all books used in regular classes except those for history and geography which have to be prepared manually by the class teacher. However, revisions or substitutions of the texts authorized in the schools may not be followed by a corresponding publication in large type.

The facilities provided, and the regulations issued by the Montreal School Board to those instructing partially-sighted children indicate that the class is well equipped and conducted according to acceptable modern standards. However experience elsewhere indicates there may be some pupils needing the services of this type of class who are not attending. After surveying the education of partially-sighted children in selected American cities and examining publications in this field, the Department of Education of the Province of Saskatchewan estimated that one child in five hundred is in need of the services of a sight-saving class.[32] This indicates that there may be as many as one hundred children among the Protestant school population of Montreal who should attend a sight-saving class. No assistance is at present arranged by the Montreal Board for graduates of the sight-saving class who wish to continue their study at the high-school level.

Hospitalized and Home Bound Children

That both Catholic and Protestant School Boards in Montreal attempt

---

32 Special Education and Guidance Bulletin, No. 8., Dept. of Education, Regina, Saskatchewan, 1956.

to meet their obligations in educating hospitalized children is shown by the fact that both provide the services of teachers at the Montreal Children's Hospital, the Protestant Board supplying, in 1955-56, one academic teacher, the Catholic supplying three academic teachers and one speech therapist for cerebral palsied children. Neither authority has as yet undertaken to provide a similar service for home bound children. Their position is illustrated by an appeal made by Dr. H.C. Dimock of the Montreal Children's Hospital for fifteen English-speaking teachers to volunteer their services as home instructors of convalescent children to help them make a satisfactory adjustment when they return to school. Dr. Dimock states that this solution to the problem is a temporary one, since hospital authorities hope eventually to persuade Protestant and Catholic Boards of Education in Greater Montreal to assume responsibility for convalescent children and provide permanent paid teachers.[33] The children for whom this appeal was made range in age up to fifteen years, their stay at home averaging two or three months, from a short period of two weeks to a year or more.

The School for Crippled Children

The present School for Crippled Children on Cedar Avenue began as a teaching service in the Montreal Children's Hospital in 1906. In 1914, a committee was formed to provide a permanent building for this

---

[33] H.G. Dimock, "An Appeal to Teachers", The Teacher's Magazine, Prov. Association of Protestant Teachers, Feb. 1956, Montreal, p. 16.

teaching service and by means of an appeal to the public $5,000 was raised to provide a building of three rooms on the present site of the school. The original class consisted of seven pupils but despite financial difficulties the school expanded so that in 1919-20 one hundred and four children were in attendance. That the citizens committee operating the school at this time did so under considerable difficulties is illustrated by the following quotation from the 1919-20 Annual Report.

> Firewood for cooking is composed of dry branches children pick up from under the trees on their mountain playground at recess. The price of coal is so high we would not dare use one lump for cooking.[34]

The School for Crippled Children, a non-sectarian institution, now has an enrolment of one hundred and seventy-five pupils in fifteen classrooms with a full time staff of seven academic teachers in addition to the principal. The school also employs four part-time academic teachers who give instruction in English, French, music and woodwork. Additional staff, necessitated by the nature of the school, includes two full-time nurses, two speech therapists, one teacher to provide bedside services at the Montreal Children's Hospital and two teachers for cerebral palsy patients who constitute approximately one-third of the school's enrolment. The average size of classes is twenty-five but this varies because of the fluctuating grade distribution of the pupils. The aim of the training given at the school is to fit pupils to return, or to enter for the first time, the normal public schools, and during 1954-55 nineteen pupils made this transfer. The average time spent

---

[34] Annual Report, School for Crippled Children, 1919-20.

by pupils at the school is two years although there are individuals who receive most or all of their education there. The school works in close co-operation with the Montreal Children's Hospital which assists with physical and occupational therapy.

Although the school is non-sectarian, the course of study of the Protestant schools of Quebec is followed, and academic teachers, who are paid on the salary scale of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, are teachers who have qualified to teach in the public schools of the province and participate in the Quebec teacher's pension plan. Since 1950 the enrolment at the school has been approximately forty per cent Catholic and sixty per cent non-Catholic.

Financial Position of the School

In common with other institutions in Montreal providing specialized education to physically handicapped Protestant children, the School for Crippled Children relies heavily on public charity for its maintenance. While, as has been shown, the Mackay School for the Deaf does receive a small direct contribution from the Provincial Government, the school for Crippled Children does not.

> Since its inception as a separate entity in 1914 this institution has received no capital sums from the provincial government. Its only financial contact there is through the Quebec Public Charities Act, and half the money received from this source is paid by the municipality. [35]

The Public Charities Act is administered by the Department of Health

---

35 Brief Submitted to the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Constitutional Problems by the School for Crippled Children, 1954, p.4.

and an incongruous situation arises when its funds are used for purposes of education since the Act specifies:

> Any grant or aid whatsoever given by the bureau of public charities to a public charitable institution must be devoted entirely to maintenance or hospital treatment of the indigent and must not in any manner whatsoever be diverted from its destination.[36]

In its Brief presented to the Tremblay Commission, the Board of Governors of the school pointed out that while enrolment and costs of operation have risen sharply since 1950 the income obtained from the operation of the Quebec Public Charities Act has decreased.

Table XIV

ENROLMENT, COST OF OPERATION, INCOME UNDER Q.P.C.A., SCHOOL FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN 1950-54

Year	Enrolment	Operating Costs	Income under Q.P.C.A.
		$	$
1950	158	86,639	24,248
1951	185	111,846	16,700
1952	164	127,222	14,500
1953	176	130,859	10,560
1954	195	135,000	8,100

Thus the School is faced with a situation of increasing enrolment, increasing costs, but diminishing income from the Quebec Public Charities Act. This situation has been produced because the definition of indigency under the Act has remained fixed, while the income of parents having pupils at the school has in most cases risen above the defined maximum thus making

---

36 Public Charities Act, Section 13, Revised Statutes of the Province of Quebec, Vol. III, 1941.

these families ineligible for assistance. Where children are accepted under the Act, the grant received pays less than one-third of the cost of the child at the school. No fees are paid by the parents of any children attending the school.

The decrease in the proportion of children attending the School for Crippled Children accepted for assistance under the Quebec Public Charities Act and the corresponding decrease in income from this source are shown in Table XV.

Table XV

PERCENTAGE OF ENROLMENT ACCEPTED FOR ASSISTANCE AND INCOME RECEIVED FROM THE QUEBEC PUBLIC CHARITIES ACT, SCHOOL FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN, 1950-54

Year	Per Cent of Pupils Receiving Assistance	Per Cent of School's Income Received
1950	69	28
1951	45	15
1952	39	11
1953	28	9
1954	28	6

In addition to funds received under the Quebec Public Charities Act, the school's other sources of revenue are the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal and philanthropy. The Protestant Board now contributes $250 per year for each non-Catholic pupil, resident of the area under its jurisdiction, attending the school. This payment in 1953-54 amounted to $20,800. While ninety-one Catholic children also attended during 1953-54 no similar payments were made by any organization on their behalf. Although since 1950 income from philanthropy has

increased by eleven per cent this has not balanced the rising costs and decreasing payments made under the Public Charities Act with the result that annual deficits have been incurred, the largest being $38,819 in 1952-53.

