

“prosecuting vice; etc.”

Emma Stirling’s Work for Children, Youth and Young Women, 1894-95

by

Julielynne Marie Anderson

A thesis submitted to  
Saint Mary’s University, Halifax, Nova Scotia  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Arts in Atlantic Canada Studies

September 2007, Halifax, Nova Scotia

© Copyright Julielynne Marie Anderson 2007

Approved: Dr. Peter L. Twohig  
Supervisor

Approved: Dr. Colin Howell  
Internal Examiner

Approved: Dr. Janet Guildford  
External Examiner

Date: 14 September 2007



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file    Votre référence*

*ISBN: 978-0-494-35757-6*

*Our file    Notre référence*

*ISBN: 978-0-494-35757-6*

#### NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

#### AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

“prosecuting vice; etc.”

Emma Stirling's Work for Children, Youth and Young Women, 1894-95

by Julielynn Marie Anderson

**Abstract**

Emma Maitland Stirling, if she is known at all in Nova Scotia, is known for her child migration work in the province between 1886 and 1895. Yet, her last years here have not been fully explored and her work with the Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union has been completely overlooked.

Emma Stirling's efforts with the WCTU were about combating the possibility of moral decay in Nova Scotia society. Particularly important, at times, was combating this apparent moral decay in the young of the world. In 1895, this work with the WCTU would converge for Stirling with her child migration work. The Parker and Miller abortion trial, Stirling's last engagement in Nova Scotia, must be re-envisioned as an extension of Stirling's WCTU work. By defending Grace Fagan, a grown child migrant, Stirling believed she was defending all the young of Nova Scotia society, local or transplanted, from moral degradation.

September 2007

## Acknowledgements

I have often described this project as looking for a needle in a haystack. When a project involves as much endless searching as this one, many people must be thanked for their help along the way. My thanks to my thesis supervisor Peter Twohig for suggesting possibilities of where to look next when records did not follow each other in logical order and for reminding me not to let newspaper research get too far out of hand.

My thanks to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and Saint Mary's University for allowing me the opportunity to hold a SSHRC grant. Without the grant I would not have been able to embark on the major research trips I took. My thanks also to John Reid and Peter Twohig again for writing me recommendations for SSHRC.

My thanks also goes out to the staff of the numerous archives and museums I visited in the course of my research. Special thanks goes to the staff of the National Archives of Scotland. Extra thanks must also be sent to the staff of the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management who helped me decipher nineteenth century handwriting and who did their utmost get me the obscure records I kept requesting. Another note of special thanks must be sent to the staff at the Archives at Acadia University. They put up with me for days as I searched through years worth of original newspapers and they also had helpful suggestions of where to look for further information.

Finally, thanks is sent to my family and friends who must be tired of hearing me talk of Emma Stirling at this point. Special thanks is extended to my mother particularly. She accompanied me on most of my major research trips, making them more logistically

feasible and she waited around a lot while I buried myself in archives. Further, she spent hours tracking down a secondary source I could not easily obtain. Thanks to all.

## Table of Contents

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| A Note on Names .....  | i        |
| Introduction.....  | 1-29     |
| Chapter 1: Responses to the 1895 Fire at Emma Stirling's House:<br>A Reflection of Support.....  | 30-50.   |
| Chapter 2: Emma Stirling and the WCTU.....   | 51-80.   |
| Chapter 3: Defending Grace Fagan: Exploring the Parker and Miller Abortion Trial and<br>the Merging Between Two Facets of Emma Stirling's Efforts..... | 81-125.  |
| Conclusion.....  | 126-132. |
| Bibliography.....  | 133-139. |

## A Note on Names

The last names of two of the main people in this work, Emma Stirling and Grace Fagan, are often spelled different ways. i.e. Stirling is Sterling and Fagan is Fegan, Feagan, or Fagen. Sometimes the names are spelt different ways within the same paragraph or article of a newspaper report. As such, it would be visually distracting to note these spelling mistakes every time they occurred in a quotation. Therefore, grievous or unusual mistakes will be noted, but slight variations in the spelling of Grace Fagan's of Emma Stirling's names will be left as they are.

## Introduction

Dear Sisters of the W.C.T.U., these facts concern YOU. In the action which I was obliged to take in the matter of giving information concerning crime, I simply did what every decent citizen, is *bound* to do.....I HAVE ONLY DONE *what every one of you has undertaken*, AND IS PLEDGED TO DO, by the promise she has signed as a member of the W.C.T.U., and which she openly confesses to the world by the white ribbon she wears. YOU, *as well as I*, have pledged yourselves to do all you can to spread temperance sentiment, and by every lawful means in your power to promote the cause of temperance; also we wear the white ribbon to show we uphold the cause of social purity and oppose immorality in every shape.....And it is well worth our while to consider what is our position in faithfully carrying on this warfare. Is the penalty for that to be subject without warning to a sudden and horrible death? or [sic] if delivered alive from the flames kindled by wicked hands in the middle of the night, to suffer thereby loss of all things which make life worth having? This is no exaggeration. What has happened *once* may happen *again*. These miscreants got off scotfree [sic], having escaped even the annoyance of an inquiry.....The burning of the Big House at the Hillfoot Farm was a terrible means taken to '*get rid of*' an inconvenient person, who was '*SO PECULIAR*' *as to tell the truth*.....Yet, dear sisters, if *you likewise tell the truth*, the same fate may soon overtake you. And if by means of this strange story you are aroused to greater protection of your Homes, your young girls, and your dear little children; if you can really see sin as *it is*, and YOUR DANGER AS IT IS, looked at in the light of the flames of that burning house, I will almost feel reconciled to my share in the transaction, and will thank God that we have not suffered in vain nor laboured in vain.<sup>1</sup>

The above passage is an excerpt from a three page appeal to the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) found in Emma Stirling's book *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898). This appeal was placed at the end of a chapter on the events of 1895 that affected Emma Stirling's efforts in Nova Scotia. The appeal hinted at the legal proceedings Stirling became embroiled in during the spring of 1895 and it clearly illustrated her belief that the fire in her house was of malicious intent and caused by a connection to those legal proceedings. This appeal was a call-to-arms, directed primarily, though not exclusively, at the WCTU in the Maritime Provinces.<sup>2</sup> Emma Stirling, if she is known at all, is known for her work with child migration.<sup>3</sup> What



then was her connection with the WCTU? Why in 1898 was Stirling issuing a call-to-arms to the WCTU to “oppose immorality?” What happened in Nova Scotia in 1895 that would still rankle enough to warrant such a fervent appeal in a book published three years later?

Before one can answer any questions about Emma Stirling’s connection to the WCTU, however, a few more basic questions must be answered. What was child migration and who was Emma Stirling? Historian Barry Coldrey states:

Child migration, the dispatch of unaccompanied children from the United Kingdom to its colonies, later Dominions, was a feature of British social policy over some 350 years. The first 100 children were dispatched from the city of London to the colony of Virginia in 1617 and the last nine children were sent by Dr. Barnardo’s Homes to Australia in 1967.<sup>4</sup>

According to historian Marjory Harper, “the phenomenon” of child migration involved “the transfer of more than 100, 000 children and adolescents from Britain to Canada between 1870 and 1930.”<sup>5</sup> It is evident, therefore, that child migration had a long history and involved a large number of children. Within the overall movement of child migration there were numerous organizations involved, both large and small. The largest organization was that of Dr. Thomas Barnardo. An example of a large organization with its Canadian base in the Maritimes would have been that of J.T. Middlemore.

