Historical Studies in Education / Revue d'histoire de l'éducation
ARTICLES / ARTICLES

Exceptional Educators: Canada's First Special Education Teachers, 1910–45

Jason Ellis
University of British Columbia

ABSTRACT
This article examines the personal backgrounds and professional lives of Canada's earliest special education teachers. It considers the approximately 340 women and men who, between 1910 and 1945, taught special education classes in the public elementary schools of Toronto and Vancouver — the first two systems in the country to offer special education programs. Twelve selected special educators are discussed in more depth based on traces of their lives found in an eclectic array of sources, including school reports, the census, and vital records. The article considers early special educators' gender; teacher training, certification, extra qualifications, and length of service; and their relationship as non-disabled adults to children with disabilities. It discusses each of these factors in light of what it can tell us about the uniqueness of early special educators and what in turn the personal and professional stories of these individuals can tell us about the history of special education.

RÉSUMÉ
Cet article explore les antécédents personnels et la vie professionnelle des premiers enseignants en éducation spécialisée au Canada. Il prend en compte les quelque 340 femmes et hommes qui, entre 1910 et 1945, ont donné des cours d'éducation spécialisés dans les écoles primaires publiques de Toronto et de Vancouver — les deux premiers systèmes scolaires au pays à offrir des programmes d'éducation spécialisée. Cet article s'intéresse particulièrement au profil de douze éducateurs spécialisés dont il est possible de suivre la trace à partir d'un ensemble de sources éclectiques incluant les rapports scolaires, les recensements, et les registres d'état civil. Il prend en compte le genre des premiers éducateurs spécialisés, la formation des enseignants, la certification, les qualifications supplémentaires, le nombre d'années de service, ainsi que la relation de ces adultes non handicapés avec des enfants ayant une limitation fonctionnelle. Chacun de ces facteurs est analysé à la lumière de ce qu'ils peuvent révéler à propos du caractère unique des premiers éducateurs spécialisés, de même que ce que leurs histoires personnelles et professionnelles révèlent sur l'histoire de l'éducation spécialisée.

Between 1910 and 1945, about 340 different individuals taught a special class of one sort or another in the public elementary schools of Vancouver and Toronto. These were some of Canada's first special education teachers.[1] Vancouver and Toronto

public schools were the first in the country to employ "auxiliary education" teachers, as they were known early on. (The term "special education" was not widely used until after about 1930.[2]) Ontario enshrined special education in legislation as early as 1911 with its law, An Act Respecting Special Classes. Opportunities to teach special education grew steadily in both cities during the period this article examines. Both the Vancouver and Toronto public school systems started with special classes for boys and girls with learning difficulties or intellectual disabilities in 1910. They then added many more classes and programs. There were classes in both systems for deaf children, though Vancouver's system only operated classes of this type briefly, turning them over to provincial authorities in 1923. Toronto public schools also had classes for children who were "hard of hearing" (but not totally deaf) and a program for children who stuttered or had other speech problems. Toronto had classes for "foreign" children as well — boys and girls we would recognize today as English language learners. Both school systems had open-air rooms for chronically ill children, while Toronto had two forest schools for them as well. The forest schools were held entirely outdoors in Victoria Park and High Park. Open-air classes and forest schools exposed the children with health problems who went to them to the invigorating benefits of fresh air. Classes for physically disabled youngsters existed in both systems as well, as did sight-saving classrooms for children with vision problems. Both school systems had their own psychological testing and child guidance services, or used their municipality's service.[3]

The elementary school special education teachers who worked in all these classes and programs in Vancouver and Toronto were exceptional educational pioneers, but were also exceptional in several other ways that are explored in this essay. Nearly every single one was a woman — an extraordinary fact, even at a time when the teaching force was majority female. Special educators' qualifications for the job — their training and experience — made them stand out as well. Their unique preparation coincided with the distinctive opinions these teachers formed about their work and the pupils they taught. They were not merely mimickers of the views of eugenicists, psychologists, and other experts. They shared some of these authorities' views; however, they formed original insights of their own concerning the nature and treatment of disabilities and learning problems, which they — more than any other specialists — were called upon to recognize and deal with on a daily basis. However, unlike their pupils, most special education teachers were not disabled. This difference affected how special education teachers approached their work and interacted with their students.

This article looks at special educators in Toronto and Vancouver elementary schools as a group. It also sketches some of the details of the lives and careers of a dozen selected individuals throughout the article and in the attached appendices. It digs a little more deeply into the personal and professional backgrounds of these twelve, in order to give early special education a more human face.[4] The twelve individuals were selected from two more or less comprehensive lists of special class teachers from the years 1910–45, one compiled for Vancouver and one for Toronto. (See Appendix 1 for a full account of the methodology.) In addition to being discussed

throughout the essay, the ten women and two men selected are also listed in the tables found in Appendix 2. They were not selected randomly. A few were picked for their unusually successful careers in special education.[5] Others had careers that were more ordinary. One or two teachers were chosen because they did not seem to have lasted very long in special class work. One man from each city was intentionally included, even though men were radically underrepresented in special education teaching compared to women.

To be sure, early special educators in Toronto and Vancouver, as represented by the twelve discussed in this study, shared many personal and professional characteristics with their teacher colleagues in both cities. These characteristics were examined as well and can be dispensed with briefly now. Like most teachers of their day, most early special educators appear to have been of "middling" social origins, a description that historically applied to offspring "of farmers, artisans, small shopkeepers, clerks."[6] (See Table 2.) Most Canadian educators — especially in British Columbia and Ontario — were predominantly of British and Protestant heritage. Special educators seem to have been no exception in this regard.[7] (See Table 2.) Special education teachers had about the same initial teacher training and certification as most of their colleagues as well — a second-class teaching certificate was common.[8] (See Table 3.)

Feminization and Special Education

Special education teaching was heavily feminized. This set special educators apart. True, by about the turn of the twentieth century, a large proportion of the total public school teaching force was female. What historians call teaching's "feminization" unfolded differently from province to province, in urban and rural settings, and by level taught. But on the whole, it was an inescapable fact from about the mid- or later nineteenth century until about the 1930s.[9] In the 1910–11 school year, Toronto's women public school teachers outnumbered the system's men roughly eight to one.[10] In Vancouver schools (public and high), the ratio was two-and-a-half women to one man.[11] Feminization was far more pronounced in special education teaching than this though. Men accounted for approximately 4 per cent of all special educators working in the public schools of either Toronto or Vancouver. That is, in special education settings, women outnumbered men not eight-to-one or two-to-one, as they did on public school staffs generally — but about twenty-five-to-one.[12] Yet this still exaggerates the number of men who could truly be said to be special educators. Most of the Toronto males that it includes were principals at the board's forest schools. Like most public school principals at the time, these men also did some teaching. But since the forest school classes were all technically special education rooms (albeit by virtue of being for children with health problems, not because the pupils were necessarily labelled "subnormal" or "backward," though some were), these male principals became special education teachers more by default than for any other reason. The same applied to the male teachers at the Victoria Industrial School in Toronto, a boys-only custodial correctional facility also classified as special education. In Vancouver, male special educators all worked either at the school for deaf pupils or were, like Alfred

Peck Tingley, one of the Vancouver teachers discussed in this article, manual training teachers on a rotary timetable that included one or more special classes. Women completely dominated the type of special program that was most common around this time, the classes for boys and girls labelled mentally "subnormal."

Why were there so many women in this division of the school system and so few men? It is likely that at least some individual women were attracted to special education work by what historian Kate Rousmaniere describes as "the public image of the nurturing female elementary teacher." It "undergirded many women's decisions to enter the profession."[13] The prospect of work with disabled children had the power to amplify its effect. Eugenicists in this period often successfully portrayed some people with disabilities — such as the so-called "feebleminded" — as threatening.[14] However, there was the competing notion that segments of the young disabled population were especially helpless and deserved sympathy and protection that it was the Christian duty of the able-bodied to provide.[15] This sentiment lingered over the years. Subjects that Rebecca Coulter interviewed for a history of women educators in twentieth-century Ontario "spoke glowingly of the pleasures of the teaching profession, of helping young people, especially those with learning difficulties."[16] Men's identities as public school teachers, in contrast to this nurturing identity, were often expressed through rough disciplinarian, gentleman-academician, or (later) management-material personas.[17] Special class work, with perhaps the exception of teaching at an industrial school for boys or serving as the principal and therefore academic leader of a forest school, seemed to call for sympathy over sternness and to place little premium on scholarly ability or on leadership potential.