Specialized education such as is provided at the School for Crippled Children is necessarily more expensive than that provided in ordinary classes.

> Classes must be smaller. Services such as transportation, food, nursing all have to be provided. The school knows of no means of lowering its budget except by eliminating necessary services which it cannot do. [37]

Since 1950 the annual per pupil cost has exceeded $600 whereas in the Protestant schools of Montreal during the same period the average annual cost of all pupils has not exceeded $250. Smaller classes and the provision of lunches and transportation are the principal factors producing this higher per pupil cost. During 1954-55 transportation costs were $16,220 or approximately $85 per pupil and lunches $8,220 or $46 per pupil. Some four thousand visits are made annually by pupils to hospitals and clinics, transportation being provided by the school. The financial situation is made more serious by the moving of the Montreal Children's Hospital to a new location since it is now necessary to move the children by car to the hospital in order for them to continue treatment or to receive medical care.

Necessity of an Expanded Program

While the School for Crippled Children, by following the course of

---

37 Op.cit., Brief, p. 9.

study of the Protestant Schools of Quebec, and by employing only qualified teachers, maintains definite standards in the education offered its pupils, the Board of Governors state that services need expansion.

> This school needs physiotherapists, occupational therapists, clinical services which our children now get elsewhere at a tremendous loss in school time. We need a psychiatrist, a psychologist to administer a proper diagnostic program. We need more teaching staff, not only in terms of class time, but to release present staff for group consultations on each child with other experts. We need more of the many things grouped under rehabilitation. Our appeal is based not only upon our present dilemma but also even more strongly on what we ought to be doing, services that are being given to crippled children elsewhere. [38]

The Board of Governors also anticipate that greater demands will be made upon the school by further increases in enrolment.

> Recent miraculous advances in the fields of medicine and surgery have not, as one might think, lessened our load, but have increased it. Yesterday, when a child was sick or maimed, its life span was short. Today these children are living and enabled to go to schools designed for their needs. It is our duty to see that they are educated, i.e. developed mentally, socially, vocationally and spiritually. [39]

It is therefore apparent that the School for Crippled Children is experiencing great difficulty in maintaining its services at their present level and that lack of finances seriously curtail any plans for improvement and expansion. The Board of Governors suggest increased provincial aid as a solution to this problem.

---

[38] Ibid., p. 9.

[39] Ibid., p. 3.

> The provincial government must be asked to accept a much larger share of the cost of keeping this institution open. It is our opinion and urgent request that the provincial government should be willing to accept half of the cost of educating and rehabilitating our pupils. [40]

If the provincial government co-operates in this respect the school will be able to continue its operation without any curtailment for some time but this plan makes no provision for the desirable expansion of its services, which could only be effected by further recourse to charitable appeals.

Speech Defective Children in Montreal Schools

In the absence of any comprehensive survey and because of the lack of agreement among various authorities as to the incidence of speech disorders, it is difficult to estimate the number of pupils requiring special instruction of speech defects in the Protestant Schools of Montreal. The White House Conference on Special Education in 1930 estimated that 0.81% of American school children between five and eighteen required speech therapy. In his presidential address to the Canadian Education Association at Toronto in 1953, Dr. C.C. Goldring estimated that between two and three per cent of the school children in Canada require special speech instruction. A comparison of some centres having an established speech correction program shows an even greater discrepancy. Three centres, Kansas City, Aylesbury, and Toronto, selected as standards for comparison with Montreal in this thesis, report respectively 7.2%, 1.1% and 1.4% of their total school population receiving speech therapy. Another

---

[40] Ibid., p. 12.

Canadian city, Winnipeg, which has had a speech correction program established for some time, provided therapy for 0.75% of its pupils in public schools. [41]

The two factors which contribute to this variation are special characteristics of the population of the region and the standards used in determining the degree of defect that necessitates treatment. Financial considerations may cause certain centres to be restrictive in their admissions to speech therapy classes.

Two estimates have been made of the number of children in Montreal Protestant Schools requiring speech therapy. In 1949 the Montreal Rehabilitation Committee, basing their calculations on statistics reported in the United States, estimated there were 450 children between the ages of five and eighteen with speech disorders requiring treatment.[42] In 1953 the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal conducted a speech survey in twenty-three elementary schools in Lachine, Verdun, and the western section of Montreal. Of the pupils surveyed 2.1% were found to have speech so defective as to require special attention. The therapist conducting the survey pointed out that it was made chiefly in districts enjoying better than average economic status and that the true percentage for the entire school system may be somewhat higher. Applying the per cent obtained in this survey to the present Protestant school population of Montreal would indicate that there are approximately 1,100

---

41 Annual Report, Child Guidance Clinic of Greater Winnipeg, 1954-55, p. 23.

42 Re-establishment of Disabled Persons, Montreal Rehabilitation Survey Committee, 1949, p. 53.

children requiring classes in speech correction. Despite the lack of agreement in estimates as to the number of pupils requiring speech therapy it is evident that a considerable problem exists in this field among Protestant school children in Montreal.

Interest in speech therapy developed originally in Montreal through the efforts of plastic surgeons whose recognition of the fact that their cleft palate patients required speech therapy for effective rehabilitation led to the establishment of speech clinics of a very limited capacity in some city hospitals during the 1930's. In its report the Montreal Rehabilitation Survey pointed out the great disparity which existed between their estimate of the need and the services offered.[43] The three hospitals, Montreal General, Children's Memorial and St. Justines which operated speech clinics in 1949, reported a total of seventy patients receiving therapy and of this number only twenty were at the two English-speaking hospitals. There has been a considerable expansion in the services offered at hospital speech clinics since 1949. The Annual Report of the Royal Victoria clinic shows the hospital served 153 patients during 1955, and, while the clinic at the Montreal Children's Hospital has no statistics of the number of patients served, they report 1,646 clinic visits for speech therapy during 1955 which represents approximately one hundred cases.

As a result of its investigation in 1953 the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal organized speech correction classes in eight elementary schools engaging one speech therapist who visited each school

---

[43] Ibid., p. 55.

weekly. These classes, at the end of the first year of operation, had, in the opinion of all the principals of the schools concerned, produced most satisfactory results.[44] The Board decided, in view of this favourable report, to continue speech therapy in its schools, but there has been no expansion of the service since 1953. Speech classes enrolling one hundred and twenty-five pupils were conducted during 1955-56 at George Esplin, Iona Avenue, Central Park, Merton, Willingdon, Herbert Symonds, Cote des Neiges, and Van Horne elementary schools which have a total of 6,570 pupils of whom 1.9% receive speech therapy. Although fifty per cent of the cases in 1954-55 were considered to have progressed sufficiently to discontinue regular periods of speech correction, the therapist reported a considerable waiting list in each school during 1955-56.