Organizations such as Barnardo’s and Middlemore Homes each brought at least several thousand children to Canada. The names of massive organizations such as Barnardo and Middlemore are the ones that even people with only a vague familiarity with child migration may recognize. However, to focus solely on the large organizations would be to ignore the existence of the numerous small child migration organizations that operated in Canada in general and the Maritimes specifically.<sup>6</sup>

Born in the late 1830s in Edinburgh and reared in St. Andrews, Emma Stirling was a Scottish woman who became involved in child welfare work and that led her into the practice of child migration. Family money transferred to Stirling after her parents' deaths, allowed Stirling to create, in the late 1870s, what would become the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge Society, an organization concerned with the welfare of impoverished children. Eventually, this organization would merge with others to become the Scottish National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Stirling and the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge Society were also involved with political agitation to create laws that were supposed to improve the lives of children. However, by the 1880s Stirling's focus would turn to child migration<sup>7</sup>

Stirling's family money also was useful for enabling her child migration work. She also left to posterity several editions of a book that were all called *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia*. She used these to garner support for her migration work as well. In the sphere of child migration, Emma Stirling's organization was an example of a small organization in a much larger movement. She was based at Hillfoot farm near Aylesford, Nova Scotia between the years of 1886 and 1895 when her home was burned to the ground and she removed herself and her operation from Nova Scotia.<sup>8</sup> Prior to the fire, Stirling had settled a couple hundred Scottish children in Nova Scotia.<sup>9</sup> After her efforts in Nova Scotia ended in 1895, Stirling went to the United States where "she divided her time between Florida and Coatesville, Pennsylvania, where she died in 1907."<sup>10</sup>

As a subject that had a long history and involved a large number of children, child migration has received attention from everyone from academic historians to genealogists

and from journalists to children's fiction writers.<sup>11</sup> Academic works on child migration that are national and international in scale have been written by authors such as Joy Parr and Gillian Wagner respectively. More popular national histories have been written by people such as Kenneth Bagnell. Collections of memoirs of children brought out by migration organizations have been edited, compiled or included in the works of Phyllis Harrison, Michael Anthony Staples and Gail Corbett. However, the existing literature has tended to focus on large organizations such as those of Dr. Thomas John Barnardo, Annie Macpherson, William Quarrier and Maria Rye who brought at least several thousand children each to Canada and who operated for long periods of time. Furthermore, the collections of memoirs have tended to be primarily recollections of twentieth century child migrants.<sup>12</sup> Until Marjorie Kohli's 2003 book *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939*, the literature on child migration that was national in scope made little or no contribution to the preservation of Emma Stirling's history.<sup>13</sup>

Outside the world of academia, local historians in the Annapolis Valley of Nova Scotia have been interested in Emma Stirling since the 1980s.<sup>14</sup> By the end of the 1990s genealogists such as Mary Louise Rippey and Leland Harvie and Marjorie Kohli had published articles on or with Stirling as a substantial part of their subject matter.<sup>15</sup> However, works that count Stirling substantially amongst their subject matter written by academic historians remain few and far between. Scholarly historians such as Marjory Harper and Judith Fingard have made brief references to Stirling in works devoted to other aspects of Atlantic Canadian history.<sup>16</sup> However, in the field of scholarly history only Philip Girard has written articles that include Stirling amongst their subject matter in

any comprehensive way. Girard's two articles, published respectively in 1995 and 1999, remain the two most nuanced and detailed studies of Stirling's efforts to assist children.<sup>17</sup> Even with Girard's contribution to preserving the history of Stirling's work, much remains to be explored.

Here is where the WCTU must be worked back into the discussion of Stirling, her work and what posterity has so far recorded of her history. In the existing secondary literature, no discussion has taken place about Stirling's work with the WCTU. Not even Girard has mentioned this aspect of Stirling's work, though he is quite aware of the importance religion played in Stirling's life.<sup>18</sup> Stirling spent a substantial amount of space discussing her involvement with the WCTU in both her 1892 and 1898 books. The call-to-arms Stirling issued to the WCTU in her 1898 book reiterates that Stirling felt her connection to the WCTU was an important one.<sup>19</sup> Given how heavily many of these existing sources rely on Stirling's books<sup>20</sup>, it is surprising that Stirling's work with the WCTU has been ignored.

It is equally surprising how easily the manifestations of Stirling's religious prejudice against Catholics in her books have been ignored by many of the secondary sources.<sup>21</sup> This is particularly surprising in regards to an author such as Marjorie Kohli who is well aware of similar religious prejudices amongst other child migration workers.<sup>22</sup> Girard has done significant work in exploring Stirling's anti-catholic prejudices – particularly as they pertained to the Delaney case.<sup>23</sup> The Delaney case was a court case in Nova Scotia that involved a Catholic father named Arthur Delaney who wanted his children returned. Given the court case's longevity, this case is crucially important to a study of Stirling's full ten years in Nova Scotia. However, it falls outside

of the 1894-1895 period on which this project is focusing.<sup>24</sup> Further, Girard's work on the Delaney case has laid a strong framework for future academic studies on the Delaney case.<sup>25</sup> This study endeavours, in part, to lay that same sort of framework for another religious aspect of Stirling's efforts in Nova Scotia – Stirling's work with the WCTU.

While discussing women's organizations in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Veronica Strong-Boag has written:

For many years the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) attracted the most publicity, the most criticism and the most support.....In addition to the major goal – prohibition – WCTU'ers crusaded for Protestant missions, domestic science instruction for the poor, anti-tobacco legislation, stronger drug laws, social purity, school temperance textbooks and woman suffrage.<sup>26</sup>

The WCTU was a large women's organization and it was a large organization within the Maritimes specifically. In regards to the size of Maritime Union of the WCTU, Marlene Willigar has stated: "The Maritime WCTU's growth in the early 1890s not only surpassed the steady increases of the proceeding decade, but it outstripped that of any other Canadian provincial union during the 1890-1891 year."<sup>27</sup> It was precisely in this time of phenomenal growth, that Emma Stirling joined the WCTU in 1890, becoming president of the new Aylesford Union. By 1893, she had become Superintendent of the Kings County WCTU.<sup>28</sup>

While the quotation from Strong-Boag illustrates that WCTU work had many facets, Marlene Willigar has argued that in the Maritimes, the WCTU's "most successful reform initiatives centred primarily on the transmission of middle class temperance values to Maritime children."<sup>29</sup> Willigar has also demonstrated how much of the Maritime WCTU's work had a preoccupation with enforcing temperance for the sake of improving the lives of children and youth and thereby society.<sup>30</sup> Emma Stirling's

justification for becoming involved in temperance work was in a similar vain. In the introduction to her 1892 chapter entitled "Temperance Work", Stirling stated: "This has been a most helpful and blessed adjunct to the work for our children. We have been enabled at Hillfoot Farm to maintain a united and steady protest against drink in all its forms. It will be obvious that this is the only safety where so many young people are concerned."<sup>31</sup> Clearly for Stirling, her temperance work was an additional part of her efforts to improve the lives of children and, therefore, it combined well with some of the Maritime WCTU's preoccupations.