Inseparable from the emotional rewards of special education work was a downside that the promise of those rewards may have concealed from the novice special class teacher. The idealistic beginner public school teachers Rousmaniere describes soon awakened to the reality of difficult working conditions. There was, she writes, "a disjuncture between their image of the generous and caring teacher and the hard work and often menial conditions of the job."[18] Teachers who worked with disabled children experienced similar realizations. In 1928, a former special class teacher in Toronto, Miss R. W. Adolph, wrote the board's chief inspector to explain her reluctance to continue teaching disabled youngsters. "Auxiliary [that is, special education] work is both discouraging and depressing, and most teachers need the contact with normal children once in a while," she stated.[19] Florence MacTavish taught at Toronto's Wellesley Public School in its orthopaedic classes for children with physical disabilities, including boys and girls with paralysis caused by polio. She also wrote the chief inspector about frustrating working conditions. Orthopaedic classes had no recess and, as Moshier wrote, MacTavish reported lacking even "a spare minute of time in school" to perform duties like drawing up French and Latin exercises for senior pupils.[20]

Historians have shown that individual women were also drawn to teaching by its advancement prospects at a time when few other occupations had these for females.[21] This applied in its own particular way to special class teaching. As city school systems became bigger — bureaucracies from the turn of the twentieth century

onwards — they established special education programs and created specialist and supervisory roles at the head of those programs.[22] Female special educators rose to fill the new positions.[23] The Vancouver school district named one of the twelve teachers discussed in this essay, Josephine Dauphinee, to one of those positions when it made her supervisor of special classes.[24] Born in Nova Scotia into a Methodist family of English heritage, Dauphinee trained as a teacher and nurse. She arrived in British Columbia around 1910 to work in a relative's medical practice but switched to teaching shortly afterwards. She had been teaching special education for nearly a decade when the district named her supervisor in 1918. She would hold the position until her retirement in 1941.[25] Vancouver also elevated special class teachers Ruby Kerr and Jean Cantelon to specialist roles. Kerr was appointed school district assistant psychologist and eventually, in 1920, head psychologist. In 1926, however, the district, on the advice of the Putman-Weir survey of provincial schools, demoted Kerr to a subordinate position within a new Bureau of Measurements that had a man in charge.[26] Cantelon was a special class teacher before the district moved her up to the position of social worker with special classes.[27] The Toronto Board of Education named Imogen Palen its "senior teacher" of deaf, hard-of-hearing, and speech correction classes in 1924.[28] It also tapped women for principalships of its two all-girls special education schools for adolescents. Jane Little and Grace MacKenzie were the first two women secondary school principals the Toronto board ever hired.[29] Of course not every special education teacher could move up like this. Adolph complained that special educators were deprived of opportunities to teach higher graded classes in the public schools, which at this time was considered a promotion. They should be compensated with the possibility of "fill[ing] more of the vacant positions" in the schools that Little and MacKenzie headed, Adolph said.[30] Men, the minority on public school staffs, enjoyed disproportionately better access to all sorts of promotions into positions that for all practical purposes were closed to women. They did not need to go into special education work to move up the career ladder. Vancouver was the British Columbia district "most resistant to appointing women as school managers," one historian has concluded.[31] In Toronto, men occupied nine out of ten principal positions in elementary schools in 1930 and 95 per cent of these positions in 1940 and 1950.[32]

Bonus pay also represented a reward and therefore a potential incentive to teachers taking up special class work. The Ontario Department of Education provided a salary supplement to a board for its special education teachers, which the board turned over to individuals. The premium was paid to the board only when the teacher had earned a provincial auxiliary teacher's certificate through the process described in the next section. By 1928, the bonus amount was $100 per teacher annually.[33] The Vancouver school district paid a similar premium. It was not dependent on auxiliary certification, since British Columbia did not have this at the time. As early as 1911, trustees passed a special resolution authorizing pay for Dauphinee "in advance of the regular schedule." This earned her $90 on top of her existing salary.[34] Tingley received $100, $125, and $140 bonuses in different years for his special class work. His salary was around $2,000 annually at this time.[35] In 1928, a group of former

Toronto special education teachers characterized the added auxiliary class amount "as scarcely adequate for the extra responsibilities and difficulties involved in teaching such a class." They asked unsuccessfully to have it increased to $150.[36] The $100 that was disbursed to special education teachers was handed to them whether they were male or female. But because of the salary differentials that existed between men and women teachers in urban systems, the bonus represented a smaller proportion of the total compensation for men, and therefore could be said to have acted as a smaller incentive to a male teacher such as Tingley.[37]

School boards benefited financially from using women overwhelmingly as special class teachers. This and the prevailing gender norms about women teachers as nurturers likely combined as inducements for districts to direct women into this work, or at least not to protest too loudly when they congregated there.[38] Using women in special class work was to the fiscal advantage of urban districts because of the lower salaries they paid women. They justified this practice by arguing that as "'naturally' maternal, caring, and patient," women would have "a greater interest in personal satisfaction than in financial reward."[39] Alternatively, they claimed women teachers were flighty "birds of passage." Said to be young, unmarried, and without dependents, they were also believed to be briefly attached to a career that they would shortly abandon for marriage.[40] Historians have since refuted with strong evidence any claim that women were less professionally committed to teaching than men were.[41] Yet in successfully rationalizing low female pay, school districts derived huge savings for local ratepayers at a time of massive and costly system expansion.[42] This helped them to afford new and more expensive frills — fittingly enough, special education itself. Special classes were costlier to deliver on account of lower class sizes than graded rooms. In 1928–29, for instance, the average special education class size was fifteen pupils in Vancouver and Toronto. The average class size of graded public school classes in either city was from two-and-a-half to nearly three times this: thirty-seven in Vancouver and forty-one in Toronto.[43] The Toronto board calculated the cost of delivering special education at $242 per pupil in 1928. (This was the cost for the most numerous classes, those for "subnormals." Other types of special classes were even more expensive.) The cost for a regular graded class in the Toronto public schools, in comparison, was just $91 per pupil.[44]

Training and Experience

Special education teachers stood out from the rest of the teaching force by virtue of the special and additional certification they often held. Even shortly after the first special classes appeared in the 1910s, special educators were surprisingly well prepared for their work, especially the Toronto teachers. Most of the seven Toronto teachers discussed in this article obtained the Ontario "auxiliary certificate" that qualified teachers to lead special education classes, on top of the certificate they earned that initially certified them to teach in public schools (see Table 3). They obtained additional certification at a time when the majority of their public school colleagues still held no special credential whatsoever. In 1919–20, just 14 per cent of Toronto

public school teachers held a special certificate of any kind. (The vast majority of these were women with kindergarten certificates.[45]) One, and even two decades later, the percentage was practically unchanged.[46]

It was in 1915 that the Ontario Department of Education first offered the auxiliary certificate to teachers who successfully completed a five-week summer course in special education.[47] By 1917, departmental regulations obliged teachers in charge of special education classrooms to possess the credential and to have three years of teaching experience (with any students).[48] Several of the seven Toronto teachers discussed taught special classes before earning the auxiliary certificate, though most of this group did earn it eventually (see Table 3). Two of the Toronto teachers never earned their auxiliary certificates. Lillian Carruthers and Bessie Bowling, however, began teaching special education in the early 1910s, before the certificate existed. Bowling, who started teaching in the regular grades in Toronto in 1901 at the age of twenty-three, and taught special education from 1912, held a temporary certificate for special class work by 1919. She appears never to have qualified for the permanent credential, even though she taught special classes for many more years.[49]

Studies leading to a formal certificate were only one kind of preparation for special class teaching. Special educators underwent other forms of professional training or academic preparation directly or indirectly related to teaching exceptional children as well. In 1911, before the auxiliary certificate was available in Ontario, the Toronto Board of Education paid some of Carruthers's expenses to attend the summer school for teachers at the Vineland Training School.[50] This was a New Jersey custodial institution that housed so-called "mental defectives." It had a reputation as the premier centre for preparing public school teachers to work with "feebleminded" schoolchildren.[51] Its summer sessions drew educators from the eastern United States and Canada. Renowned mental deficiency experts such as H. H. Goddard, who imported the Binet intelligence tests to the United States and coined the clinical term "moron," taught the courses.[52] Goddard and the other staff subscribed to — and indeed helped in no small way to develop — the earliest eugenics-based theories about mental deficiency and learning problems.[53]

British Columbia did not have an auxiliary certificate like Ontario. In fact, as late as 1942, Ontario was the only province with a separate qualification for special class work.[54] Lack of formal certification, however, did not stop Vancouver special educators from seeking additional training and preparation related to their work. In the 1910s and 1920s, several of them took summer courses for teachers in mental hygiene and other subjects at the University of California or in psychology at the University of Washington.[55]

It is not surprising that a large female teaching force in special education sought out upgrading. It was more common for women teachers to do this than it was for men, Geraldine Clifford contends. In large numbers, women attended summer school and normal school courses, "read pedagogy texts," and were paying subscribers to teacher publications, she shows.[56]

Some of the twelve special class teachers discussed in this essay also trained in an area outside of teaching that was nevertheless related to instructing disabled children

(see Table 3). Dauphinee was qualified as a nurse as well as a teacher.[57] One of the Toronto special educators, Jean Hampson, was also dually prepared for special class work. She began teaching in Toronto around 1915. Shortly after, she took a hiatus to enroll in the ward aide's course at the University of Toronto. There she was to learn how to do rehabilitation work with hospitalized disabled First World War veterans.[58] She subsequently came back to the classroom to teach orthopaedic classes for children with physical disabilities at Wellesley Public School. War again interrupted her career, and she spent the years 1941 to 1945 at the Astley-Ainslie Hospital in Scotland, where she led an occupational therapist training program. She returned to Wellesley once more, teaching there until taking retirement in 1952 at age fifty-eight.[59]

Just because they were educated by university and other experts in mental deficiency and other disability-related fields does not mean that special class teachers unquestioningly accepted everything their instructors told them. (Though, to be sure, they shared many of their views.) When we look more closely at teachers' knowledge and attitudes around disability, distinctions start to emerge between them and other professionals in these two respects. As Barry Franklin and Jane Read have demonstrated with case studies of special education in Minneapolis and London (United Kingdom) respectively, teachers working in special programs held—and indeed acted upon—a variety of beliefs about the best way to instruct struggling students.[60] Along with their range of views, special educators arrived at those views in a different manner than other professionals involved in working with these youngsters. Typically teachers had much more day-to-day and face-to-face experience instructing and assessing disabled children than people who saw them only occasionally and did not try to teach them anything—such as physicians and psychologists, asylum directors, and even social workers and nurses. Teaching is a different type of relationship, an undertaking that it could be argued gives educators their own unique form of insight and expertise on the nature of learning difficulties. Much like the British Columbia educators Edith Lucas, Mary Ashworth, and Amy Brown that Helen Raptis has presented to historical audiences, special education teachers in Toronto and Vancouver had the opportunity and knowledge-base to form opinions that were different from those of the educational specialists or school officials they worked more closely with.[61] Special class teachers were not afraid to act on their views, quietly behind the scenes or by expressing them more loudly.