Despite the expansion of hospital clinical services from twenty patients in 1949 to approximately 250 in 1955, and the introduction of speech correction classes in some schools operated by the Protestant School Board, a great need still exists in this field. There are certain disadvantages in attempting to meet this need by expanded clinical services alone. Very young children form the largest group requiring training and problems in transportation are apt to interfere with regular attendance at clinics. Furthermore, time spent in visiting a clinic interrupts regular school attendance and may seriously handicap the child in his school work. Only extreme cases are likely to be brought to

---

44 Annual Report, Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, 1953-54, p. 14.

the attention of clinical workers and children with minor defects which can be readily detected and treated in school may not receive any attention. Existing clinical facilities are thought to be adequate to care for cases of major defect but an expansion of the school program appears necessary to insure the early detection and training of all children needing speech therapy.

In discussing the problem of providing adequate speech therapy facilities, the Montreal Rehabilitation Survey Committee made the following recommendations:

(i) A broad educational program among the general public.

(ii) Schools or speech therapy departments in universities to train speech therapists.

(iii) Provision in schools for the systematic detection, diagnosis and correction of speech defects and impediments among children.[45]

While the second of these recommendations lies outside the jurisdiction of the Montreal Protestant School Board greater steps could be taken towards the implementation of the other two. The present program needs to be vastly expanded to provide even the minimum service required for the estimated number of pupils needing training in speech correction.

---

[45] Montreal Rehabilitation Survey Committee, Re-establishment of Disabled Persons, Montreal, 1949, p. 105.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Legislation and Regulations Governing the Education of Physically Handicapped Children in Missouri, Ontario and Quebec

The dates of the first legislation regarding public school classes for physically handicapped children show that the Departments of Education in Missouri and Ontario were interested in this field some years before any official action was taken in Quebec. The State of Missouri enacted General Rules and Regulations Applying to Special School Classes for the Feeble-Minded, Deaf, Blind, Backward, Crippled and Speech-Defective Children in 1921, and the Auxiliary Classes Act initiating such classes in Ontario was passed in 1914. However it was not until 1929 that similar legislation was enacted in Quebec. All these Acts were alike in that they were permissive legislation enabling school boards to set up classes for handicapped children but applying no compulsion to do so. This remained the case until July 1955, when revisions in the Missouri legislation made it mandatory for school boards to set up classes or to arrange with neighbouring school boards for the education of handicapped children.

Whereas there were in both Missouri and Ontario active policies to encourage and assist boards to set up classes for the physically handicapped, and regulations formulated and enforced to insure that proper standards were maintained in these classes, in Quebec no further steps have been taken by

the Provincial Government after passing permissive legislation in 1929. In Missouri and Ontario the Departments of Education have set up a special division with responsibility for the administration of education for handicapped children; in Quebec the Department of Education does not actively participate in any phase of special education for the physically handicapped in the Protestant schools of the Province.

In both Missouri and Ontario teachers of classes for the physically handicapped must hold a valid teacher's certificate and in addition must have training in the methods peculiar to the type of class they plan to teach. In Missouri this means a year of study beyond that required for teacher certification in an institution approved for this purpose by the Missouri Department of Education. The Ontario Department of Education conducts summer courses to enable teachers to qualify for work in Auxiliary Classes, the successful completion of three summer sessions being required to obtain an Auxiliary Classes permit. In Quebec no provincial regulations govern the qualifications of teachers in classes for the physically handicapped.

Number of Pupils in Classes for the Physically Handicapped

The following table showing, for the various types of handicap being considered, the maximium number of children per class allowed by regulation reveals a close similarity between Missouri and Ontario. No provincial regulations govern the size of such classes in Quebec.

Table XVI

MAXIMIUM NUMBER OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN PER TEACHER, MISSOURI, ONTARIO, AND QUEBEC

Type of Handicap	Missouri	Ontario	Quebec
Blind			
1 grade level	8	12	No regulations
2 grade levels	-	8	
Partially seeing			
1 grade level	18	20	
2 grade levels	15	16	
Crippled			
1 grade level	20	20	
2 grade levels	12	16	
Hard-of-Hearing			
1 grade level	20	20	
2 grade levels	12	16	
3 grade levels	10	-	
Deaf			
1 grade level	10	12	
2 grade levels	8	8	
3 grade levels	6	-	
Speech Defective	150	150	

State Assistance to Classes for the Physically Handicapped

Financial assistance is given by the Departments of Education of Missouri and Ontario to Boards of Education conducting special classes for the handicapped. In Missouri a fixed sum is paid on behalf of each child attending a special class. Grants paid to Boards of Education by the Ontario Department of Education are based on the average daily attendance and a percentage, varying according to the population of the area served by the board, of the approved cost of operating schools maintained by the Board. A fixed sum of $16.00 per annum is paid for each pupil of average

daily attendance and, for cities over 200,000 population 16 per cent of the approved cost. In municipalities with smaller populations the percentage of the approved cost contributed by the Ontario Department of Education is larger. The following table shows the amounts payable to School Boards in Missouri and on estimate, based on the 1955-56 costs of such classes in Toronto, the amount payable to Boards in Ontario serving an area with a population in excess of 200,000. Since Toronto conducts no classes for blind children no estimate is available as to the provincial contribution, which, however, may be expected to approximate that for oral classes for the deaf.

Table XVII

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PAYABLE BY DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION TO ASSIST BOARDS IN CONDUCTING CLASSES FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Type of Handicap	Amount per pupil Missouri	Amount per pupil (Est. cities over 200,000) Ontario	Quebec
	$		
Blind	225	(In prov. inst.)	No grants made by Dept. of Education
Partially-seeing	225	160	
Crippled	300	272	
Hard-of-Hearing	250	160	
Deaf	250	384	
Speech Defective	20	6.50	

While no comprehensive plan exists in Quebec for provincial assistance to classes for physically handicapped children, some financial support is given by Departments other than that of Education. The Department of Youth and Social Welfare contributes $7,000, or approximately

$318.00 per pupil resident of Quebec, to the Mackay School for Deaf Mutes, and the School for Crippled Children receives some support, amounting in 1954-55 to $8,100 or approximately $40 per pupil, through the operation of the Quebec Public Charities Act. These amounts contributed to institutions in Montreal for the education of the physically handicapped fall far short of contributions by Departments of Education in both Missouri and Ontario. While contributions by the State of Missouri and the Province of Ontario for the education of physically handicapped children in Kansas City and Toronto were approximately $268,000 and $100,000 respectively, the amount received by institutions serving Protestant children in Montreal was $15,100 in 1954-55.

Education of Physically Handicapped Children in Kansas City, Toronto, and Montreal.