Even Stirling's reputation in the WCTU was predicated somewhat on her child migration work. She made an appearance in the Wolfville *Acadian's* report of the 1894 Maritime WCTU annual convention held in Fredericton a month and a half earlier.<sup>32</sup>

The *Acadian* stated:

Miss Stirling is one of the most interesting delegates. She is a woman of broad culture, and is strongly interested in many subjects. Her Scotch home is in Edinburgh, and in Aylesford, N.S. she has a farm of some seven hundred acres to which she brings poor children from the old country and has them educated to lead useful lives in this New Scotland.<sup>33</sup>

This passage, however, was copied exactly from a report on the WCTU convention in the Fredericton *Daily Gleaner* on 25 September 1894 as the convention was winding to a close. The *Daily Gleaner's* article that the *Acadian* copied was entitled "THE PROMINENT VISITORS SHORT BIOGRAPHIES OF SOME OF THE W.C.T.U. DELEGATES" and also included brief histories on prominent Maritime women such as Edith Jessie Archibald, then president of the Maritime WCTU.<sup>34</sup> What the papers chose to highlight in their "short biography" of Stirling is instructive. They chose to highlight her work with "poor children," specifically migrant children. A year later while writing a

request to assist Stirling the president of the Fredericton Union of the WCTU would describe this “philanthropic work” as “so well-known on both sides of the water”.<sup>35</sup> In essence, even when her fellow members of the WCTU were writing about her in 1894 Emma Stirling was still known for her work in child migration, which they, rightly or wrongly, assumed would improve the lives of children.

A year later, however, the *Acadian*’s report of the 1895 Maritime WCTU convention would take a dramatically different tone when talking about Emma Stirling. In 1895, the *Acadian* stated:

In the afternoon a letter was read from Miss Stirling, lately of Aylesford, and former Co. Supt. of Kings. After relating some of the trials to which she had been subjected during last winter she made the following suggestion to all local unions. ‘That at every trial of a woman some white ribbon sister strive to be present at her examination, and in the court room, and that we petition the Legislation to make it illegal for the trial to proceed without the presence of a woman.’<sup>36</sup>

The positive tone of the 1894 report had disappeared as had the focus on Stirling’s child migration work. No longer were the reports speaking of work to improve children’s lives, but instead were speaking of legal matters and protecting women in the courts. What happened in 1895 to cause this change?

Stirling’s life in Nova Scotia in 1895 was punctuated by two interrelated – but separate – events. One event was that both Dr. Samuel Nelson Miller and Robert S. Parker were subjected to legal proceedings for apparently executing or soliciting an illegal abortion on Grace Fagan, one of Stirling’s grown child migrants. Executing and soliciting an abortion were criminal offences under the law,<sup>37</sup> and the resulting legal proceedings lasted for three months, beginning in late March and ending in late June 1895. They would involve a stipendiary magistrate and two judges. They would also

garner a fair amount of attention in the Nova Scotia newspapers, particularly the Halifax newspapers. The legal proceedings ended with the jury refusing to punish Miller and Parker and would leave Emma Stirling enraged at this lack of punishment.<sup>38</sup>

The second event was a fire that took place on 3 April 1895. The fire caused the utter destruction of the main house at Hillfoot Farm, Stirling's Nova Scotia home.

Stirling believed that the fire was caused by human beings with malicious intent in retaliation for the legal proceedings of Miller and Parker.<sup>39</sup> As Girard, drawing on an account published 3 April 1895 in the Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor*, has noted:

"Newspaper opinion agreed that the fire was probably set."<sup>40</sup> The *Western Chronicle* out of Kentville and a couple of Halifax papers agreed with the *Weekly Monitor*.<sup>41</sup> Questions of origin notwithstanding, in the aftermath of the fire, Emma Stirling and her efforts would also receive a fair bit of newspaper coverage as certain groups rallied to give Stirling support and one of those groups would be members of the WCTU.<sup>42</sup>

The fire and the trial consumed Stirling's life in 1895. Yet, when searching for information on these two events there are some obstacles. Much of the secondary literature's reporting of the events of 1895 is problematic. Girard provides the reader with the basic facts of the events of 1895 and some brief analysis of the societal factors surrounding these events. However, neither of his articles is focused on 1895.<sup>43</sup> In other sources basic facts are wrong. Some sources wrongly cite the year the fire happened and do not even mention the trial. Others chronologically confuse the events of 1895 making it appear that the trial was about the fire and not a case of illegal abortion. None of the sources provide an expansive view of what happened in Stirling's life in the spring and



early summer of 1895.<sup>44</sup> One important fact the secondary literature illustrates is that there is a need to further explore the events that affected Emma Stirling's life in 1895.

A prime example of these problems is the most recent and most easily accessible of all sources that treat the subject of Stirling substantially, Marjorie Kohli's *The Golden Bridge*. Kohli's comments on the events of 1895 read:

Emma Stirling's house and barn were burned down on April 3, 1895, under mysterious circumstances. She believed the fire had been set deliberately. Although an arrest was made, the verdict of the jury was not guilty. On July 19, 1895, tired and ill, she ceased operation of her home and moved to Coatesville, Pennsylvania.<sup>45</sup>

This contains no mention of abortion. It also places the arrest after the fire. The chronological history of events went: arrest, fire and acquittal. Various primary sources are very clear on this, including Stirling's 1898 book to which Kohli had access

.<sup>46</sup> Stirling's book while not mentioning the word abortion precisely makes it very clear the trial is not about the fire.<sup>47</sup> Any confusion Kohli had about what the trial concerned

might have been cleared up by consulting the court records, which make very clear that the legal proceedings were about abortion. Kohli uses the only source, Rippey and Harvie's article "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm", which cites the court records.

However, Rippey and Harvie's chronological jumping around does not necessarily make it readily apparent that the court case was about abortion.<sup>48</sup> Unfortunately, without the mention of abortion and because of the reported order of events, Kohli's reporting of the events of 1895 could be misconstrued by the reader to imply the trial was about the fire.

Thus, the newest of secondary sources is a telling example of why it is necessary to make a further study of the primary sources on the events of 1895.

Unfortunately, some obvious primary documents are not altogether useful when looking at the 1895 period of Stirling's life. The Minute Books of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge Society, the organization that Stirling founded in Scotland, do not mention the fire of 1895 or the Parker and Miller trial.<sup>49</sup> Nor do the *Journals and Proceedings of House of Assembly of the Province of Nova Scotia* mention these events in either their educational or agricultural reports. Despite suggested connections in other sources to the Inspector of Schools for the District of Hants and Kings and George Lawson, the Secretary of Agriculture for Nova Scotia, the official reports for the Nova Scotia departments of education and agriculture contained in the *Journals* tell one little about Emma Stirling's ten years in Nova Scotia.<sup>50</sup> The report of the immigration agent out of Halifax in the *Sessional Papers of Canada* also does not mention the fire or the trial. When Stirling first arrived in Nova Scotia Edwin Clay, the federal immigration agent in Halifax, was extremely interested in her work. While his interest in and support of child migration did not wane, his interest in Stirling inexplicably evaporated.<sup>51</sup> If obvious government publications and organizational records do not provide information, where can one look for the history of these events?

Perhaps one can turn to Stirling's writings. Emma Stirling's two books, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (London: John Haddon & Co., 1892) and *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (Coatesville, PA: C.N. Speakman, 1898) on her years in Nova Scotia have been extensively used in the secondary literature. In 1999, Mary Louise Rippey and Leland Harvie stated that "[m]ost of what we know about her life and mission, caring for poor and homeless children in Edinburgh and Nova Scotia, comes from her own writings" on

the opening page of their article on Stirling.<sup>52</sup> This is undoubtedly true of much of the information that is imparted in most of the secondary literature. Even Girard's analyses, which contain a substantial amount of primary research, have to rely to some extent on the information provided by Stirling herself.<sup>53</sup>

It is, however, important to use Stirling's books with a critical eye. Girard has noted that in certain cases that her views were "hardly unbiased" and has described her as "self-righteous".<sup>54</sup> Rippey and Harvie have noted that Stirling's writings "were sold to raise money for the cause".<sup>55</sup> Stirling's writings therefore need to be treated with some skepticism, although some of the secondary literature that relies heavily on Stirling's writings has failed to do this.<sup>56</sup> Stirling's works may be a start, but other sources are needed.