Carruthers is a perfect specimen of the vocal approach. Like many other teachers, she accepted some of the dominant view on "feeblemindedness" in the 1910s.[62] She supported a plan that Toronto eugenicists were popularizing at this time to institutionalize "feebleminded" adults permanently in a farm colony, and her understanding of mental deficiency, probably acquired initially in her studies at Vineland, stressed the firm line between "backwardness" and "mental defectiveness" that most specialists of the day believed in.[63] However, she disagreed noisily with prevailing expert theories about the learning potential of "feebleminded" children.[64] We know this from newspaper coverage of a controversy in 1912 that involved Carruthers, the chairman of the Toronto Board of Education Fred Conboy, and W. E. Struthers, who was a physician and head of the school medical inspection service. Conboy initiated the

dispute. At a convention on "feeblemindedness," he made remarks that were quoted in two city newspapers. According to the *Globe*, Conboy stated that "fifty percent of the [mental] defectives" attending special classes "cannot be educated."[65] He apparently subscribed to the prevailing view of eugenicists at the time that "feeblemindedness" was inherited and innate, intractable against any educational effort to remove it.[66] Carruthers — unlike Conboy — actually worked on a day-to-day basis with these very children and had a different perspective. In a letter the *Toronto Star* published, she shot back at Conboy and his "gratuitous statement" that her pupils were mostly unteachable. "From my experience of almost two years with these children, I have no hesitation in stating that they are all unmistakably educable."[67] There were only two exceptions, she said. There was one child that might have been educable, but that had not stayed in her class long enough for her to find out for sure; the other child was not teachable because "insanity had supervened upon mental defect." Carruthers defended her pupils, deploring the newspaper for reporting "so cruelly and with such little truth upon the children of the special classes, whose gentle manners and loving hearts are worth tons of intellect."[68]

Special education teachers who earned credentials and pursued other forms of professional engagement could capitalize on both to improve their practice as educators. They could also contribute through that engagement to the refinement of special education pedagogy, which teachers developed at least partly in isolation from the influence of other experts — though, as we have seen, teachers' ideas were never categorically different than theirs.[69] Teachers grew the theory and practice of special education from the bottom up, often leaning on their direct and lengthy involvement actually teaching special classes. Hampson accumulated educational experiences (the ward aide's course) and credentials (manual training and auxiliary certification). She developed an approach to treating physically disabled children in the schools that other special educators were ultimately encouraged to adopt. She contributed to the section on orthopaedic class work in the Ontario Department of Education's 1933 manual, *Training Handicapped Children*. The section she worked on describes the program of studies for these classes and the equipment necessary to accommodate physically disabled pupils. It lists physical exercises that teachers could have these children do to improve movement and speech.[70]

Hampson's colleague in Toronto, Bessie Bowling, demonstrated a similar long-term commitment to her craft. One of the first women to teach special classes for so-called "backward" children in that city, Bowling later became a lip-reading teacher for public school children who were deaf, hard-of-hearing, or had speech difficulties. She published two articles on treating speech defects. One appeared in the published proceedings of the Ontario Educational Association in 1929.[71] The other was published in 1941 in *The School*, a periodical for teachers.[72]

Special education teachers who were members of the Ontario Educational Association put out their own magazine. They started it as *The Bulletin* in 1924. It became *Special Class Teacher* sometime in the mid-1930s.[73] The publication was a forum for special educators to share teaching practices and to discuss more theoretical issues regarding disabled children's education as well.

In Vancouver, Dauphinee's work building special education had more in common with that of other mental deficiency experts than most educators (in either Toronto or Vancouver). She consistently encouraged the application of eugenics to special education policy, urging school systems to test and place the "feebleminded" in special classes as a first step towards life-long custodial institutional segregation that would prevent them from having children. When Vancouver's public school board promoted her from special class teacher to supervisor of special classes, she gained a golden opportunity to make policy change. Gerald Thomson even argues that Dauphinee had a significant part to play in the lobby that succeeded in British Columbia enacting a eugenic sexual sterilization law in 1933. She also refined Vancouver's special education curriculum.[74]

Classroom experience, as well as education and training, was an ingredient in the particular expertise that Dauphinee, Bowling, Hampson, or Carruthers displayed. Special education teachers in Vancouver and Toronto appear to have been no less experienced than other educators; it is possible even that they had more experience than was typical at the time. This made them stand out as well. School systems seemed reluctant to use raw rookies in special classes. What is more, many special class teachers appear to have migrated to that work after teaching graded classes first for a few years (see Table 4).

In Ontario, regulations may have played a part in keeping greenhorns out. By 1928, to lead a special education class in the province, a teacher was required to be a normal school graduate, have three years' teaching experience, and have taken the five-week summer course for the auxiliary teaching certificate. She or he needed an inspector's recommendation of suitability as well.[75] However, the department does not seem to have always been able to enforce its auxiliary education regulations because teachers like Bowling taught special education without having complete certification. Nevertheless, before rules even existed, the Toronto board showed a preference for assigning experienced teachers to its special classes. To teach the very first classes the board opened in 1910, officials chose Carruthers, who had already been teaching in the city's schools for nearly two decades. The other woman selected, Florence Sims, was also an experienced teacher. Bowling, assigned to a class for so-called "backward" children in 1912, had eleven years under her belt at this time.[76] Dauphinee was thirty-five years old when she started in Vancouver's first special class.[77]

More than attracting experienced educators, special education also retained teachers. A number of the special educators discussed stayed in their line of work for years (see Table 4). Hampson did twenty-six years in special education. Her colleague at Wellesley, John McCallum Henderson, started teaching an orthopaedic class in 1936–37 and stayed in that branch of special education until 1958–59, his final year in the profession. In 1953, he even moved with the orthopaedic program from Wellesley to the brand new Sunny View School that the Toronto board opened for physically disabled children that year. Bowling's tenure in special education came in two parts. From 1912 to about 1926, she initially taught special education classes for "backward" children, and then later, classes for so-called "subnormal" children (a different group) at Queen Alexandra Public School.[78] In 1926, she became one of

the Toronto board's itinerant lip-reading teachers. She would close out her career in that position, leaving the system at age sixty-two in 1940. Dauphinee's entire career in Vancouver was in special education, first as a teacher, then as supervisor of special classes. Annabel Guest, another of the Vancouver teachers, did twelve of her fourteen years' teaching in the special education classroom. Like Guest, Katherine Buckerfield, also of Vancouver, spent most of her career in special education. Both women, once they entered this line of work, did not leave it until their careers ended. Buckerfield's came to a close in 1937 when she married for the first time at age forty.[79] Guest left teaching at age fifty in 1934, after sixteen years in special class work.

Rookie teachers were sometimes assigned to special education classrooms too though. In 1923, Mary Wallace Adam, one of the selected Vancouver teachers, was still in her first year of teaching and still a teenager. She was working as a substitute teacher at Henry Hudson Public School in the fall. In December, she was assigned a special class at Dawson Public School. Adam "dropped special class work" quickly.[80] For September 1924, she had a regular grade assignment at Simon Fraser Public School. She never returned to special education in a career in Vancouver that continued for another five years before she married and left the district's employ.

It was not just rookies like Adam who dropped out of special education teaching after a short time. Jeannette McLeod, one of the selected teachers for Toronto, taught a special class for just one year, 1921–22, at Hughes Public School. Because she received her auxiliary certificate two years after this, in 1924, it could be inferred she intended to return. But she appears also to have been pursuing a leadership position and may have given up special education for that. (Or she may have entered special class teaching in the first place to upgrade her experience and credentials in hopes of getting an assistant principal or principal's job.) In 1922–23, McLeod, by this time about forty years old though only a decade into her teaching career in Toronto, served as the assistant principal at Hughes. The next year she went back to teaching senior fourth (equivalent to grade 8 in twenty-first-century terms). After that she was again assistant principal at Hughes, until she left the Toronto public system in 1929 and could not be followed any further in the records.

Using experienced teachers or teachers who stayed a long time in special education — such as Bowling (twenty-seven years in special classes), Guest (twelve years), or Henderson (twenty-three years), to name just three — likely improved instructional quality in early special education. All other things being equal, teachers improve by staying on the job past the novice stage and by staying in the same teaching assignment for at least a few years, long enough to learn what works best at a particular school or with a particular group.[81] A saying goes "familiarity breeds contempt." Yet for rank-and-file teachers who stuck with special education for a long time, familiarity fostered experience; we could even imagine that it brought affection and devotion. Early special education teachers, the likes of which we have looked at, could have left to return to graded classrooms. They could have taken special credentials in other areas. Yet many of them trained to be special educators and many remained in special classrooms for the long term. For these teachers, special education may have been a calling.