Increased interest in classes for the physically handicapped became evident in the three cities being considered during the first two decades of the present century. The first classes for the handicapped were established by the Toronto Board soon after the passage by the Ontario Legislature of the Act Respecting Special Classes in 1911. In Kansas City public school classes for the deaf, the hard-of-hearing, and the partially seeing were established in 1914. It is evident that the Protestant School Board of Montreal at that time recognized the need of some similar classes for it played a large role in raising funds for the Montreal School for the Blind which opened a financial campaign in 1908, and it also assisted in establishing the School for Crippled Children which was opened

in 1914. However while it assisted in establishing, and continued to give modest support to the operation of these institutions, the Board did not take the initiative in developing a program for handicapped children as was done by the school boards in the two other cities being considered. Not until 1931 did the Board make its first direct contribution by organizing a sight-saving class in one of its schools. That the initiative in setting up further special classes continued to be left to public-spirited citizens in Montreal is shown by the fact that when, in 1950, it seemed imperative that some purely oral classes for deaf children be organized, this was done, not by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal but by a group of citizens interested in the problem who organized Hearing Handicapped Inc. The Board however has since given considerable assistance to this group. The introduction of speech therapy classes in 1953 and the hearing survey now being conducted seem to indicate an increased acceptance of responsibility on the part of the Board in special education.

The fact that special education in Montreal has been left largely to private initiative has resulted in a lack of standards both of qualifications for teachers and of the achievement of pupils in such classes. Since classes for children with very serious handicaps are conducted by voluntary associations which are handicapped by lack of funds, and because of the late date in which the Protestant School Board became interested in the problem of classes for children with defective speech and serious hearing loss, there is a less comprehensive program in Montreal than in Toronto or Kansas City.

Table XVIII

NUMBER OF PUPILS, SPECIAL CLASSES FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, KANSAS CITY, TORONTO, AND MONTREAL, 1955-56

Type of Handicap	No. Pupils Kansas City	No. Pupils Toronto	No. Non-Catholic Pupils, Montreal
Deaf	40	93	35
Hard-of-Hearing	36	33	-
Blind		13 [3]	9
Partially Seeing	35 [1]	55	8
Orthopedic	570 [2]	837 [2]	104
Speech Defective	3,531	1,114	125
Total Special Classes	4,202	2,145	281
Total School Population	61,200	64,240	54,811

1. Includes blind and partially seeing
2. Includes home and hospital teaching and classes for children with delicate health.
3. Attending provincial institution.

These figures indicate that there are large numbers of children in Montreal needing special attention because of physical handicaps who are not at present receiving it.

Such classes as exist in Montreal are at present finding it difficult to maintain themselves. Furthermore a comparison of operating costs with those of Kansas City and Toronto indicates that, in the case of classes outside the jurisdiction of the Montreal Board, the quality of the work done may be hampered by lack of funds.

Table XIX

PER PUPIL COST OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, KANSAS CITY TORONTO, AND MONTREAL

Type of Handicap	Kansas City Public Schools	Toronto Public Schools	Montreal Public Schools or other Institutions
	$	$	$
Deaf	690.00 *	2,318.00	1,362.00 [1] 700.00 [2]
Hard-of-Hearing ...		938.00	No classes
Blind			1,250.00 [3]
Partially Seeing ...	705.00 **	905.00	900.00
Crippled ...	970.00	1,639.00	600.00
Speech Defective ..	27.00	36.00	40.00
Average per Pupil in regular classes ...	309.00	306.00	239.00

*Average cost of deaf and hard-of-hearing pupils
**Average cost of blind and partially seeing pupils
1. Mackay School. Includes board and lodgings.
2. Hearing Handicapped Inc. Day classes only.
3. Montreal School for the Blind. Includes board and lodgings.

Administrative and other expenses not directly associated with class room work are not included in the Kansas City costs thus causing the apparent discrepancy between Toronto and Kansas City. That accounting systems can present an entirely different picture of an existing situation is illustrated by the following table comparing costs of special education in Toronto in 1949 and 1955.

Table XX

COMPARISON OF REPORTED COSTS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
TORONTO, 1949 AND 1955

Type of Class	1949	1955
	$	$
Oral classes for the deaf	608.53	2,318.94
Orthopedic classes	643.20	1,639.13
Hard-of-Hearing classes .	378.64	939.38
Sight Saving classes	467.38	905.57
Speech Correction classes	23.06	36.05

This startling increase in reported expenditure is to a large part accounted for by the fact that costs of administration, transportation of pupils, and lunches were not included in the 1949 figures.

Because of the small numbers requiring special classes the annual per pupil cost can often be misleading. This can be seen in the case of the Mackay School for Deaf Mutes which in 1955-56 had an operating budget of $126,518 or approximately $1,360 per pupil for ninety-three pupils. The present enrolment has fallen to sixty because of the withdrawal of pupils from Alberta, but since no reduction in operating costs is foreseen for this year by the Board of Governors, the per pupil cost will then rise from $1,360 to $2,100 during the present year.

Despite these considerations Table XX does indicate that both Kansas City and Toronto are spending larger amounts than Montreal for the education of physically handicapped children. Furthermore, organizations, other than the Protestant School Board, which conduct these classes have reached a

point where they can no longer, even with the greatest economies, meet the present inflated costs of operation.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provisions for Special Education in Montreal Compare Unfavourably with the Programs of Kansas City and Toronto.

Four facts are evident from the comparison of special education in Montreal, Kansas City, and Toronto: (i) The program of special education for physically handicapped children in Montreal is less extensive than in the two other cities. (ii) The School Board in Montreal plays a lesser role in special education than do boards in Kansas City and Toronto. (iii) The Government of Quebec exercises less control and provides less financial support for special education than do the Governments of Ontario and Missouri. (iv) The present system of conducting special education in Montreal, some classes being under the control of the School Board and others provided by independent institutions, can only be continued if some additional financial support be found for the independent institutions.

It has been shown in Chapters IV and V that, while present programs of special education were being developed in these three cities, in no case was compulsion applied by the central government to force School Boards to establish or expand their facilities for special education. The writer therefore assumes that the School Boards of Toronto and Kansas City showed greater initiative and sense of responsibility in this field than did the Montreal Board, although, as has been pointed out financial difficulties and lack of state support may be the valid reasons why the Montreal Board has not pursued a more active policy. The Governments

of both Ontario and Missouri recognize that a program of special education entails greater expense than does the education of ordinary children and give financial assistance to Boards of Education for the operation of special classes.

Difficulty of Obtaining Compulsory Legislation for Special Education In Quebec

Both Missouri and Ontario recognize that the local Board of Education is the agency best fitted to administer special education. However since there may be a reluctance on the part of many boards to accept this additional responsibility there has been a growing realization that some compulsion may be necessary to insure that all handicapped children are given the maximum opportunity of obtaining the education best suited to their needs. The State of Missouri, in 1955, enacted legislation making it mandatory for Boards of Education to arrange for handicapped children to attend suitable special classes. While Ontario has not enacted such legislation the Hope Report[1] recommended that this be done as the only means of insuring that all children needing special educational treatment would receive it.