There are trial records for the Parker and Miller case but they are incomplete and they do not discuss the fire.<sup>57</sup> There are also the newspaper articles used by Girard.<sup>58</sup> Concerning Stirling's "departure from Nova Scotia", Girard contends that her "story can be confirmed through local newspapers such as the *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor*, April-June 1895."<sup>59</sup> However, the value of the 1895 newspapers is not just to "confirm" Stirling's "story." What further analysis of newspapers can do is allow the reader to understand how some of Stirling's contemporaries, especially those from Nova Scotia but throughout the region as well, regarded her and her work after the fire of 1895. Further analysis of the newspapers can also provide missing pieces of the history of the Parker and Miller court case, illustrate the confusion that sometimes surrounded it and also illustrate some attitudes towards home children in the 1890s.

Nova Scotia newspapers had been interested in Emma Stirling since she arrived in Nova Scotia in 1886.<sup>60</sup> Unfortunately for the 1895 period there are gaps in the newspaper record and particularly unfortunate in this case is the lack of remaining copies of newspapers from either Berwick or Middleton. Berwick was, and still is, conveniently close to Aylesford and Middleton was the home of Dr. Samuel Miller.<sup>61</sup> However, surveys of five Halifax newspapers for the months of April to June 1895, in addition to the *Western Chronicle* out of Kentville, N.S. and the *Weekly Monitor* out of Bridgetown provide significant coverage on the fire and trial. These have been supplemented by surveys of the *Daily Sun* from Saint John, New Brunswick and the *Daily Gleaner* and *The Reporter and Fredericton Advertiser* out of Fredericton, New Brunswick.<sup>62</sup>

The newspapers, such as the *Evening Mail* out of Halifax, were quick to point out that in regards to the legal proceedings against Parker and Miller “opinion is much divided.”<sup>63</sup> However, in all the coverage of the fire and trial, whatever their opinion of Parker and Miller’s guilt, the newspapers either remained laudatory towards Stirling or neutral towards her. They did not always accord this same treatment to other people involved in the case.<sup>64</sup> Nowhere is this respect shown towards Stirling more evident than in the newspaper reports of the fire and in the subsequent appeals published asking for people to assist her.<sup>65</sup>

On the other hand, how the surrounding communities divided on the Parker and Miller case is still an uncertainty. Moreover, how many people agreed or disagreed with the verdict is at this point immeasurable.<sup>66</sup> Posterity also cannot discern how many people individually believed there was a direct connection between the fire and the arrest of Parker and Miller. In discussing the arrest of Parker and Miller, Girard has stated:

“The significance of the fact that the fire at Hillfoot Farm was started four days after Stirling laid the information was lost on no one.”<sup>67</sup> Many people may have privately thought that there was a connection, but the newspapers were very cautious about saying this. Some papers did not even suggest the possibility of arson.<sup>68</sup> The *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor* strategically placed an article about an appeal for assistance for Stirling after the fire just before an article on the Miller and Parker case, however, when they suggested the fire was arson in a previous issue they did not make a direct connection to the abortion trial.<sup>69</sup> Although both the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Echo* were well aware of the arrest of Miller and Parker, when they noted that the fire was perhaps arson they did not make a direct connection either.<sup>70</sup> In fact, the only paper surveyed to actually make blunt reference to the legal proceedings in its report of the fire was not a Nova Scotian newspaper at all. In its report about the fire, it was the Saint John *Daily Sun* that stated: “Miss Sterling has recently caused the arrest of a physician and a young man in Middleton, charging criminality with a girl brought out from England by Miss Sterling.”<sup>71</sup> Ironically, the one paper surveyed that actually made a specific link between the legal proceedings and the fire did not use the words arson or incendiary.<sup>72</sup> Whatever people may have believed privately, most of news organs of the day that have been surveyed were very cautious about how much a connection they drew between the Parker and Miller case and the fire at Stirling’s house.

It was the *Western Chronicle* out of Kentville that provided the most intriguing comments on the fire’s supposed beginnings. The *Western Chronicle*’s report of the fire stated: “As this is the third disastrous fire in this community within a short time it is asked if this is not the work of an incendiary. Especially in view of the active part taken

by Miss Sterling in prosecuting vice; etc. Miss Sterling has the sympathy of the better class of people.”<sup>73</sup> This clearly suggested a schism within local communities; however, the correspondent behind this report perhaps somewhat condescendingly assumed that Emma Stirling and her supporters were in the right. Also, the term “prosecuting vice; etc” can cover a lot of subjects. It is likely, given the timing, what the correspondent had in mind was the arrest of Parker and Miller, but it did not have to be solely that. Stirling was involved in other forms of “prosecuting vice; etc.” such as providing evidence on those who broke the liquor laws.<sup>74</sup> The newspaper left the reader to form their own interpretations over which exposed “vice” might have been the trigger for the obliteration of Stirling’s house.

In a sense, however, Stirling’s last few years of work in Nova Scotia were all about “prosecuting vice” of one sort or another. While known primary sources on the fire can illustrate to the historian that Emma Stirling’s work had support and that some people believed that the fire was caused by malicious intent because of Stirling’s role in fighting apparent immorality to go much beyond that is to enter into the realm of conjecture. Although, it can be shown that some of Stirling’s support came from groups she had been or was affiliated with. However, sources on Stirling’s WCTU work and the legal proceedings against Parker and Miller provide greater material for further analysis.

As with any project, there are limitations on what this thesis can address. There are many aspects of Stirling’s work that remain unexplored. Stirling’s connections with government representatives and officials, both provincial and federal, require further exploration. Fleshing out Stirling’s connections to other child migrant operators such as Miss Croall, Mrs. Blaikie, William Quarrier, J.T. Middlemore and Dr. Barnardo would

also do much to add to greater understanding of Stirling's history.<sup>75</sup> Further, while scholars such as Joy Parr have analyzed the religious nature of the work of other child migration organizations<sup>76</sup>, work needs to be done on comparing Stirling's religious beliefs with that of other child migrant workers. These are all vast topics aimed at including Emma Stirling into the wider story of child migration, however, they warrant massive projects of their own.

It is also not within the purview of this project to examine how successfully or unsuccessfully Stirling combated, in general, the typical problems of the child migration movement such as proximity of and lack of supervision, emotional turmoil of the children, overuse of the children as workers, and abuse. There is some evidence to suggest that Stirling recognized some of these problems and tried to ameliorate them at times. There is other evidence to suggest that she was not always successful and also sometimes that other factors co-opted her ability and desire to do these tasks. Further, in regards to Stirling, historians are severely limited in their ability to judge her migration program over all as they cannot track any of her children past young adulthood and there are absolutely no testimonials from any of Stirling's child migrants.<sup>77</sup>

Finally, this thesis will discuss topics that could easily be related to broader themes in the social history of Atlantic Canada and Atlantic Canadian women. Evidence of Stirling's religious beliefs is clear from her writings and through her beliefs one can link her reform efforts to the broader milieu of the Social Gospel movement. Exploring Stirling's place in the Social Gospel movement would allow the scholar to explore the interconnectedness of reform movements in the 19th century. More work remains to be done on the linkages that existed among various reform movements during this period.