Able Teachers and Disabled Students

Rousmaniere observes that histories of teacher identity often overlook disability. This is despite "cultural concepts of ability and disability [that] have shaped all educators' occupational identity and experience over time."[82] Teachers' work could in its very nature be disabling, and ironically, school boards discriminated against disabled teachers, though historians have not often acknowledged these facts. Rethinking her own work on the American teacher and union leader, Margaret Haley, for example, Rousmaniere writes that Haley's "physical ailments… were *caused* by her work: an aching tooth, a hurt foot, broken bones from a car accident, and innumerable colds — including a six-month illness that brought her close to death — that was what happened to a woman who worked obsessively seven days a week, traveling around the country lobbying for her political cause."[83] Employers and teacher training institutes screened out disabled applicants. Rousmaniere unearthed examples of teacher job-seekers in New York City from the 1930s to the 1970s who were not hired because they were physically disabled, partially blind or had hearing loss, had a speech difficulty, a psychiatric illness (a justification also used not to hire teachers suspected of homosexuality), or were simply too short, too thin, or too heavy.[84] Kristen Chmielewski shows how, in the same city in the 1920s to 1940s, one board of education psychiatrist used disability as a justification to remove more than 100 public school teachers from their jobs. He deemed them "unfit" to teach because they were disabled, which he said defined them as incompetent, costly, and even dangerous. "'A sick teacher'… 'makes a sick child'" was his refrain.[85]

There is no known study of systematic discrimination against disabled teachers by Canadian school systems. However, there is evidence that some discrimination occurred. To gain admission to a teacher training school, according to the 1915 Ontario Normal School manual, *School Management*, "a candidate has to present a certificate of health." Teachers were also expected to keep healthy if they wanted to keep their jobs.[86] Other parts of the Ontario manual made oblique, but nevertheless suggestive, mention of ability and disability. For example, this eugenics-tinged statement refers to an ideal teacher's mental capacity: "As the race is gradually progressing to higher intellectual levels, the standard of attainment for teachers must also be advanced to keep pace with it."[87] Provincial authorities in Ontario banned deaf people from training as teachers in 1919, a prohibition that continued beyond the end of the period this article covers.[88] For older female teachers, the birds-of-passage view that painted an image of the ideal female teacher as young reinforced negative stereotypes that veteran women educators were "psychologically and socially undesirable" and was used by some school systems to justify delaying implementing pensions for them.[89]

None of the twelve special education teachers discussed in this essay were disabled; or if they were, their disabilities went unrecorded where we might expect to find them written down — in the census and vital records. Despite official restrictions, there were teachers with disabilities in public schools, educators like Haley who became disabled at some point during their careers and because of their work.[90] There were special education teachers among them. MacTavish, the orthopaedic class teacher at

Wellesley who protested about her lack of preparation time, also wrote the city's chief inspector about the effects of the demanding job of teaching special education classes. She was eventually placed on doctor-ordered rest, exhibiting signs of having what we today might call "burn out." The strain was caused by her giving up her holidays for two years in order to earn the auxiliary class certificate, a separate qualification for orthopaedic class teaching, and a High School Assistants' Certificate that she needed to teach the school's fifth form classes (equivalent to grades 9 and 10 today).[91]

Special educators do not appear to have had higher incidences of disability than regular educators. By this same token, these educators stood apart. In this case, it was because of their students, who *were* disabled. This mattered because there is some suggestion that disabled students who did have teachers with disabilities found comfort in that fact. The Canadian children's author, Jean Little, who had strabismus (and for a time attended sight-saving special education classes), was taught in graded classes by two disabled teachers. Just being instructed by this man and woman was reassuring, she would write in her memoir, *Little by Little*. "As I listened to [Miss Marr] passing out books behind me, I could hear her limping, first a quick step, then a slow one. The sound made me feel a little less lonely. My teacher would understand how it felt to be the only cross-eyed girl in Victory School." Both Marr, and Little's other disabled teacher, Mr. Johnston, displayed insight into how school, and social situations in particular, challenged her—though not much these two educators did could help Little feel welcomed by the other children, who teased her severely.[92] Little would later apply to a teachers' college in Ontario around 1960, which rejected her when she failed the medical examination. She took teacher training in Utah instead, in a course for special educators. To gain admission to it, she still had to pledge never to apply for a job in the state.[93]

Conclusion

The teachers employed early on in Vancouver and Toronto's special education classrooms were exceptional in several senses. They stood apart by being nearly all women, even in a teacher work force crowded with females. There were practically no men in special class work in either city during the first thirty-five years of special classes. Special educators were exceptional as well because the teachers who did this work were often uniquely trained, possessing—as most of the Toronto teachers discussed did—an auxiliary certificate, or failing that, perhaps university course work in psychology or mental hygiene like some of the Vancouver educators had. More than one special educator stayed for many years in special classes, with their long tenures likely enhancing the quality of instruction. Special class teachers built special education from the bottom up, developing it in ways that converged with and diverged from what the other experts of the day envisioned for the field. The unique conditions of teaching special classes lent themselves to special educators developing their own ideas and expertise around the truly knotty problems of childhood learning difficulties and disabilities. Yet teachers of disabled children seldom shared their pupils' experience of being disabled.

Exceptional early special educators helped to further distinguish special education as the unique area of schooling that it would increasingly become—and that it remains today. Yet there are many things we still do not know about early special educators' opinions, motivations for taking up this work, feelings about it, and their classroom practices. These topics await further inquiry, using diaries and memoirs, or interviews, and perhaps inspector's reports on individual teachers.[94] These sources should be able to tell us more about special class teachers and special education's separate historical development and its challenging legacy.

Notes

I wish to thank the University of British Columbia Hampton Fund Research Grant for financial support for research for this article, and Funke Aladejebi, Claudia Díaz-Díaz, Fahd Husain, and Joanna Pearce, for research assistance.

1 In looking at special education teachers in the public elementary schools, there are a few special educators this study leaves out. Teachers in Toronto's three "junior vocational schools," which were in part designed for thirteen- to sixteen-year-old special class pupils, are not considered. Nor are teachers in Vancouver's "pre-vocational" classes for a similar group of youngsters. See Jason Ellis, *A Class by Themselves?: Children, Youth, and Special Education in a North American City— Toronto, 1910–45* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018); Gerald Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst These Unfortunates': A Historical Inquiry into the Influence of Eugenics, Educational Efficiency as Well as Mental Hygiene upon the Vancouver School System and Its Special Classes, 1910–1969" (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1999). Teachers in Roman Catholic separate schools in Toronto, some of which had special education classes after 1923, are not examined. See R. T. Dixon, *We Remember, We Believe: A History of Toronto's Catholic Separate School Boards, 1841 to 1997* (Toronto: Toronto Catholic District School Board, 2007), 132–3, 147. There were no separate schools in British Columbia. However, there were special education teachers who worked in British Columbia's Woodlands provincial custodial institution. They had contemporaries who taught in Ontario's provincial custodial institution at Orillia. Neither of these groups of teachers is considered in this essay. See Val Adolph, *In the Context of Its Time: A History of Woodlands* (Victoria: BC Ministry of Social Services, 1996) and Harvey G. Simmons, *From Asylum to Welfare* (Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation, 1982). Nor do I look at the small number of teachers who operated private schools for disabled children. See Jason Ellis, "Early Educational Exclusion: 'Idiotic' and 'Imbecilic' Children, Their Families, and the Toronto Public School System, 1914–50," *Canadian Historical Review* 98, no. 3 (Fall 2017): 497.

2 "F. Special Classes," in *White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. Preliminary Committee Reports* (New York: The Century Co, 1930), 314–43.

3 Ellis, *A Class by Themselves;* Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst These Unfortunates'"; F. Henry Johnson, *A History of Public Education in British Columbia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1964), 168–70.

4 See also Jean Barman, "British Columbia's Pioneer Teachers," in *Children, Teachers and Schools in the History of British Columbia*, ed. Jean Barman and Mona Gleason, 2nd ed. (Calgary: Detselig, 2003), 171–190; and Geraldine Jonçich Clifford, "The Historical Recovery of Edyth Astrid Ferris," *Educational Researcher* 17, no. 4 (May 1988): 4–7.

5 This included one that I knew was exceptional enough for another historian to have written an article profiling her. See Gerald Thomson, "'Through no Fault of their Own': Josephine Dauphinee and the 'Subnormal' Pupils of the Vancouver School System, 1911–1941," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 18, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 51–73.

6 Note that "middling" and "middle class" are not the same thing. Gidney and Millar avoid the label "middle class" for teachers prior to 1940, contending that it fails to capture accurately typical values and experiences at this point in history. R. D. Gidney and W. P. J. Millar, *How Schools Worked: Public Education in English Canada, 1900–1940* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012), 140–2.

7 The reader should make no assumptions about the rest of the country based on Ontario and British Columbia. Gidney and Millar observe that the Prairies were quite another matter, with growing numbers of teachers who had origins other than British or French, *How Schools Worked*, 139–40. See also, on teachers' social origins, Eric W. Sager, "Women Teachers in Canada, 1881–1901: Revisiting the 'Feminization' of an Occupation," *Canadian Historical Review* 88, no. 2 (June 2007): 210–12; and Cecilia Reynolds, "Hegemony and Hierarchy: Becoming a Teacher in Toronto, 1930–1980," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 100.

8 By around the outset of this period (1911), over three-quarters of teachers in the employ of Toronto public schools held a second-class certificate. Ontario Legislative Assembly, *Public and Separate Schools and Teachers in the Province of Ontario*, *June 1911* (Toronto: L. K. Cameron, 1911), 275. In Vancouver, eighty-six first-class certificated teachers in the public and high schools outnumbered seventy-one second-class certificated ones. But this is counting both public *and* high school teachers, whose ranks the Vancouver School Board's report did not disaggregate. In addition to the first- and second-class certificates noted above, there were ninety-four university arts and science graduates who held no certificate (likely high school teachers, who in British Columbia until 1920, if they were university arts and science graduates, did not require any professional teacher education); eight "academic" certificate holders (university graduates with professional training); three third-class certificate holders; and one teacher on a temporary certificate. Board of School Trustees, *Eighth Annual Report* (Vancouver: Board of School Trustees, 1911), 34. For more about teachers' educational and professional qualifications in Ontario and British Columbia, how teachers obtained them, and what the qualifications meant at different points in time, consult Robert M. Stamp, *The Schools of Ontario, 1876–1976* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 15–16, 76–78; Albert Fiorino, *Teacher Education in Ontario: A History, 1843–1976*, Information Bulletin No. 4 (Toronto: Commission on Declining School Enrolments, 1978), 7–52; Johnson, *A History of Public Education in British Columbia*, 71–80, 209–17; Nancy M. Sheehan and J. Donald Wilson, "From Normal School to the University to the College of Teachers: Teacher Education in British Columbia in the Twentieth Century," in *Children, Teachers and Schools in the History of British Columbia*, eds. Barman, Sutherland, Wilson, 307–21. For an overview that also very helpfully clarifies terms that have become obscure with the passage of time, such as "junior matriculation," see Gidney and Millar, *How Schools Worked*, 124–31.