It appears therefore from the situation in Missouri and Ontario that the administrative problems involved in special education in Montreal may best be solved by the enacting of legislation by the Provincial government making it compulsory for Boards of Education to provide the

---

1. Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario 1950, Toronto, Baptist Johnston 1950, p. 380.

necessary classes for the physically handicapped, and by providing adequate financial assistance to Boards for the setting up of these classes. However, as was pointed out in Chapter V, certain difficulties inherent in the dual educational system of Quebec render such a course highly improbable. Permissive legislation, enacted in 1929 at the suggestion of the Protestant Committee, already exists, but since the law is common to both Protestant and Roman Catholic school systems compulsory legislation is unlikely unless it is desired by the majority of the population of the province. Since this majority is Catholic, with an established tradition which places the care of handicapped children in the hands of religious organizations rather than School Boards, no change in the law appears likely. However since Protestant Boards are allowed a large degree of autonomy, and since enabling legislation exists, it appears that any steps in the field of special education will have to be taken on the initiative of local Boards of Education.

Difficulties Presented by the Present Position of Special Education in Montreal.

While a program of special education administered by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal might be expected to provide better services for the physically handicapped than any other plan, certain aspects of the existing situation make the institution of such a program unfeasible at present. Three of the institutions now providing education for handicapped children, the Mackay School, the School for Crippled Children, and the Montreal School for the Blind, have a long record of devoted and competent public service and their governing bodies, together

with large sections of the general public, are likely to be reluctant to see them lose their identity by being merged into the public school system of Montreal. Furthermore the School for Crippled Children, the Montreal School for the Blind, and Hearing Handicapped Inc. are non-sectarian organizations and under conditions existing in Quebec it would be difficult for a Protestant Board to assume responsibility for their operation. It would be equally difficult for the Montreal Board to assume responsibility for the Mackay School since only twenty-two of the sixty pupils attending during 1956-57 come from the province of Quebec. While therefore it would not seem practical, under present conditions, for the Montreal Board to assume the management of all existing institutions, it seems equally impractical for the Board to set up classes for all categories of handicap in competition with existing facilities. It is difficult to erase the traditions of nearly half a century and make a fresh beginning, therefore any new steps in the field of special education are more likely to be successful if taken in co-operation with existing institutions. Any other procedure would be likely to arouse strong opposition from the general tax-paying public. Furthermore the Board may be expected to be reluctant to supply the necessary funds for such an addition to its load at this time because of the present demands made on it by the rapidly increasing school population of the city.

A Proposed Solution to the Problem of Special Education in Montreal

In two of the areas considered in this thesis, Britain and Missouri, the law demands that local Boards of Education take the necessary steps

to insure that all handicapped children in the district under their control are educated in suitable classes. In Ontario, while legislation is permissive, the more progessive Boards have assumed this obligation. In all three areas financial assistance is given for special classes by the central government. It is suggested therefore, in view of the policies pursued in the centres chosen for comparison with Montreal, that the only satisfactory solution to the problem of special education in Montreal lies in the acceptance by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal of full responsibility for seeing that all physically handicapped children resident in the area under its jurisdiction are placed in classes which will give them an education commensurate with their needs and abilities.

Because of the situation which has developed in Montreal it is further suggested that this may best be done by the Board's giving to institutions now conducting special education financial assistance approximating the actual cost for each child attending. Where facilities do not exist or are inadequate in extent, as in the case of speech therapy, sight-saving, and hard-of-hearing classes, the necessary services should be set up within the school system.

In suggesting that increased payments be made to private institutions it is assumed that adequate safeguards will be provided to satisfy the Board that a suitable educational program is being conducted at these institutions. The Hepburn Report, in recommending a similar plan, suggested:

> Officers of the School Board and of the Protestant Committee should, by visits of inspection, be allowed at all

> times to satisfy themselves with regard to the quality of the education and training given. [2]

It is not unreasonable to assume that if the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal were paying the entire cost of the education of certain pupils at these institutions arrangements for inspection by officers of the Board could be made.

Since tradition and practice in the province of Quebec dictates that each branch of the dual educational system pay for its own services, and since approximately two-thirds of the Protestant school pupulation of Quebec reside on the island of Montreal, it would not be inconsistent with accepted policy if the Montreal Board were to become entirely responsible for this increased expenditure. However since special education is more costly than the education of ordinary children, and since the provincial government does, through various departments, already contribute towards the support of special education in existing independent institutions, it seems reasonable that the Montreal Board explore the possibilities of having the Protestant proportion of any such contributions channelled through the Department of Education, increased if possible, and entrusted to the Board for administration locally.

Problems Arising from a Program of Special Education Financed by the Board and Using Existing Institutions.

As was shown in Chapter V the School for Crippled Children, the Montreal School for the Blind and Hearing Handicapped Inc., while following

---

2 Hepburn Report, op.cit. p. 108.

the course of study of the Protestant Schools of Quebec, are non-sectarian institutions. If, as has been proposed, the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal were to increase its contributions to cover the actual cost of each Protestant child attending, and since money paid to these schools must of necessity be used for the education of all their pupils, it may be argued that by increasing its contributions the Protestant Board would be partially supporting the education of Catholic children since the Catholic Board makes no contribution to these institutions. There appears to be no solution to this dilemma unless provincial legislation be passed making it mandatory that all School Boards become responsible for the education of physically handicapped children under their jurisdiction. This would create an entirely new situation since a Catholic Board would be unlikely to support children at an institution following the curriculum of Protestant schools. However in the absence of such legislation it appears that to meet its obligations the Protestant Board must make payments to institutions which educate Catholic children.

The problem of educating deaf-mutes is further complicated by the question of methodology. As was shown in Chapter V, different methods are used at Hearing Handicapped Inc. from those at the Mackay School making it impossible for children at the latter to be transferred to the former. Furthermore some deaf children are unable to receive maximum benefits under the oral method of instruction and an institution offering education based on manual instruction is necessary for them. While it is suggested that the Hearing Handicapped Inc. classes receive the full support of the Board, and, since authorities agree that a deaf child should have the

opportunity to begin his education by an oral method, that efforts be made to encourage Protestant parents having deaf children to enroll them there, some provision must still be made for Montreal children now attending the Mackay school. These children may be expected to complete their education there and other children, unable to receive maximum benefits under a purely oral type of training, will need the services of a school offering alternate methods. Whereas other city school systems that conduct oral classes for the deaf may usually make arrangements at state supported institutions for the education of children unable to progress satisfactorily in public school classes, no state institution for the education of Protestant deaf-mutes exists in Quebec. It therefore seems necessary that the Board support both institutions educating deaf children in Montreal.

The most difficult problem in carrying out the proposal that the Board assume the full financial obligations for educating physically handicapped children would be in deciding whether or not the existing institution is conducting a satisfactory educational program, or if not, would it do so if additional financial support were to be received from the Board. It seems to the writer that to avoid ill-will and possible loss of public support the Board would have to begin by increasing their contributions to all institutions now receiving such assistance from its present level of $250 per Protestant pupil, to the actual cost incurred in educating the child. The new situation thus created would have to be studied over a period of years to determine whether or not such support should be continued.