Similarly, one could profitably explore the influence of feminist thinking on Stirling. Particular examples of this influence can be seen when she rallied the Maritime WCTU to fight for suffrage in her 1898 book. One could also compare and contrast Stirling's feminism with that of her contemporaries, such as Edith Archibald. However, a full analysis of her feminist thought would require a separate project. The objective of this thesis is to focus more closely on Stirling's work with the WCTU and, through this, provide a more complete analysis of her time in Nova Scotia. In this way, this thesis will provide a different portrait of Stirling than that of existing studies and force a re-envisioning of her to counterbalance the somewhat reactionary portrayal of her Emma Stirling seen in existing works.<sup>78</sup> In addition, Stirling's WCTU work with the WCTU illustrates the friction within reform movements between those who advocated that heredity was responsible for social ills and those who advocated that environment was responsible for social ills.<sup>79</sup> Furthermore, the Parker and Miller trial and Emma Stirling's involvement in it could be related to concerns about social purity and abortion that were happening in Canada at the time.<sup>80</sup> To explore all these connections to the extent they deserve, however, would require additional major projects. This thesis has a more fundamental job. Because Stirling's work with the WCTU and the Parker and Miller trial has not been explored in depth, this project must lay the groundwork. Until solid foundations are laid for Stirling's later years in Nova Scotia, implications of the interconnectedness of and tensions within social movements in 19<sup>th</sup> century Atlantic Canada and beyond cannot be explored with the careful analysis they deserve.

This thesis will illustrate the interrelation between Emma Stirling's WCTU work and the Parker and Miller abortion trial. The first chapter will take a brief look at the



support Stirling received in the aftermath of the fire. The calls for aid in the wake of the fire and the responses to those calls found in the newspapers, particularly the *Halifax Herald* and the *Fredericton Daily Gleaner*, provide the historian with a fascinating resource to examine the reaction to Stirling and her work. Questions of origin aside, the fire was seen as a tragedy by some and initially Stirling did have support. Further, while the newspapers cannot tell the historian how long this initial support was retained, they can illustrate that groups that Stirling had been associated with did respond to the calls for aid, thus, reiterating the importance of Stirling's connections with the WCTU.

The second chapter will explore Emma Stirling's work with the WCTU particularly in the period after she became Kings County Superintendent in 1893. As has been mentioned, nothing has been said about this work in the child migration literature and up to this point it has been left completely unexplored by people focusing to any great extent on Emma Stirling herself. The exploration of this WCTU work will illustrate its growing importance in Emma Stirling's efforts, suggest a change of focus for Stirling, and highlight how Emma Stirling had revised her work to include protecting diverse groups of children and young people in Nova Scotia from "vice".

The final chapter will explore the events of the Parker and Miller abortion trial. Given how little has been written on the trial by modern writers and the confusion surrounding it in many of those pieces of secondary literature, an effort must be made to piece together the story. The known primary sources on the trial do not allow the historian to put together a fully comprehensive history. There are still questions that remain unanswered. However, the reports of various Nova Scotia newspapers and the trial records allow the historian to report a more nuanced and detailed history of what

happened, or perhaps what contemporary people thought happened, than has previous been told in the secondary literature. This will help the reader to comprehend the events that Emma Stirling became embroiled in 1895 at her own impetus.

The final chapter will also illustrate how the Parker and Miller abortion trial was an amalgamation of Emma Stirling's work for home children and her work with the WCTU. It will explore how this trial brought up opposing views on the character of child migrants. This chapter will also illustrate how to Emma Stirling this trial had far reaching consequences beyond one grown child migrant further reinforcing that her sphere of interest in children and young people extended far beyond her child migrants by 1895.

Thus, this project will re-envision Emma Stirling's efforts on behalf of children and young people in her last few years in Nova Scotia. It will illustrate how her work became not solely about improving the lives of migrant children, but also about improving the lives of children and young people in the broader Nova Scotian society through the countering of supposed bastions of immorality. The Parker and Miller abortion case must be envisioned as the final engagement in this fight. For Emma Stirling, the trial of Parker and Miller was a chance to defend one of her grown child migrants, but it was also an extension of her WCTU work that called on her to protect the sanctity and morality of the lives of a much larger group of children and young people. Emma Stirling's efforts in her last few years in Nova Scotia, therefore, were about "prosecuting vice; etc."<sup>81</sup> in whatever form for the sake of children and young women.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (Coatesville, PA: C.N. Speakman, 1898), 174--176.

<sup>2</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 174-177.

<sup>3</sup> For discussions of reasons why Stirling may not be well known even considering her efforts with child migration and other children see: Philip Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95." *Myth, Migration and the Making of Memory: Scotia and Nova Scotia c. 1700-1990*. Edited by Marjory Harper and Michael E. Vance, (Halifax: The Gorsebrook Research Institute, 1999), 218 – 231.

<sup>4</sup> Barry Coldrey, "A Charity which has Outlived its Usefulness': The Last Phase of Catholic Child Migration, 1947-56." *History of Education*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (1996), 373.

<sup>5</sup> Marjory Harper, "Cossar's Colonists: Juvenile Migration to New Brunswick in the 1920s." *Acadiensis*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Autumn 1998), 47.

<sup>6</sup> To obtain a picture of the vast number of migration organizations and some idea of their differing sizes see: Gillian Wagner, *Children of the Empire* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982) 259 and Marjorie Kohli, *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939* (Toronto: Natural Heritage Books, 2003), 71-265. An example of a large organization was Dr. Barnardo's which brought over 26,790 children between the years of 1882 and 1928. An example of a large organization in the Maritimes was Middlemore Homes which brought over 5,109 children between the years of 1873 and 1928. An example of a small Maritimes' organization was Oliver Hind's Dakeyne Farm in Falmouth, Nova Scotia which brought over 110 youths between the years of 1913 and 1928. See: Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 259

<sup>7</sup> For further discussion on Emma Stirling's life and work in Scotland see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231 and Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 222-225. Girard gives her birth date as either 1838 or 1839. See: "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 219.

<sup>8</sup> Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 5-6 and 10.

<sup>9</sup> Harper, "Cossar's Colonists," 52. Harper uses the number 200. Two hundred seems to be the accepted number in the secondary literature. Philip Girard has used the phrase "some two hundred children" when referring to the how many children Stirling brought to Atlantic Canada. See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218. Judith Fingard uses the term "several hundred". See: Judith Fingard, "The 1880s: Paradoxes of Progress". *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*. Edited by E. R. Forbes and D. A. Muise (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 110. The number seems to be a little larger than 200 as in 1889, according to records of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge Society that Stirling founded, "225 children have been emigrated to Nova Scotia." See: *Annual Report of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge for Prevention of Cruelty to Children*, Royal Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Edinburgh branch, p. 2 [1889], Royal Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, GD 409/5/4, National Archives of Scotland [hereafter NAS]. There are still children coming in to Emma Stirling as late as 1894. See: *Sessional Papers of Canada* (SP), 58 Victoria (13) 1895, p. 105. The number may not be substantially larger the 200, but there were over 200. More research needs to be done in compiling the exact number of children Emma Stirling brought over.

<sup>10</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218. For further information on Stirling's life in the United States see: Girard, "Victorian

Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 227. See also: Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 11.

<sup>11</sup> For an example of work done on child migration by an academic historian see: Joy Parr, *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994 (1980)). For an example of work done on child migration by a genealogist see: Mary Louise Rippey and Leland Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm". *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999): 5-11. For an example of work done on child migration by journalists see: Michael Anthony Staples, *Middlemore Memories: Tales of the British Home Children* (Fredericton, N.B.: Unipress Limited, 2003). For a work of children's fiction that treats the topic of child migration see Jean Little, *Orphan at My Door: The Home Child Diary of Victoria Cope* (Markham, ON: Scholastic Canada, 2001).

<sup>12</sup> For an example of a Canadian national history of child migration written by an academic see: Joy Parr, *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994 (1980)). For an example of an academic history of child migration that is international in scope see: Gillian Wagner, *Children of the Empire* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982). For a popular Canadian national history of child migration see: Kenneth Bagnell's popular history, *The Little Immigrants: The Orphans who Came to Canada* (Toronto: Dundurn, 2001 (1980)). For examples of works containing recollections of home children see: Phyllis Harrison (Ed.), *The Home Children: Their Personal Stories* (Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer Publishing Ltd., 1979); Michael Anthony Staples, *Middlemore Memories: Tales of the British Home Children* (Fredericton, N.B.: Unipress Limited, 2003) and Gail H. Corbett, *Barnardo Children in Canada* (Peterborough, ON: Woodland Publishing, 1981). For a list of numbers of children and dates in operation see: Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 259.