9 See Marta Danylewycz and Alison Prentice, "Teachers, Gender, and Bureaucratizing School Systems in Nineteenth Century Montreal and Toronto," *History of Education Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 75–100; Marta Danylewycz, Beth Light, and Alison Prentice, "The Evolution of the Sexual Division of Labour in Teaching: A Nineteenth-Century Ontario and Quebec Case Study," *Histoire sociale/Social History* 16, no. 31 (mai-May 1983): 81–109; Jean Barman, "Birds of Passage or Early Professionals? Teachers in Late Nineteenth-Century British Columbia," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 17–36; Susan Gelman,

"'The "Feminization" of the High Schools'? Women Secondary School Teachers in Toronto: 1871–1930," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 119–48; Andrée Dufour, "Les institutrices rurales du Bas-Canada: incompétentes et inexpérimentées?," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 51, no. 4 (printemps 1998): 2–7; Gidney and Millar, *How Schools Worked*, 142–50. See also Sager, "Women Teachers in Canada, 1881–1901," 212–13, for a slightly different interpretation of the significance of feminization in particular.

10 Ontario, *Public and Separate Schools and Teachers in the Province of Ontario*, *June 1911*, 275. For Toronto figures in other years, see Reynolds, "Hegemony and Hierarchy," 112.

11 The smaller spread on the Pacific coast is explained by the Vancouver statistics, which counted both elementary and high school teachers (the latter typically more male), and by the less pronounced feminization of teaching in British Columbia than in other places historians have examined. Vancouver Board of School Trustees, *Annual Report* (1911), 34; and Barman, "Birds of Passage or Early Professionals?," 20–2.

12 In Toronto, the figure was 10 men out of a total of 252 special education teachers for the years 1910–45; in Vancouver during the same period, it was 4 out of 89. For Toronto, this is not counting "occasionals," whom the handbooks that are the source for teachers' names and professional assignments (see Appendix 1) do not name and whose gender I cannot therefore hope to ascertain. There are also a tiny number of teachers' whose gender I cannot determine because they are either not identified in the records by a title such as "Mr.," "Miss," because only their first initial is given, or because their given name could be either a man's or a woman's, like "Leslie."

13 Kate Rousmaniere, *City Teachers: Teaching and School Reform in Historical Perspective* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997), 41. See also Danylewycz, Light, and Prentice, "The Evolution of the Sexual Division of Labour in Teaching," 82–7; and Rebecca Priegert Coulter, "'Girls Just Want to Have Fun': Women Teachers and the Pleasures of the Profession," in *History Is Hers*: *Women Educators in Twentieth Century Ontario,* ed. Rebecca Priegert Coulter and Helen Harper (Calgary: Detselig, 2005), 211–29.

14 On split images of disabled children, see Nic Clarke, "Sacred Daemons: Exploring British Columbian Society's Perceptions of 'Mentally Deficient' Children, 1870–1930," *BC Studies* 144 (Winter 2004–5): 61–89; and Laurie Block, "Cure and the Contempt of Goodwill: Reason and Feeling in Disability Narratives, 1850–1950," in *Healing the World's Children: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Child Health in the Twentieth Century,* ed. Cynthia Comacchio, Janet Golden, and George Weisz (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008), 125–57.

15 Block, "Cure and the Contempt of Goodwill," 127–32.

16 Coulter, "'Girls Just Want to Have Fun'," 214.

17 Kari Dehli, "'They Rule by Sympathy': The Feminization of Pedagogy,' *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 2 (1994): 199–200; Thomas Fleming, *The Principal's Office and Beyond.* Vol. 1. *Public School Leadership in British Columbia, 1849–1960* (Calgary: Detselig, 2010), 137–226.

18 Rousmaniere, *City Teachers*, 41.

19 Letter from D. D. Moshier to S. B. Sinclair, January 17, 1928, with enclosed letter from R. W. Adolph to D. D. Moshier, January 12, 1928. See also, Memorandum Re Qualified Teachers for Toronto Auxiliary Classes, January 10, 1928, 1. Ontario Government Records, Series RG 2-59, Auxiliary Education Service Correspondence Files, Box 1, "Toronto 1924–30," Archives of Ontario (hereafter, AO).

20 Letter from D. D. Moshier to H. E. Amoss, February 2, 1932. Ontario Government Records, Series RG 2-59, Auxiliary Education Service Correspondence Files, Box 1, "Toronto 1931–42." AO.

21 See especially Sager, "Women Teachers in Canada, 1881–1901," 201–36, and Patrick J. Harrigan, "The Development of a Corps of Public School Teachers in Canada, 1870–1980," *History of Education Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 490–3.
22 David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), 185–6.
23 See also Amy Samson, "Eugenics in the Community: Gendered Professions and Eugenic Sterilization in Alberta, 1928–1972," *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 31, no. 1 (2014): 144–6.
24 Dauphinee entry, Teachers' record book (1904–24), Series 330, Payrolls, 1895–1955. Vancouver School Board Fonds, City of Vancouver Archives (hereafter, CVA).
25 Thomson, "'Through No Fault of Their Own'," 63–73.
26 Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst these Unfortunates'," 209–52.
27 Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst these Unfortuantes," 178.
28 Ellis, *A Class by Themselves?,* 128.
29 Gelman, "'The "Feminization" of the High Schools'," 135–6; Ellis, *A Class by Themselves*?, 108. See also Douglas C. Baynton, *Forbidden Signs: American Culture and the Campaign Against Sign Language* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 58, on the feminization of oralist instruction for deaf pupils in American public school systems.
30 Letter from D. D. Moshier to S. B. Sinclair, January 17, 1928, with enclosed letter from R. W. Adolph to D. D. Moshier, January 12, 1928, AO.
31 Fleming, *The Principal's Office and Beyond,* 197–8.
32 Reynolds, "Hegemony and Hierarchy," 111.
33 Memorandum re Securing of Qualified Teachers for Toronto Auxiliary Training Classes, January 11, 1928, 1, AO.
34 Dauphinee entry, Teachers' register (1900–12). Series 330, Payrolls, 1895–1955. Vancouver School Board Fonds, CVA. The register does not give her base salary for 1911.
35 Tingley entry, Teachers' record book (1909–24), CVA.
36 Memorandum re Qualified Teachers for Toronto Auxiliary Classes, January 10, 1928, 1, AO.
37 On urban teacher salary differences by gender, see R. D. Gidney and W. P. J. Millar, "The Salaries of Teachers in English Canada, 1900–1940: A Reappraisal," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 22, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 14–15.
38 Rousmaniere, *City Teachers*, 40–1; Dehli, "'They Rule by Sympathy'," 195–216; Gidney and Millar, "The Salaries of Teachers in English Canada, 1900–1940," 14–18.
39 Rousmaniere, *City Teachers*, 40.
40 Barman, "Birds of Passage or Early Professionals?," 17–18.
41 See Barman, 21–3; Marta Danylewycz, "Sexes et classes sociales dans l'enseignement: le cas de Montréal à la fin du 19e siècle," Paul-André Linteau, trans., in *Maîtresses de maison, maîtresses d'école: Femmes, familles et éducation dans l'histoire du Québec,* ed. Nadia Fahmy-Eid and Micheline Dumont (Montreal: Boréal Express, 1983), 106–9; Gidney and Millar, *How Schools Worked*, 142–50.
42 Danylewycz and Prentice, "Teachers, Gender, and Bureaucratizing School Systems in Nineteenth Century Montreal and Toronto," 84–91; Danylewycz, Light, and Prentice, "The Evolution of the Sexual Division of Labour in Teaching," 91; Marta Danylewycz, "Sexes et classes sociales dans l'enseignement," 92–7; Dufour, "Les institutrices rurales du Bas-Canada," 13–15; Reynolds, "Hegemony and Hierarchy," 103–111; Myra H. Strober and David Tyack, "Why Do Women Teach and Men Manage?: A Report on Research in Schools," *Signs* 5, no. 3 (Spring 1980): 494–503.
43 *Toronto Board of Education Annual Report 1929* (Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, 1929), 235; see also Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst These Unfortunates'," for

special education class size, though he shows the average in special classes was higher both the year before and the year after this one, 396–7; *Twenty-Sixth Annual Report of Vancouver City Schools with Reports on the Schools of South Vancouver and Point Grey for the Year Ending December 31st, 1928* (Vancouver: Board of School Trustees, 1928), 135.

44 *Toronto Board of Education Annual Report 1928* (Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, 1928), 408. The cost per pupil of Vancouver's regular graded public school classes was $65, in an analogous year. The public school board calculated the per-pupil cost for "special classes" at a surprising $35 or half the cost of regular classes. This figure is suspect. It excludes various maintenance costs and inexplicably, given what we know about class sizes, sets the teacher salary cost at just $25 per pupil, versus $45 on average in the public schools. Board of School Trustees, *Twenty-Sixth Annual Report of Vancouver City Schools*, 160–1.

45 Ontario Legislative Assembly, *Public and Separate Schools and Teachers in the Province of Ontario*, *November 1919* (Toronto: A. T. Wilgress, 1919), 21.

46 It was 13 per cent in 1929 and 17 per cent in 1939. Ontario Legislative Assembly, *Public and Separate Schools and Teachers in the Province of Ontario*, *November 1929* (Toronto: King's Printer, 1929), 34; Ontario Legislative Assembly, *Public and Separate Schools and Teachers in the Province of Ontario*, *November 1939* (Toronto: T. E. Bowman, 1939), 45.

47 Ontario Legislative Assembly, *Report of the Minister of Education, Province of Ontario, for the Year 1929* (Toronto: Herbert H. Ball, 1930), 33; Gerald T. Hackett, "The History of Public Education for Mentally Retarded Children in the Province of Ontario, 1867–1964," (EdD. diss., University of Toronto, 1969), 395.