One possible exception to this generalization may be the Montreal School for the Blind. As has been shown in Chapter III, classes for blind children conducted in city school systems in the United States have proved very successful. Such classes in American cities operate on lines similar to the sight-saving class now conducted by the Montreal Board at Strathearn school. The arguments advanced in favour of separate schools for the blind are based on the numerical size of such schools and are not valid if applied to the Montreal situation. Where the enrolment is large enough to permit classification by grades, to enable children to form friendships with others of the same age, and to reduce the average per pupil expenditure for equipment and library facilities, a separate school may provide better services. However, the present enrolment at the Montreal School for the Blind is eighteen, of whom nine are Protestants. While acquiring none of the benefits that may accrue from a separate school, these pupils are not only losing the advantages of association with others of their own age, but are receiving an education of an institutional type which tends to set them even more apart from seeing persons than their handicap of itself must do.

Since the Board already works in close co-operation with Hearing Handicapped Inc., making classroom space available and paying the salary of one teacher on the staff, the possibility of incorporating these classes into the school system should be explored. Since this organization has been in existence only since 1950 no strong sentimental or traditional ties are likely to govern its administration. While this organization is non-sectarian only three of its twenty-one pupils are Catholic, and since

Catholic children may attend Protestant schools in Montreal by paying the same fee which is now charged at Hearing Handicapped Inc., no additional hardship would result from this step. Such a step would permit easier solution of problems which will arise when present pupils at this school reach high-school grades and need a more varied curriculum involving specialists in a variety of subjects.

Considerations of What May be Involved in a Program of Special Education Financed by the Board.

Comparison with Kansas City and Toronto indicates that there is need of expansion in the areas of special education now provided by the Board in Montreal. The Board at present conducts one sight-saving class, provides speech therapy for one hundred and twenty-five pupils in seven elementary schools and is giving consideration to the setting up of a class for children with serious loss of hearing. During 1955-56 Kansas City provided special instruction for thirty-five partially seeing, forty hard-of-hearing and 3,531 speech defective children, while Toronto in the same period provided for fifty-five partially seeing, thirty-three hard-of-hearing and 1,114 speech defective children. These figures indicate there may be need in Montreal for at least two sight-saving classes, two classes for the hard-of-hearing and, on the present ratio of one speech therapist for seven elementary schools, the services of at least eight speech therapists. This appears to be the minimum necessary if conditions in Montreal are to approach the level established in Toronto and Kansas City. At present the Board provides the services of one teacher at the Montreal Children's Hospital but makes no provision for home teaching.

As was shown in Chapter V, the hospital estimates that fifteen English-speaking teachers are required to meet the existing needs. In the absence of statistics regarding the religious affiliation of the children concerned the writer assumes it reasonable to expect that at least half the teachers required would be Protestant.

If it is assumed that all deaf, blind and orthopedically handicapped children who need public tax-supported special education are now attending one of the institutions catering to their needs in Montreal, it is possible to form an approximate estimate of the costs to the Board, based on the 1955-56 per pupil costs at the School for Crippled Children, Hearing Handicapped Inc., the Mackay School, the Montreal School for the Blind, and the cost of normal classes in the Montreal school system, that would be involved if the Board were to meet the full expenses of each Protestant child needing special education. This proposed expenditure is compared in Table XXI with the present expenditure by the Board in this field of education.

Table XXI

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED COST OF A PROGRAM OF SPECIAL EDUCATION FINANCED BY THE BOARD AND PRESENT ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE BY THE BOARD

Type of Class	Estimated Cost	Present Contribution
	$	$
School for Crippled Children	63,000	26,000
Hearing Handicapped Inc.	14,000	4,000
Mackay School	21,000	4,750
Montreal School for the Blind	12,000	2,250
Sight Saving Classes	14,000	7,000
Hard-of-Hearing Classes	14,000	-
Speech Therapy (8 teachers)	40,000	5,000
Home & Hospital Teaching (8 teachers)	40,000	3,000
Total	218,000	52,000
Increased Expenditure Required	$166,000	

As has been shown in Table XIX the per pupil expenditure of institutions in Montreal providing special education is somewhat less than that for similar classes in the Toronto and Kansas City public school system. These Montreal institutions are handicapped by lack of funds and it seems safe to assume that their programs would be improved if their financial difficulties were to be alleviated. The increased expenditure shown in Table XXI therefore represents the minimum amount required and it may be that the cost of a thorough and adequate plan may be much higher.

The expansion of the Board's program of special education would require increased specialized staff. In Ontario and Missouri teachers are required to have taught in normal classes and to have acquired a permanent teaching licence before being permitted to work in special classes. The increased requirements in Montreal may best be met by the Board's attempting to interest qualified and experienced teachers now in its employ and arranging for them to obtain the specialist training necessary in the various fields required. Since the number required is small and the need urgent the cost of such training should be met by the Board. No facilities exist in Quebec for the training of English speaking teachers in methods required for deaf, blind, hard-of-hearing, sight-saving, orthopedic or speech therapy classes and the small number of teachers needed in these fields does not justify the arranging of such classes. Such courses are available in Ontario and in many American Universities.

Increased interest on the part of the Montreal Board may assist some institutions in their problem of obtaining suitable teachers. Since their financial position would be strengthened by greater contributions

from the Board these institutions may be able to offer a more attractive scale of salaries. Of the schools in Montreal offering special education only at the School for Crippled Children do teachers participate in the Provincial Teachers' Pension Plan. This situation does not make it attractive for persons who may be specialists in the instruction of blind or deaf children to offer their services to the Mackay School or the Montreal School for the Blind. If the Montreal Board were to interest itself in seeing that blind and deaf children were taught by the best instructors available, this might be instrumental in bringing about an arrangement whereby teachers in all such institutions could become eligible to participate in the Provincial Teachers' Pension Plan.

While an active policy would have to be pursued to see that all children needing the services of special classes were discovered and properly placed, the present administrative organization of the Board appears adequate for this purpose. Experience at the Toronto Child Adjustment Clinic indicates that there is no great need for psychiatric and psychological services in placing children in classes for the physically handicapped. Of 4,842 children examined at this clinic in 1955-56, only twenty pupils were considered to determine their suitability for special classes for the physically handicapped. Individual arrangements on such a limited scale could, where necessary, be made by the Board.

Special education for handicapped children seems to have reached a critical stage in Montreal. Speaking in a purely financial sense, the President of the Board of Governors of the Mackay School has stated,

"The day of the private institution is over in Montreal."[3] Essentially the same idea is expressed in the Brief presented by the School for Crippled Children to the Tremblay Commission in 1954. Not only has the day of private institutions passed in the sense that economic conditions make their continuation increasingly difficult, but it is no longer a satisfactory state of affairs when this type of special education is conducted piecemeal, with varying degrees of quality, and without any regulating body to insure that satisfactory standards are being set. As has been shown modern educational thought indicates that the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal is the most suitable agency to accept responsibility for the necessary program of education for physically handicapped children.

---

3 Annual Report, Mackay School for Deaf-Mutes, June 1955, p. 7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. Best, Harry, The Deaf, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1914.

2. Conway, C.B., The Hearing Abilities of Children in Toronto Public Schools, Toronto, Ontario College of Education, 1937.