<sup>13</sup> Prior to the three and a half pages devoted to her in Marjorie Kohli's *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939* (Toronto: Natural Heritage Books, 2003), Emma Stirling receives little or no coverage in earlier national academic or popular works on child migration. For example see Joy Parr's scholarly history entitled *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994 (1980)), and Kenneth Bagnell's popular history, *The Little Immigrants: The Orphans who Came to Canada* (Toronto: Dundurn, 2001 (1980)). No memoirs of Emma Stirling's children are contained in Phyllis Harrison (Ed.), *The Home Children: Their Personal Stories* (Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer Publishing Ltd., 1979) either.

<sup>14</sup> These sources include: John A. DeCoste and Twila L. Robar-DeCoste, *A History of Aylesford and District: In Commemoration of the 200<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Aylesford Township* (Aylesford, N.S.: n.p., 1986), 235-238; Elizabeth Rand, "Dempsey Corner." *Kings County Vignettes* (n.p.: Community History Kings Historical Society, 1989), 4-5, George B. Conway, "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm." *Kings County Vignettes: Interesting Stories of Kings County (Volume 10)*. Compiled by Helen Hansford and Cathy Margeson. (Kentville, N.S.: The Community History Committee of the Kings County Historical Society, 2000), 45-49 and *Some History of Aylesford* by Greta Balsor, 1983-1984. Property of the Genealogical Committee of the Kings Historical Society. Kings County Museum [hereafter KCM]. This is a binder of compiled articles, sketches, etc. written about Aylesford and the surrounding area. It includes three news articles written by Greta Balsor between 1983 and 1995 that are either include Emma Stirling as part of a history of Dempsey Corner or are on Emma Stirling specifically.

<sup>15</sup> These sources are: Mary Louise Rippey and Leland Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm". *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999): 5-11 and Marjorie Kohli, "Young Immigrants in Nova Scotia", *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999): 11-21.

<sup>16</sup> Stirling rates a couple of lines in Marjory Harper, "Cossar's Colonists: Juvenile Migration to New Brunswick in the 1920s." *Acadiensis*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Autumn 1998): 47-65 and in Judith Fingard, "The 1880s: Paradoxes of Progress". *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*. Edited by E. R. Forbes and D. A. Muise (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 110.

---

<sup>17</sup> These two works are: Philip Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia." *Children's Voices in Atlantic Literature and Culture: Essays on Childhood*. Edited by Hilary Thompson, (Guelph: Canadian Children's Press, 1995) 10-23 and Philip Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95." *Myth, Migration and the Making of Memory: Scotia and Nova Scotia c. 1700-1990*. Edited by Marjory Harper and Michael E. Vance, (Halifax: The Gorsebrook Research Institute, 1999), 218-231. Philip Girard has also written about Emma Stirling in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. However, this entry is an abbreviated version of his much more nuanced articles. See: Philip Girard, "Stirling, Emma Maitland". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2004 edition. Online. [www.oxforddnb.com](http://www.oxforddnb.com). (accessed on various dates 2007). To access the online version of the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* one has to have a subscriber login or be at a university that subscribes to it.

<sup>18</sup> See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18 and Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231. Emma Stirling does occasionally receive mention in works on the Maritime WCTU though not always by name. For example, see: Joanne Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900" (Ph. D. Thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1994), 103 & 133.

<sup>19</sup> See: Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (London: John Haddon & Co., 1892), 151-153 and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel....* (1898), 156-157 & 174-177.

<sup>20</sup> For heavy reliance on Stirling's work, see for example: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 222-225 and Conway, "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm," 45-49.

<sup>21</sup> For the clearest expression of Stirling's anti-Catholic prejudices see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 131-152.

<sup>22</sup> For Kohli's discussion of Emma Stirling and the lack of mention of Stirling's religious prejudice see: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 222-225. For an example of where Kohli recognizes the religious prejudices of a child migration worker see: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 252-253.

<sup>23</sup> See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18 and Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231.

<sup>24</sup> See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231 and Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18 for further discussion of the Delaney case. For the records of the court case see: *Delaney vs. Stirling* (Halifax Supreme Court) [1888-1891], RG 39C, Vol. 396, No. 3071 & 3080, NSARM.

<sup>25</sup> See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231 and Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18.

<sup>26</sup> Veronica Strong-Boag, "'Setting the Stage': National Organization and the Women's Movement in the Late 19<sup>th</sup> Century." *The Neglected Majority: Essay's In Canadian Women's History*. Edited by Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice. (Toronto.: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 89-90.

<sup>27</sup> Marlene J. Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society." (M.A. Thesis, Saint Mary's University, 2001), 28.

---

<sup>28</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia* (1892), 151-153 and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel....* (1898), 156-157 and *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2

<sup>29</sup> Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 2

<sup>30</sup> Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 48-142.

<sup>31</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 151.

<sup>32</sup> *Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), 3 November 1894 and *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, 8 [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management [hereafter NSARM]. The report of the convention is actually dated October, but the *Daily Gleaner* of Fredericton was reporting the events of the convention in September of 1894 and people who were at the convention the previous year, such as the President of the Fredericton union of the WCTU, writing a request for aid in the *Daily Gleaner* the next spring, recalled the event as being in September. So this paper follows the *Daily Gleaner*'s and the Fredericton WCTU's date. See *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 21 September – 27 September 1894 and 22 April 1895.

<sup>33</sup> *Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), 3 November 1894.

<sup>34</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 September 1895. (Capitals in the originals) For information on Edith Jessie Archibald see for example: E. R. Forbes, "Battles in Another War: Edith Archibald and the Halifax Feminist Movement." *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 67-89.

<sup>35</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895.

<sup>36</sup> *Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), 25 October 1895.

<sup>37</sup> For information on changing abortion law in 19<sup>th</sup> Century Canada see: Constance Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada." *Windsor Yearbook Access to Justice* 3 (1983), 61-130.

<sup>38</sup> See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, no. 3, NSARM; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), April – June 1895. For Emma Stirling's opinion of the trial see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-177. For discussion of the legal proceedings against Parker and Miller in the secondary literature, see: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 18; Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231; Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 10.

<sup>39</sup> For Stirling's opinion of the fire see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-177. For discussion of the origin of the fire in the secondary literature see: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 18; Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231 and Conway, "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm," 48-49.

<sup>40</sup> Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 18.

<sup>41</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 4 April, 1895 and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 6 April 1895.

---

<sup>42</sup> See particularly *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), April – June 1895.

<sup>43</sup> See: Girard, “Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia,” 10-23 and Girard, “Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95,” 218-231.

<sup>44</sup> For examples of where the fire is cited in the wrong year and the trial is not mentioned see: DeCoste and Robar-DeCoste, *A History of Aylesford and District*, 237; Rand, “Dempsey Corner,” 5. For an example of a case where chronological confusion makes it seem as if the trial was about the fire see: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 225.

<sup>45</sup> Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 225.

<sup>46</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 156-177; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895. For Kohli’s referencing of Stirling’s book see: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 415.

<sup>47</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 156-177.