48 *Regulations for Auxiliary Classes*, Ontario Department of Education Circular No. 22 (Toronto: King's Printer, 1917), 3. Ontario Historical Education Collection (hereafter OHEC), Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) Library. The department does not, however, appear to have always enforced requirements and the minister could issue a temporary certificate to cover teachers who did not meet them.

49 *Toronto Board of Education Annual Report 1920* (Toronto: Board of Education, 1920), 15. There may have been a brief interruption in Bowling's special education teaching service in the mid-1920s, before she switched from an auxiliary class at Queen Alexandra to working as an itinerant lip-reading teacher. I am missing a handbook entry for her for one year in the 1920s.

50 *Toronto Board of Education Minutes 1911* (Toronto: Board of Education, 1911), Appendix No. 42, Management Report No. 10, May 25, 1911, adopted June 1, 1911, 399.

51 Seymour B. Sarason and John Doris, *Educational Handicap, Public Policy, and Social History: A Broadened Perspective on Mental Retardation* (New York: The Free Press, 1979), 316–19.

52 E. R. Johnstone, "The Summer School for Teachers of Backward Children," *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics* 13 (1908): 122–30; James W. Trent, Jr., *Inventing the Feeble Mind: A History of Mental Retardation in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 156–61.

53 Trent, Jr., *Inventing the Feeble Mind*, 166–74.

54 David H. Russell and Fred T. Tyler, "Special Education in Canada," *The School* 30, no. 10 (Elementary Edition) (June 1942): 887. In the United States, by contrast, special education certification was common. Robert L. Osgood, *The History of Special Education: A Struggle for Equality in American Public Schools* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008), 52.

55 Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst These Unfortunates'," 169–70, 235–67.

56 Geraldine J. Clifford, *Those Good Gertrudes: A Social History of Women Teachers in America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 187–8. See also Gidney and Millar, *How Schools Worked*, 129.
57 Thomson, "'Through no Fault of Their Own'," 57–61.
58 Judith Friedland, *Restoring the Spirit: The Beginnings of Occupational Therapy in Canada, 1890–1930* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011), 144.
59 See also M. Thelma Cardwell, "Life Memberships," *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy* 32, no. 4 (Winter 1965): 149–50.
60 Barry M. Franklin, *From 'Backwardness' to 'At-Risk': Childhood Learning Difficulties and the Contradictions of School Reform* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1994), 105–138; Jane Read, "Fit for What? Special Education in London, 1890–1914," *History of Education* 33, no. 3 (May 2014): 283–98.
61 Helen Raptis, "A Tale of Two Women: Edith Lucas, Mary Ashworth, and the Changing Nature of Educational Policy in British Columbia, 1937–1977," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 17, no. 2 (Fall 2005): 293–319; and Helen Raptis, "Bending the Bars of the Identity Cage: Amy Brown and the Development of Teacher Identity in British Columbia," *History of Education* 39, no. 2 (March 2010): 199–218.
62 See Mona Gleason, *Small Matters: Canadian Children in Sickness and Health* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press), 19.
63 Ellis, *A Class by Themselves?*, 20–9.
64 Lillian Carruthers, "Children in Special Classes," *Toronto Daily Star,* March 29, 1912, 5. See also Lillian Carruthers, "How Numerous Are Subnormal Pupils?" *Toronto Daily Star,* November 9, 1912, 8.
65 "To Safeguard Those Who Have Weak Minds," *Toronto Daily Star,* March 27, 1912, 10; "Home Proposed for Feeble-Minded," *Globe,* March 27, 1912, 9. The *Daily Star* reporter, unlike the reporter from the *Globe* who had quoted Conboy directly, paraphrased the chairman's remark as these children "could not be instructed in any way."
66 Ellis, *A Class by Themselves?*, 18–19.
67 Carruthers, "Children in Special Classes," *Toronto Daily Star,* March 29, 1912, 5.
68 Carruthers.
69 Thomson, "'Through No Fault of Their Own'," 52–3.
70 Harry Amoss and L. Helen DeLaporte, *Training Handicapped Children* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1933), 216–20. See also Jean Hampson, "Occupational Treatment at Crippled Children's School, Toronto," *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation* 12, no. 1 (1933): 55–8.
71 E. Bowling, "Some Causes and the Re-education of Speech Defects," in *Proceedings of the Sixty-Eighth Annual Convention of the Ontario Educational Association* (Toronto: Ontario Educational Association, 1929), 93–8.
72 Elizabeth Bowling, "The Stutterer," *The School* 29, no. 10 (Elementary Edition) (June 1941): 934–6. On *The School*, see Theodore Michael Christou, *Progressive Education: Revisioning and Reframing Ontario's Public Schools, 1919–1942* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 30–1.
73 See *The Bulletin* 10, no. 3 (March 1934), a "tenth anniversary number." To my knowledge, this publication is only available at the OISE Library in Toronto. I am grateful to Kathy Sassonow for locating it.
74 Thomson, "'Through No Fault of Their Own'," 68–71.
75 Memorandum re Qualified Teachers for Toronto Auxiliary Classes, January 10, 1928, 1, AO.
76 Ellis, *A Class by Themselves?*, 22 and Table 3.
77 Thomson, "'Through No Fault of Their Own'," 57.

78 See Ellis, *A Class by Themselves?*, 26–8 on the differences.
79 Her husband, I would discover only when I began making linkages, was the UBC historian Seaman Morley Scott. Sadly, Buckerfield passed away very shortly after she married.
80 Adam entry. Teachers' record book (1909–24), CVA.
81 Gidney and Millar, *How Schools Worked*, 134–5; Jennifer King Rice, *Teacher Quality: Understanding the Effectiveness of Teacher Attributes* (Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 2003), 15–19.
82 Studies of deaf teachers notwithstanding, she notes. Kate Rousmaniere, "Those Who Can't, Teach: The Disabling History of American Educators," *History of Education Quarterly* 53, no. 1 (February 2013): 90–6.
83 Rousmaniere, "Those Who Can't, Teach", 95.
84 Rousmaniere, "Those Who Can't, Teach", 98.
85 Kristen Chmielewski, "'Hopelessly Insane, Some Almost Maniacs': New York City's War on 'Unfit' Teachers," *Paedagogica Historica* 54, no. 1 (2018): 169–83.
86 Ontario, *School Management* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1915), 65–6. Anecdotally, my father and one of my aunts — both retired schoolteachers — remember a young man from their Ontario hometown who in the late 1950s or early 1960s was prevented from registering at a teachers' college in Ontario because the college said he was too overweight. When he lost the weight, the college let him in. See also Jean Little, *Little by Little: A Writer's Education* (Markham, ON: Viking Kestrel, 1987), 229–3, for her anecdote (also discussed later in this article) of an Ontario teacher's college turning down her application for admission on health grounds.
87 Ontario, *School Management*, 65; see also (62) "In order to guide aright the child's activities the teacher must have attained an advanced stage of mental development."
88 Jason A. Ellis, "'*All methods — and wedded to none*': The deaf education methods debate and progressive educational reform in Toronto, Canada, 1922–1945," *Paedagogica Historica* 50, no. 3 (2014): 376.
89 Rousmaniere, "Those Who Can't, Teach," 95.
90 See also Little, *Little by Little*, 79, 95–96; Rousmaniere, "Those Who Can't, Teach"; Sheila L. Cavanagh, "Nervous Narratives: Female Teacher Maladies in the Twentieth Century," in *History Is Hers*, ed. Coulter and Harper, 211–29, and the latest reassessment of the 1928 suicide of British Columbia teacher Mabel Jones while she was said to be "temporarily insane." Alastair Glegg, "Anatomy of a Tragedy: The Assisted Schools of British Columbia and the Death of Mabel Jones," *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'education* 17, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 145–64. This case might be further fruitfully reinterpreted under Rousmaniere's disability framework.
91 Letter from D. D. Moshier to H. E. Amoss, February 2, 1932; H. E. Amoss to D. D. Moshier, February 5, 1932. Ontario Government Records, Series RG 2-59, Auxiliary Education Service Correspondence Files, RG 2-59, Box 1, "Toronto 1931–42," AO.
92 Little, *Little by Little*, 79, 95–98. Strabismus is also known as "cross-eye" and can cause significant visual impairment, as in Little's case.
93 Little, *Little by Little,* 229.
94 See such studies as Jean Barman, *Sojourning Sisters: The Lives and Letters of Jessie and Annie McQueen* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004); Coulter and Harper, eds., *History Is Hers;* and Kristina R. Llewellyn, *Democracy's Angels: The Work of Women Teachers* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012).

Appendix 1: Methodology

Locating Special Education Teachers

Research assistants compiled the names of every person who taught special education in a public elementary school in Toronto or Vancouver between 1910 and 1945. Two hundred and fifty-two teachers from Toronto and eighty-nine from Vancouver met the criteria.

Toronto names were collected from the Board of Education handbooks, a directory updated annually. It contained the name of every teacher in the city's public school system, the school the person worked at, and the grade or class she or he taught.[1]

Vancouver names are from the British Columbia Department of Education annual reports.[2] It listed by name teachers in every provincial school and the grade (or grades) and number of pupils the person taught. This source, however, does not identify special education rooms. But as Gerald Thomson discovered in his research, Vancouver special education classes do show up in the reports as rooms in the city's schools that contained a smaller number of pupils than was typical, pupils who were also usually distributed across multiple grades. With this knowledge, research assistants were asked to assume that small, multi-grade classes appearing in the reports were potentially special education rooms and to record the teachers in charge as special education teachers. Thomson employed this method with some reliability to identify special classes in his study.[3]

The names of teachers of small, multi-grade classes in the provincial annual reports were then verified by matching them against two other sources that do identify special education teachers and classrooms, although not comprehensively. (They cannot be used for this purpose in place of the annual reports.) These sources are three registers of teachers who joined the Vancouver system between 1904 and 1924,[4] and the yearly volumes of the Vancouver School Board's own annual report, which make many passing references to teachers in charge of special classes.[5] Frequent matches between names found in these sources and the names of teachers of small, multi-grade classes in the provincial annual reports leads to the reasonable belief that the list of Vancouver special educators compiled for this study is fairly complete and accurate.