3. Cruickshank, W.M., Psychology of Exceptional Children and Youth, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1955.

4. Cubberley, E.P., A Brief History of Education, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1922.

5. Fay, E.A., Histories of American Schools for the Deaf 1817-1893, Washington, Gibson Brothers, 1893.

6. Framptom, M.E., and Gall, E.D., Special Education for the Exceptional, Boston, Porter-Sargent, 1955.

7. Good, H.C., A History of Western Education, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

8. Goodenough, F.L., Exceptional Children, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

9. Harvard Studies in Education, The Education of Visually Handicapped Children, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1933.

10. Hathway, W., The Education and Health of the Partially Seeing Child, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943.

11. Hayes, S.P., Contributions to a Psychology of Blindness, New York, American Foundation for the Blind, 1941.

12. Heck, A.O., The Education of Exceptional Children, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1940.

13. Hepburn, W.A.F., Report of the Quebec Education Survey Committee, 1938.

14. Johnson, W., Speech Handicapped School Children, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1948.

15. Kandell, I.L., Education Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College, New York, Columbia University Bureau of Publications, 1944.

16. Lowenfeld, B., Braille and Talking Book Reading, New York, American Foundation for the Blind, 1945.

17. McDonald, R.A.F., Adjustment of School Organization to Various Population Groups, New York, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1915.

18. Munroe, Paul, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Revised Edition, New York, MacMillan Co., 1952.

19. Percival, W.P., Across the Years, Montreal, Gazette Printing Co., 1946.

20. Pinter, R., Psychology of the Physically Handicapped, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1941.

21. Protestant Committee of the Council of Education of the Province of Quebec, Statement Concerning the Report of the Quebec Protestant Education Survey Committee, 1939.

22. Report of the Regents' Inquiry, Education for American Life, New York, McGraw-Hill Co., 1949.

23. Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario 1950, Toronto, Baptist Johnson, 1950.

24. Sullivan, O.M., and Snortum, K.O., Disabled Persons, Their Education and Rehabilitation, New York, Century Co., 1927.

25. Upshall, C.C., Day Schools vs. Institutions for the Deaf, New York, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1929.

26. Widd, Thomas, The Deaf, the Dumb and Blind Deaf-Mutes, Montreal, F.E. Grayton, 1880.

27. White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, Report of the Committee on Special Classes, New York, Appleton Co., 1931.

Periodicals

28. American Speech and Hearing Association Committee on the Mid-Century White House Conference, "Speech Disorders and Speech Correction", Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, Dec. 1952.

29. Dimock, H.G., "An Appeal to Teachers", The Teachers' Magazine, Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers, Montreal, Feb. 1956.

30. Fusfeld, I.S., "A Cross-Section Examination and Evaluation of the Academic Program of Schools for the Deaf", Gallaudet College Bulletin 3, 1954.

31. Goldring, C.C., "Presidential Address", Canadian Education, Dec. 1953.

32. Grossvenor, Lillian, "Deaf Children Learn to Talk at Clarke School", National Geographic Magazine, March, 1955.

33. MacDonald, A.H., "History of the School", Mackay Bulletin, 1942-43.

34. Russel, D.H., "Special Education in Canada", Mental Health, April, 1932.

35. Russel, D.H. and Tyler, F.T., "Special Education in Canada", The School, June 1942.

36. Wallace, H.M., Wrightstone, J.W., and Gall, E., "Special Classes for Handicapped Children", American Journal of Public Health, Vol. 44, no. 8, Aug. 1954.

Public Documents

37. Amendments to the Department of Education Act 1954, Province of Ontario, 1956.

38. Amendments to the Schools Administration Act of 1954, Province of Ontario, 1955.

39. Bill to Amend the Laws Pertaining to Education in England and Wales, 1944.

40. Bill to Amend the Laws Relating to Education in Scotland, 1945.

41. House Bill 27, 68th General Assembly of the State of Missouri, 1955.

42. Manual of Public Instruction, Acts and Regulations, Nova Scotia, 1921.

43. Public Charities Act, Revised Statutes of Quebec, Vol. III, 1941.

44. Regulations, Assistance in Payment of Cost of Education of Retarded Children, Consolidated Regulations of Ontario 176/54.

45. Regulations, Auxiliary Classes, Regulations 38 of the Consolidated Regulations of Ontario.

46. Regulations, General Legislative Grants 1956, Consolidated Regulations of Ontario 2/56.

47. Regulations Governing the Securing of State Aid for Special Classes for Exceptional Children, Department of Education, State of Missouri, 1955.

48. Regulations Prescribed by the Minister of Education under Section 34(5) of the Education Act 1944, British Ministry of Education 1945.

49. Schools Administration Act, Statutes of Ontario, Chapter 86, 1954.

50. Special Classes Education, Statutes of Quebec, 19 Geo.V, 1929.

Annual Reports

51. Alberta, Annual Report of the Department of Education 1953.

52. British Columbia, Annual Report of the Public Schools of the Province 1953-54.

53. Child Guidance Centre of Greater Winnipeg, Annual Report 1954-55.

54. Clarke School for the Deaf, Northampton, Mass., Annual Report 1954-55.

55. Mackay Institute for Protestant Deaf-Mutes, Annual Reports 1881, 1955, 1956.

56. Manitoba, Report of the Department of Education 1953.

57. Montreal Association for the Blind, Annual Reports 1954-55, 1955-56.

58. New Brunswick, Annual Report of the Department of Education 1951.

59. Ontario, Report of the Minister, Department of Education 1954.

60. Perkins Institute and Massachusetts School for the Blind, Annual Report 1955.

61. Principal School Medical Officer, Buckinghamshire, England, Annual Reports 1954, 1955.

62. Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, Annual Reports 1953-54, 1954-55, 1955-56.

63. Royal Victoria Hospital Speech Clinic, Annual Report 1955.

64. Saskatchewan, Annual Report of the Department of Education 1954.

65. School for Crippled Children, Montreal, Annual Report 1919-20.

66. Toronto Board of Education, Statistical Summary of Psychiatric and Psychological Work, 1955.

Miscellaneous

67. Department of Education, Saskatchewan, Special Education and Guidance, Bulletin no. 8, 1956.

68. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Biennial Survey of Education, Elementary and Secondary Schools in Canada 1944-46, Ottawa, 1949.

69. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Survey of Elementary and Secondary Education 1948-50, Ottawa, 1956.

70. Education in Britain, Central Office of Information, London, 1955.

71. Explanatory Memorandum by the President of the Board of Education, H.M. Stationery Office, 1943.

72. Finnet, C., Memorandum to the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, Dec. 1955.

73. Kansas City Public Schools, Handbook 1955-56.

74. Montreal Association for the Blind, Annual Appeal 1914.

75. Montreal Junior Board of Trade, A Report on the Montreal Protestant School Situation 1935.

76. Montreal Re-habilitation Survey Committee, Re-establishment of Disabled Persons, Montreal, 1949.

77. Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers, Brief Presented to the Quebec Protestant Education Survey Committee, March 1938.