<sup>48</sup> See: Rippey and Harvie. “Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm,” 10-11 for reference to the court case and court records. See: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 225 and 415 for reference to Rippey and Harvie. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM for what the court records contain. Even Girard does not use the court records. Further, Rippey and Harvie are the only secondary source to cite Parker and Miller’s names. Unfortunately, Rippey and Harvie are not as clear with their information about the court case as they could be. See: Rippey and Harvie. “Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm,” 10-11; Girard, “Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia,” 10-23 and Girard, “Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95,” 218-231. Even Girard’s article on Emma Stirling in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is not free of chronological errors as it erroneously places the acquittal before the fire. Girard’s longer articles, however, do not suffer from this sort of chronological misrepresentation. See: Girard, “Stirling, Emma Maitland”. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Online. [www.oxforddnb.com](http://www.oxforddnb.com).; Girard, “Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia,” 10-23 and Girard, “Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95,” 218-231.

<sup>49</sup> See: Minute books of Directors’ Monthly Meeting Stockbridge Day Nursery, Infant Home & branches, Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, [November 1888-October, 1895], GD 409/1, vol. 2, NAS.

<sup>50</sup> See: *Journals and Proceedings of House of Assembly of the Province of Nova Scotia* [hereafter JPNS], 50 Victoria—60 Victoria, 1887-1897. For hints of Stirling’s possible connection to the Inspector of Schools for the District of Hants and Kings, see: *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, 140 [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM. For hints to Stirling’s connection to George Lawson, see: Minute book of Directors’ Monthly Meeting Stockbridge Day Nursery, Infant Home & branches, Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, [May 1, 1884-September 5, 1889], GD 409/1, vol. 1, NAS.

<sup>51</sup> *Sessional Papers of Canada*, 50 Victoria – 59 Victoria, 1887-1896. According to a note added to a questionnaire Emma Stirling filled out in 1895 for Ottawa she sent a communication with the questionnaire about the events of 1895. However, as of yet that extra piece of communication has not been uncovered. For the survey questions and Stirling’s answers see: Circular of 1895 Sent to Agencies Involved with Immigrant Children, [1895], RG 76, Vol. 118, File 22857, microfilm reel C-4782, National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC]. For the questions on the survey and the different organizations it was sent to see: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 377-378.

---

<sup>52</sup> Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 5.

<sup>53</sup> See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 10-23; Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231. Girard has a substantial amount of primary research and the information that he takes from Stirling's books is used in compliment to this research. For an example of other secondary literature's heavier reliance on Stirling's writings see: Conway, "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm," 45-49.

<sup>54</sup> Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 17. For further discussion of Emma Stirling's prejudices and views that affected her work see: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 17-18 and Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231. Girard describes Stirling as "self-righteous" on page 223.

<sup>55</sup> Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 6

<sup>56</sup> For example see: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 222-225. Kohli does use some sources outside of Stirling's book, however, most of her coverage relies extensively on Stirling's writings and there is no critical comment or even a caution to the reader about Stirling's writings included in this coverage.

<sup>57</sup> See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 29, Vol. 7, no. 3, NSARM.

<sup>58</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 229.

<sup>59</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 229.

<sup>60</sup> *New Star* (Kentville, N.S.), April 1886 – 1890. Original copies are these are held by the archives at Acadia University in Wolfville, N.S. However, there are considerable gaps in the coverage, especially for the years of 1889 and 1890.

<sup>61</sup> Copies of the Berwick paper no longer exist. There is one edition from 1895 of the *Outlook* out of Middleton, Nova Scotia. Fortunately it happens to be the 28 June 1895 issue and it happens to have two mini-articles that relate to the Parker and Miller trial in it. This is an original copy held by the MacDonald Museum in Middleton, Nova Scotia. For a list of known sources of historical Nova Scotia newspapers see: *Nova Scotia Newspapers: A Directory and Union List 1752-1988*. Compiled by Lynn Murphy. Catalogued by Brenda Hicks. With assistance from Anjali Vohra. (Halifax: Dalhousie University School of Library and Information Studies, 1990).

<sup>62</sup> While there is a basically complete set of the Wolfville *Acadian*, the *Acadian* was uninterested in the trial of Miller and Parker. See: *Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), April – June 1895. Other papers such as the *Presbyterian Witness*, the *Methodist Wesleyan* and the *Chignecto Post* have also been surveyed for the months of April – June 1895, however, they provided little or no coverage of the fire and/or the trial of Parker and Miller for abortion. See: *Presbyterian Witness* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895, *Methodist Wesleyan*, April – June 1895 and *Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), April – June 1895.

<sup>63</sup> *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>64</sup> Even the *Morning Chronicle* out of Halifax which reports with some fervor the failings of the prosecution during the Parker and Miller trial keeps an at least neutral tone on Emma Stirling. The *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor* does not show the same discretion towards Grace Fagan. The *Herald* out of Halifax is quick to point out the Sheriff's faults when he is charged with contempt of court at the end of



---

the trial. See *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895 and *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895.

<sup>65</sup> See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.) April-June 1895 for an example of the considerate treatment of Emma Stirling after the fire in her house. The reaction to the fire will be discussed further in the first chapter.

<sup>66</sup> After the significant coverage the newspapers give the Parker and Miller case their coverage of the verdict is somewhat disappointing. Except for the Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor*, the final reports in most trials do very little to assist the historian in understanding what occurred. They all basically report the verdict and that Grace Fagan, the apparent victim, got married and most report somewhere that the Sheriff was fined for contempt of court. This is particularly surprising concerning the coverage of the *Morning Chronicle* out of Halifax and its evening counterpart the *Echo*. In May, they are particularly loquacious about reporting the early testimony in the trial, particularly that which is harmful to the prosecution and yet by June even the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Echo* have generic reports of the trial's end. Why this is the case is not readily apparent. See: *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>67</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 222

<sup>68</sup> See: *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), April 1895 and *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April 1895

<sup>69</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 3 April 1895 and 24 April 1895.

<sup>70</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April 1895 and *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), April 1895.

<sup>71</sup> *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), 4 April 1895.

<sup>72</sup> *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), 4 April 1895.

<sup>73</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895

<sup>74</sup> Emma Stirling was involved providing evidence against those who failed to follow the laws that restricted alcoholic beverages. She reported a case of doing this in Kentville in her 1894 Superintendent of King County, Nova Scotia report to the Maritime WCTU. This report is contained in the *Annual Report* of the Maritime WCTU for 1894. It is also quoted by Joanne Veer in her work on the WCTU in the Maritime provinces. However, Veer does not refer to Emma Stirling by name, but only as the "Kings County WCTU superintendent." See: Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 103 and *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, 140 [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM. It was not unheard of for people to be attacked or have their property attacked when they were responsible for ensuring that the laws that restricted or banned alcohol were being followed. See: Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 108-109.

<sup>75</sup> There are many areas of Emma Stirling's work that could be explored. While mentioning every aspect that remains unexplored would be a project in itself, a few possibilities for further exploration will be highlighted in this note. While her relationship with her board of directors of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge Society in Scotland has been explored by Philip Girard, Stirling's relationships with other organizations and governments has not been. Her relationship with Ottawa and with provincial politicians or bureaucrats such as George Lawson, the Secretary for Agriculture in Nova Scotia or D.L. Hannington, the member of the New Brunswick legislature for Dorchester, N.B., need to be explored. Emma Stirling hinted at substantial connections with George Lawson in her 1892 version of *Our Children*. She also published a letter in her 1892 book that would suggest a substantial connection with D.L. Hannington. Stirling hinted at difficulties with Ottawa in her 1898 version of *Our Children*. Michael