The Twelve Selected Special Education Teachers

Twelve teachers were selected to study in depth for this article. Master files were created where their careers and personal details were gathered through the sources and linkages described below (and see Tables 3–5). It was confirmed, by matching names across provincial and school board sources, that the five Vancouver teachers identified were definitely special educators.

Linkages were created for the twelve individuals among microdata from different digital databases. A linkage means taking a teacher's name from the lists described

above and searching for that name in other records, such as the decennial manuscript census databases at the Library and Archives Canada website and at Ancestry.ca, the vital records databases at FamilySearch.org, and in historical newspaper databases or other similar sources.[6] (See Table 1, Parts 1 and 2, for the complete list of databases and materials consulted.)

Challenges with Digitized Records and Solutions

Most historical records that Canadian archives have digitized were scanned using optical character recognition (OCR) equipment that electronically translates printed or handwritten text into machine-encoded text. The encoded text is machine keyword searchable by the historian through the electronic database that the digitizer built to accompany the records. Computerized scanning errors and human data entry errors can be introduced into the digitized material and especially can occur in the database, impeding the historian's search.[7] The name "Smith," for instance, might have been encoded by the machine as "S*n*ith" or otherwise entered into the database this way.

It was sometimes necessary to manually check scanned images for records when a keyword search failed to turn up "hits" for a name. Since digitized sources consist of both a computerized database and scanned images of original documents, manual checks will work provided that the scanned images were arranged logically to begin with (by surname, for instance), and that the original document was not illegible and un-scannable.

Digitized records do not alleviate two other problems historians can encounter making linkages between different forms of microdata: false positives and name variations. How to be sure that the "Bessie Ross," teacher, the historian was looking for was the same "Bessie Ross" that turned up in other records? The sheer number of digitized records brings scores of search hits for common names like this. False positives were gradually eliminated by matching birth dates, addresses, occupations, first names, middle initials, and last names across different sources. In the 1921 census, there may have been multiple "Bessie Rosses" in Toronto who were teachers. But the handbooks and another source, *Public and Separate Schools and Teachers in the Province of Ontario* (a directory known as the "blue books"), showed that the Bessie Ross in question's middle initial was "M" and that in 1921 she taught at Bolton Public School.

City directories proved vital in solving riddles like this one. They list people by address, name, and occupation. For teachers, the school where the person taught is also often indicated. Might's *Toronto Directory* for 1921 listed a "Bessie M. Ross," teacher at Bolton, residing at 508 Ontario Street. This address was matched against the address the census taker recorded in 1921 for "Bessie Ross." They were the same. The census divulged Ross's age (thirty-five) from which a birth year could be calculated. In turn, Ross's full name (including the initial "M.") and birth year were employed to search computerized vital records databases. (No matching vital records were found in her case, but were located in other ones. See Table 1 in Appendix 2.)

Name variations are a different problem. They raise questions such as: is "Jean Hampson," teacher, the same person as "Martha Jane Hampson," teacher? Much the

same process described above was used to eliminate false positives to confirm that name variations referred to the same individual. The city directory for 1922 confirms that Jean Hampson was Martha Jane Hampson from the 1921 census. Both resided at 38 Wade Avenue. Both were teachers.

A final problem potentially arising from digitized sources is the historian's undue selectiveness. Canadian historians who cite newspapers, Milligan observes, now tend to use only the *Toronto Star* and *Globe/Globe and Mail*. This appears to be because keyword-searchable OCR databases with extensive date coverage exist for both papers, but do not exist for many other dailies.[8] Admittedly for this article, these two Toronto papers were used selectively, as Milligan says historians often do, because they have searchable databases. Vancouver papers were not employed because none for this period has been systematically digitized. Newspaper searches however were added value to other research for the study, not the only source of information — a justified selectiveness.

Notes

1 Toronto Board of Education, *Handbook* (Toronto: various publishers, years).
2 British Columbia Legislative Assembly, *Annual Report of the Public Schools of the Province of British Columbia, Sessional Papers* (Victoria: various years).
3 Gerald Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst These Unfortunates': A Historical Inquiry into the Influence of Eugenics, Educational Efficiency as Well as Mental Hygiene upon the Vancouver School System and Its Special Classes, 1910–1969" (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1999), 369.
4 Teachers' register; Teachers' record book (1904–24); Teachers' record book (1909–24). Series 330, Payrolls, 1895–1955. Vancouver School Board Fonds, City of Vancouver Archives.
5 Board of School Trustees, *Annual Report* (Vancouver: Board of School Trustees, various years from 1903 onwards).
6 See also Peter Baskerville and Kris Inwood, eds., *Lives in Transition: Longitudinal Analysis from Historical Sources*, Carleton Library Series 232 (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015).
7 Ian Milligan, "Illusionary Order: Online Databases, Optical Character Recognition, and Canadian History," *Canadian Historical Review* 94, no. 4 (December 2013): 540–69.
8 Milligan. More than that, not all university library systems carry both subscriptions, including mine, which does not subscribe to the *Star*.

Appendix 2: Tables

Table 1, Part 1. Selected Teachers, Sources

I located information about the twelve selected teachers in these sources. Specific references follow in Table 1, Part 2. Specific Records.

British Columbia Department of Education Annual Reports (digital and print)
British Columbia Legislative Assembly, *Annual Report of the Public Schools of the Province of British Columbia,* Sessional Papers (Victoria: various years), http://circle.ubc.ca/.
Census
Ancestry.com. 1921 *Census of Canada* [database online]. RG 31, Statistics Canada.
Library & Archives Canada. 1881 *Census of Canada* [database online], http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/census/1881/Pages/1881.aspx. RG 31, Statistics Canada.
———. 1891 *Census of Canada* [database online], http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/census/1891/Pages/1891.aspx. RG 31, Statistics Canada.
———. 1901 *Census of Canada* [database online], http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/census/1901/Pages/1901.aspx. RG 31, Statistics Canada.
———. 1911 *Census of Canada* [database online], http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/census/1911/Pages/1911.aspx. RG 31, Statistics Canada.
City Directories
Vancouver Public Library. British Columbia City Directories, 1860–1955 [database online], http://www.vpl.ca/bccd/index.php.
Toronto City Directory (Toronto: Might Directories Limited, various years, 1921–23), https://archive.org/.
Miscellaneous Sources (digital)
Torontonensis 1953 (Toronto: University of Toronto Students' Administrative Council, 1953). [John McCallum Henderson, p. 405.], https://archive.org/.
https://www.findagrave.com, Alfred P. Tingley, #154698258.
Miscellaneous Sources (print)
City of Vancouver Archives. Vancouver School Board Fonds, Series 330, Payrolls, 1895–1955. Teachers' register.
———. Teachers' record book (1904–24).
———. Teachers' record book (1909–24).
UBC Rare Books and Special Collections. S. Morley Scott Papers (1896–1982), Box 9-7. Declaration of Intention, US Department of Labor, Immigration and Naturalization Service. [Katherine Elizabeth Buckerfield, date of death estimated.]

Newspaper Death Notices (digital)
Death notice. Carruthers, Lillian. *Toronto Daily Star,* May 13, 1953, 33.[1]
Death notice. Hampson, M. Jean. *Globe and Mail,* December 13, 1968, 41. Proquest Historical Newspapers [online database]: Globe and Mail, http://www.proquest.com/products-services/pq-hist-news.html.
School Board Annual Reports (digital and print)
Board of School Trustees, *Annual Report* (Vancouver: Board of School Trustees, various years, 1903–45, digital), http://circle.ubc.ca/.
School Board Handbooks (print)
Toronto Board of Education, *Handbook* (Toronto: various publishers, various years, 1910–45).
School Board minutes (digital)
Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board of Education for the City of Toronto (Toronto: Board of Education, various years, 1913–16), https://archive.org/.
School Directories (digital and print)
Ontario Legislative Assembly, *Schools and Teachers in the Province of Ontario* [some slight variations in the title over time] (Toronto: various printers, various years, 1911–58), https://archive.org/.
Vital Records
FamilySearch.org. Canada Births and Baptisms, 1661–1959 (online database).
———. British Columbia Death Registrations, 1872–1986; 1992–1993 (online database).
———. British Columbia Marriage Registrations, 1859–1932; 1937–1938 (online database with images).
———. Michigan Death Certificates, 1921–1952 (online database).
———. New Brunswick, Provincial Returns of Births and Late Registrations, 1810–1906 (online database with images).
———. Ontario Births, 1869–1912 (online database with images).
———. Ontario Marriages, 1869–1927 (online database with images).

1 I did not search the Toronto Star digital archives systematically for teachers because my library is not a subscriber. However, a research assistant located this obituary.

Table 1, Part 2. Selected Teachers, Specific Records

Manuscript census records. Sub-district and page reference.						
First Name	**Last Name**	**1881**	**1891**	**1901**	**1911**	**1921**
Toronto						
Mary E.	Blackwell	—	—	—	—	District 132 Toronto North (Ontario), Sub-district 64 Toronto North Ward 5, p. 1.
Bessie	Bowling	District 138 Simcoe South (Ontario), Sub-district G Alliston, p. 13.	District 119 East Toronto (Ontario), Sub-district 23 St. David's Ward, p. 59.	District 117 Toronto East (Ontario), Sub-district B, 42 Ward 2, p. 6.	—	—
Lillian A.	Carruthers	—	—	District 131 York West (Ontario), Sub-district F, 3 Toronto Ward 5, p. 12.	—	—
Jean	Hampson	—	—	—	—	District 113 Parkdale (Ontario), Sub-district 112 Toronto, p. 12.
John McCallum	Henderson	—	—	District 73 Huron East (Ontario), Sub-district B, 2 Brussels, p. 7.	District 81 Huron East (Ontario), Sub-district 26 Brussels, p. 3.	—
Jeannette	McLeod	—	—	—	—	District 134 Toronto West (Ontario), Sub-district 55 Toronto Ward 5, p. 12.
Bessie M.	Ross	—	—	—	—	District 131 Toronto East (Ontario), Sub-district 58 Toronto Ward 2, p. 23.