78. Report of a Sub-Committee of the Study Committee on English Speaking Deaf and Hard of Hearing in Montreal, Methodology in Teaching the Deaf, Montreal Council of Social Agencies, May 1956.

79. Report of the Survey Committee of the Canada and Newfoundland Education Association 1943.

80. School for Crippled Children, A Submission to the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Constitutional Problems, Montreal, 1954.

81. United States Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education 1936-38, Bulletin 1940, no. 2, Washington, 1940.

82. United States Office of Education, Statistics of Special Schools and Classes for Exceptional Children 1939-40, Washington, 1942.

83. United States Office of Education, State Legislation for Exceptional Children, Bulletin 1949, no. 2, Washington, 1949.

84. United States Department of the Interior, Public School Education of Atypical Children, Bulletin 1931, no. 10, Washington, 1931.

85. United States Department of the Interior, Public School Education of Atypical Children, Bulletin 1935, no. 10, Washington, 1935.

86. United States Government Printing Office, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1947-48, Washington, 1950.

87. United States Government Printing Office, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1954, Washington, 1956.

Letters in Possession of Author

88. Aldridge, A.A. Supervisor of Guidance, Department of Education, Edmonton, Alberta, July 11, 1956.

89. Cooke, D.E., Chief Education Officer, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, England, Jan. 27, 1956.

90. Dabney, Mrs. Nelle, Director of Special Education, Kansas City, Missouri, December 12, 1955, and May 15, 1956.

91. Hazlett, James A. Superintendent of Public Schools, Kansas City, Missouri, January 12, 1956.

92. Martin, I.H.W., Public School Inspector, Toronto, Ontario, May 24, 1956, December 1, 1956 and October 31, 1956.

93. Richard, Mrs. Isabelle, Speech and Hearing Department, Child Guidance Clinic, Winnipeg, Manitoba, May 11, 1956.

94. Townsend, G.W.H., Principal School Medical Officer, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, December 5, 1955.

APPENDIX I

SPECIAL CLASSES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CERTAIN CHILDREN

STATUTES OF QUEBEC, 19 Geo.V, 1929.

1. Boards of school commissioners or school trustees in any school municipality in the Province of Quebec may establish and carry on in any of their school buildings special classes for retarded children or those who are unable to profit from the instruction given in classes corresponding to their age, or who, from physical or other causes, require special attention.

2. Such special classes shall be carried on subject to the regulations made therefor by either committee of the Council of Education, as the case may be; such regulation to be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council before having force and effect.

3. The admission of children to such special classes shall be made by the principal of the school to which they are sent, upon the advice of the teachers identified with such special classes.

4. Any school board establishing such special classes may incur all such expenses as may be necessary for the proper carrying on of the same, as well as for the training of specialists and the appointment of a medical officer.

5. It shall be the duty of any such board to have its medical officer visit defective children in their homes when necessary, in order to advise the parents of the children with respect to the health and education of the pupils in the aforesaid special classes.

APPENDIX II

EQUIPMENT FOR SPECIAL CLASSES REQUIRED BY STATE OF MISSOURI REGULATIONS

A. BLIND

Arithmetic frames and type

Taylor Arithmetic frames and type

Peg boards and pegs

Perforated squares for sewing

Parquetry paper work

Cardboard squares

Braille slates and styli

Spelling frames

Dissected wooden relief maps

Undissected wooden relief maps

Dissected wooden maps and globes

Braille writers

Talking books

Braille library

Movable desks with adjustable seats

Typewriters

Filing cabinet

Games

Expendable supplies (crayons, paper, etc.)

Tables

Pencil sharpener

Vocational training supplies and equipment

Cost of repair and maintenance of equipment

B. DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING

Pure tone audiometer for each school

Group hearing aids for each classroom

Individual hearing aids, where recommended

Mirror (at least one 14" x 20" for each classroom)

Filing equipment

Games and objects for use in teaching the deaf

Expendable supplies

Audio-visual equipment

Cost of repair and maintenance of instructional equipment

C. PARTIALLY SEEING

Movable desks

Light meter

Large clear-type books

Magnifying glasses (at least two for each classroom)

Typewriters (one standard keyboard, large type, for use of teacher in primary grades -- others for upper elementary grades and junior and senior high school)

Filing cabinet for case records

Paper cutter (15-inch blade)

Eyelet punch

Two easels

Sight-saving globe

Expendable supplies (crayons, paper, etc.)

Physical and political maps suitable for sight saving class

Audio-visual aids

Talking books

Mimeograph

Supplementary reading books, chosen for size of type

Tables

Eye chart

Cost of repair and maintenance of equipment

D. CRIPPLED

Suitable tables

Adjustable desks

Movable blackboard for each room

Cots

Typewriters

Filing equipment

Audio-visual equipment

Blankets

Therapeutic equipment, as prescribed by physician

Expendable supplies (crayons, paper etc.)

Metronome

Cost of the repair and maintenance of instructional equipment

E. SPEECH DEFECTIVES

Recording equipment

Audiometer

Full length mirror (not more than one per building)

Filing equipment

Books

Games

Expendable supplies (crayons, paper, etc.)

Hand mirrors (not more than ten per building)

Flashlights (not more than ten per building)

Stop Watch (not more than one per speech correctionist)

Metronome (not more than one per speech correctionist)

One relaxation table or couch per building where a speech correctionist works

Movable blackboard for each building employing a speech correctionist

Models or charts of speech and hearing mechanisms

Cost of repair and maintenance of instructional equipment

APPENDIX III

THE MACKAY INSTITUTION FOR PROTESTANT DEAF-MUTES

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1956

INCOME

Grant from the Province of Quebec	$7,000.00	
Grant from the Montreal Protestant Central School Board	500.00	
Fees from Pupils from the Province of Quebec	5,954.00	
Fees for Pupils from Other Provinces	75,932.00	$ 89,386.00
Subscriptions and Donations	28,380.57	
Income from School Activities	105.18	28,485.75
Income from Investments		7,947.93
Refund of Excise Tax		698.40
		$126,518.08

EXPENDITURE

Education and Recreation	41,716.33	
Housekeeping	29,232.71	
Kitchen and Dining Room	20,634.86	
Building Maintenance, Taxes and Insurance	18,443.23	
Administration	8,458.07	
Special Charges and Non-Operating Expenses	8,206.63	126,691.83
Excess of Expenditure over Income		$ 173.75

APPENDIX IV

MONTREAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE BLIND INCORPORATED

STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1955, SCHOOL AND HOME

Revenue

School fees	$ 2,875.52
Board revenue	5,720.95
	$ 8,596.47

Expenditure

Depreciation	$ 1,951.28
General expense	291.50
Insurance and taxes	1,249.91
Laundry	994.48
Library	374.72
Light, heat and power	2,224.38
Postage, printing and stationery	49.79
Provisions	5,623.91
Repairs and maintenance	2,136.14
Salaries - tuition	5,620.45
Salaries and wages - other	5,512.83
Supplies	651.60
Telephone and telegraph	241.84
Total expenditure	$26,922.84
Excess of expenditure over revenue	$18,326.37