Manuscript census records. Sub-district and page reference.						
First Name	**Last Name**	**1881**	**1891**	**1901**	**1911**	**1921**
Vancouver						
Mary Wallace	Adam	—	—	—	District 12 Vancouver, N. Vancouver, S. Vancouver (B.C.), Sub-district 7, p. 39	—
Katherine Elizabeth	Buckerfield	—	—	District 17 Kent (N.B.), Sub-district D, Harcourt, p. 4	District 12 Vancouver, N. Vancouver, S. Vancouver (B.C.), Sub-district 42, p. 15	—
A. Josephine	Dauphinee	—	—	—	—	District 13 Vancouver (BC), Sub-district 65, West Vancouver Ward 2, p. 12
Annabel	Guest	—	—	—	—	District 13 Vancouver (BC), Sub-district 41, Vancouver Ward 5, p. 3
Alfred Peck	Tingley	—	—	—	—	District 23 Vancouver South (BC), Sub-district 9, Municipality of Point Grey, p. 3

Table 1, Part 2, continued

Vital records.				
First Name	**Last Name**	**Birth**	**Marriage**	**Death**
Toronto				
Mary E.	Blackwell	—	—	—
Bessie	Bowling	—	—	—
Lillian A.	Carruthers	—	—	—
Jean	Hampson	—	—	—
John McCallum	Henderson	Births, Ontario, 1894. Huron County, Brussels Division. John Henderson	Marriage licences with affidavits, Ontario, 1921. John M. Henderson applicant. Toronto.	—
Jeannette	McLeod	—	—	—
Bessie M.	Ross	—	—	—
Vancouver				
Mary Wallace	Adam	—	British Columbia Vital Statistics. Marriage registrations 004169 to 004684. 1929. GR-2962, Vol. 351. Reg. # 4223. Dance, Edwin Alwin & Adam, Mary Wallace.	—
Katherine Elizabeth	Buckerfield	New Brunswick provincial returns of births and late registrations, 1810–1906. Returns of births, 1897 (Abott, #1000; Cosman, #2240). No. 1769. Catherine Elizabeth Buckerfield.	British Columbia Vital Statistics. Marriage registrations 003001 to 003500. 1937. GR-2962, Vol. 449. Reg. # 3316. Scott, Seaman Morley & Buckerfield, Catherine Elizabeth.	Michigan Division for Vital Records and Health Statistics, Ann Arbor, Washtenaw, FHL micro no. 1,973,133.1
A. Josephine	Dauphinee	Canada Births and Baptisms, 1661–1959. Ada Josephine Dauphinee, Nov. 15, 1875, FHL micro no. 1,319,532.	—	British Columbia Department of Health, Division of Vital Statistics. British Columbia Death Registrations, 1872–1986; 1992–1993. Ada Josephine Dauphinee, 1977.
Annabel	Guest	—	—	—
Alfred Peck	Tingley	Canada Births and Baptisms, 1661–1959. Alfred Peck Tingley, Sept. 10, 1884, FHL micro no. 1,943,972; New Brunswick provincial returns of births and late registrations, 1810–1906; 1884–1885. Late Registrations. Alfred Peck Tingley.	—	—

1 Buckerfield's spouse was the UBC historian Seaman Morley Scott, who was residing in Michigan around the time of her death. I reasoned that Buckerfield could have died there and found this record.

Table 2. Selected Teachers' Social Origins

First Name	Last Name	Birth	Death	Ethnic origin	Immigrant? (Y/N)	Religious denom.	Father's occupation	Marital status
Toronto								
Mary E.	Blackwell	1887	Unk	English	Y	Methodist	Unk	Spinster
Bessie	Bowling	1878	Unk	English	N	Anglican	Bookkeeper, clerk[1]	Spinster
Lillian A.	Carruthers	1876	1953	Irish	N	Anglican	Unk	Spinster
Jean	Hampson	1894	1968	Scottish	N	Presbyterian	Unk	Spinster
John McCallum	Henderson	1893	Unk	Scottish	N	Presbyterian	Teamster	Married
Jeannette	McLeod	1881	Unk	Scottish	N	Presbyterian	Unk	Spinster
Bessie M.	Ross	1886	Unk	Scottish	N	Presbyterian	Unk	Spinster
Vancouver								
Mary Wallace	Adam	1905	Unk	Scottish	N	Presbyterian	Customs	Spinster
Katherine Elizabeth	Buckerfield	1896	1938	English	N	Anglican	Farmer	Spinster
A. Josephine	Dauphinee	1875	1977	English	N	Methodist	Unk	Spinster
Annabel	Guest	1884	Unk	English	N	Methodist	Clergy	Married
Alfred Peck	Tingley	1884	1977	Scottish	N	Baptist	Sea captain	Married
"Unk" = Unknown								

1 1891 census, 1901 census

Table 3. Selected Teachers' Training and Qualifications

First Name	Last Name	Certificate	Other education or qualifications	Date other qualifications earned
Toronto				
Mary E.	Blackwell	2nd class	Aux certif.	1924
Bessie	Bowling	2nd class	Aux certif., temp.[1]	1919
Lillian A.	Carruthers	2nd class	*	1911
Jean	Hampson	2nd class	Ward Aides Course, U of T[2] ; Manual training certif.; Aux certif.	[1] ca. 1918; [2] 1923; [3] 1936
John McCallum	Henderson	1st class	Aux certif.; BA	[1] 1937; [2] 1952 or '53
Jeannette	McLeod	2nd class	Aux certif.	1925
Bessie M.	Ross	2nd class	Aux certif.	1924
Vancouver				
Mary Wallace	Adam	2nd class	Unk	—
Katherine Elizabeth	Buckerfield	1st class	Unk	—
A. Josephine	Dauphinee	1st class	**	1919
Annabel	Guest	2nd class	Unk	—
Alfred Peck	Tingley	Manual training	Unk	—
"Unk" = Unknown				

* Attended 1911 summer course for teachers at the Vineland (New Jersey) Training School. Toronto Board of Education, Minutes, 1911 (Toronto: Board of Education, 1911), Appendix No. 42, 399.

** Attended University of California summer course for teachers in 1919. Gerald Thomson, "'Remove from Our Midst These Unfortunates'" (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 1999), 169–70.

1 Toronto Board of Education, *Annual Report* 1920 (Toronto: Board of Education, 1920), 15.

2 Judith Friedland, *Restoring the Spirit: The Beginnings of Occupational Therapy in Canada,* 1890–1930 (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011), 144.

Table 4. Selected Teachers' Classroom Experience

First Name	Last Name	First year teaching	Last year teaching	Age began teaching in Toronto or Vancouver	Age stopped teaching	Year started special class teaching	Year stopped special class teaching	Number of years' experience prior to special class work	Type of special program taught	Number of years of special class work	Toal career experience in years
Toronto											
Mary E.	Blackwell	1905–06	1928–29	18	42	1921–22	1928–29	16	Aux. subnormal	8	24
Bessie	Bowling	1901–02	1939–40	23	62	[1] 1912–13; [2] 1926–27	[1] unknown; [2] 1939–40	11	[1] Aux. backward, subnormal; [2] Lip-read	?–14	39
Lillian A.	Carruthers	1893–94	1921–22	17	46	1910–11	1913–14	17	Aux. mental defective	4	29
Jean	Hampson	1915–16	1951–52	21	58	1926–27	1951–52	11	Orthopaedic	26	37
John McCallum	Henderson	1920–21	1958–59	27	66	1936–37	1958–59	16	Orthopaedic	23	39
Jeannette	McLeod	1913–14	1928–29	32	47	1921–22	1922–23	8	Aux. subnormal	2	16
Bessie M.	Ross	1906–07	1940–41	20	55	1925–26	1940–41	18	Aux. subnormal	16	35
Vancouver											
Mary Wallace	Adam	1923–24	1928–29	18	24	1923–24	1923–24	0	Aux. subnormal	1	5
Katherine Elizabeth	Buckerfield	1916–17	1936–37	20	40	1920–21	1936–37	4	Aux. subnormal	17	21
A. Josephine	Dauphinee	1909–10	1940–41	34	66	1909–10	1940–41	0	Aux. subnormal; Supervisor special classes	32	32
Annabel	Guest	1919–20	1933–34	35	50	1921–22	1933–34	2	Aux. subnormal	13	15
Alfred Peck	Tingley	1913–14	1925–26	29	42	1917–18	1925–26	4	Manual training subnormal	9	13

The reader should treat ranges in this table as approximations only. Sometimes I know that a teacher began working part way through the school year, but I backdated this information to the September year start for the sake of consistency. All of the teachers' birth years are known but I do not necessarily know the exact birthdate of every teacher; this matters because a teacher may not have yet attained her or his birthday when she or he started teaching and may therefore have been younger than the table reflects. Many of these teachers likely taught elsewhere before coming to Toronto or Vancouver. It was fairly common for a teacher to spend a few years in rural schools before the city would hire her. See R. D. Gidney and W. P. J. Millar, *How Schools Worked: Public Education in English Canada, 1900–1940* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012). Other teachers may have continued teaching elsewhere after leaving these the employ of one of these cities. Finally, the tables do not account for leaves of absence or other interruptions during a teacher's career. For instance, Jean Hampson interrupted her career for war service.