Anthony Staples makes a somewhat cryptic, and unfootnoted, statement on this subject in his *Middlemore Memories*. Further, while his reports in the *Sessional Papers of Canada* and to Ottawa show that the immigration officer for Halifax was excited about Stirling early on in her time in Nova Scotia, his interest wanes as time moves forward. More work will have to be done with federal government records before Stirling's exact relationship with Ottawa or the federal government's officials can be commented on with great authority. Stirling's connections to other child migration organizations and workers need to be explored. Connections are hinted at in various sources to various migration organizations such as those run by Quarrier, Barnardo, Middlemore, Mrs. Blaikie and Miss Croall. The organizations of Barnardo, Middlemore and Quarrier are certainly much larger undertakings than Emma Stirling's. In addition, work needs to be done to compare Emma Stirling's policies and practices with those of other child migration organizations. For discussion of her relationship with the board of directors of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge Society see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231. For hints at connections to D. L. Hannington and George Lawson, see: Minute book of Directors' Monthly Meeting Stockbridge Day Nursery, Infant Home & branches, Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, [May 1, 1884-September 5, 1889], GD 409/1, vol. 1, NAS and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia* (1892), 117-119 & 137-139. For discussion of Stirling's relationship with Ottawa, see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 177-184 and Staples, *Middlemore Memories*, ix. For the waning trend of interest in the *Sessional Papers of Canada*, see: SP, 49 Victoria – 59 Victoria, 1886-1896. For connections to other child migration organizations and personalities see: Minute books of Directors' Monthly Meeting Stockbridge Day Nursery, Infant Home & branches, Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, [May 1, 1884-October, 1895], GD 409/1, vol. 1 & 2, NAS; *Annual Reports of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge for Prevention of Cruelty to Children*, Royal Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Edinburgh branch, [1886-1889], Royal Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, GD 409/5, vol. 1-4, NAS (the reports for 1886 and 1887 are written by Emma Stirling and also entitled *Our Children*) and *Eastern District Annual Reports*, Scottish National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (SNSPCC), Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Edinburgh branch, [1890-1894], RSSPCC fonds, GD 409/5, vol. 5-9, NAS. Unfortunately the annual reports for 1895 and 1896 (volumes 10 and 11) are wanting. See also: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 154 and Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 225. For the relative size of differing child migration organizations see: Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 259.

<sup>76</sup> See: Joy Parr, "'Transplanting from Dens of Iniquity': Theology and Child Emigration." *A Not Unreasonable Claim*. Edited by Linda Kealey. (Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1979), 169-183 for a general discussion of the importance of Christian belief in the child migration movement.

<sup>77</sup> All these problems were typical problems of the child migration movement aided and abetted by the prejudiced attitude towards home children that abounded. Many child migration books and articles discuss this. See for example: Parr, *Labouring Children*, 32; Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 76-79, Bagnell, *The Little Immigrants*, 156, 175-176 and Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 81-97. An article written for the *New Star* out of Kentville, Nova Scotia in 1887 would suggest that Stirling already recognized some of these problems. Strikingly one of the statements in this article was: "Perhaps I ought to say that while I am 'most anxious' for our children to be useful in their homes, my object is less to 'provide servants' than to find homes where the child is 'actually at home.'" See: *New Star* (Kentville, N.S.), 11 October 1887. This would suggest that Stirling was not unaware of the tendency to see child migrants as mere "servants" and that she was not altogether happy about this tendency. There is also evidence to suggest that sometimes she intervened in problematic situations. There is a letter from an M.P.P. from Dorchester, New Brunswick republished in Stirling's 1892 that would suggest this. It would also suggest it prompted D.L. Hannington, the M.P.P. in question, to fight for a change in the law of New Brunswick. However, a search through *Chignecto Post* out of Sackville, NB (which also covered Dorchester) did not indicate what this incident might have involved or what D.L. Hannington's involvement was. Searches through the published legislative records and some newspapers out of Fredericton and Saint John reveal that while D.L. Hannington was responsible for proposing the bill that would eventually become law there is no indication as to why he did so. Unfortunately from a coverage point of view, this law is passed at the same time as a

bill on women's suffrage was being debated in the New Brunswick legislature. More work will have to be done to try and determine the exact specifics of this situation. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia* (1892), 117-119; *Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), 1888-1889; *Journals of the House of Assembly of the Province of New Brunswick* [hereafter NBJ], 52 Victoria, 1889, 58, 63-64, 90, 92, 94, 109-110, 114 & 128; *Daily Sun* (St. John, N.B.), March – April 1889 and *The Reporter & Fredericton Advertiser* (Fredericton, N.B.), March – April 1895. Philip Girard's work on the Delaney case, a court case that involved a Catholic father named Arthur Delaney who wanted his children returned, however, would indicate that at times Stirling's anti-Catholic attitudes co-opted her actions in regards to children at times. See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231; Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18. However, outside of cases such as the Parker and Miller case or the Delaney case the historian cannot track most of Stirling's children. Even in those cases the historian cannot trace them beyond the end of the case, or in the Delaney case even during the case itself. While there are some lists of Stirling's child migrants and some have tried to correlate the names to later records, there is no conclusive connection to prove what happened to any of Stirling's children. See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18; Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 5-11; *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM and "The People of Western Kings 1785-1901: references for: Sterling Emma." [www.rootsweb.com/~nshkings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm](http://www.rootsweb.com/~nshkings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm). (accessed on various dates 2006-2007) Memoirs of other home children provide unique perspective on the child migrant's experience that differs from the adult perspective. See: Harrison, *The Home Children, passim*; Staples, *Middlemore Memories*, 1-183 and Gail H. Corbett, *Barnardo Children in Canada* (Peterborough, ON: Woodland Publishing, 1981), 79-118. In areas of Stirling's work, such as the Delaney case, Philip Girard has acknowledge the difficulties of understanding "the children's experience" when all the records are from "the adult protagonists' point of view". See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14. For one example, in the records of the Delaney case there are a set of questions Stirling had to answer. Part of one of her answers was: "Arthur Delaney was of such a character as to be an unfit custodian of said children or either of them and because I know from what said children told me when they were in my custody that they did not wish to return to him and were aff [sic] afraid of him." See: "Addendum to the Interrogatory", *Delaney vs. Stirling* (Halifax Supreme Court) [1891], RG 39C, Vol. 396, No. 3071 & 3080, NSARM. Here one has Stirling's interpretation of what the Delaney children said. As Philip Girard has noted, however, Stirling's opinions concerning Delaney are "hardly unbiased". See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 17. This illustrates a major problem for anyone trying to make comment on the success and justification of Stirling's child migration work without having any testimony of the children themselves. Interestingly enough, it does seem that a few of Stirling's children remembered her fondly enough to send donations after the fire so she could rebuild her home. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 23 April and 12 June 1895. However, further research will have to be done before any substantial claims can be made on the basis of these donation records.

<sup>78</sup> For examples of the religiousness of Emma Stirling's writings see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia* (1892), 1-153 and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 1-184. For an example of some of the more feminist remarks Emma Stirling made in her later writings see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 174-177. For an example of where focus on earlier aspects of Emma Stirling's work portrays a more reactionary figure see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231. For a good regional study on the Social Gospel movement see: E. R. Forbes, "Prohibition and the Social Gospel in Nova Scotia", *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 13-40. For a regional discussion of 19<sup>th</sup> Century feminism challenging the opinions of work done outside the region see: E. R. Forbes, "The Ideas of Carol Bacchi and the Suffragists of Halifax: A Review Essay on *Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English-Canadian Suffragists. 1877-1918*" *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 90-99.

---

<sup>79</sup> The friction between these two views is seen in the interactions between Dr. Maria Angwin and Emma Stirling after Angwin reads a paper on heredity at a WCTU district conference. Maria Angwin is arguing for heredity and Emma Stirling is arguing for environment. See: Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. The book that this exchange is found in is the reports of meetings of the District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia 1892-1899. In the inventory list at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management, where this record is housed, it is given a number 2 after the volume number. However, the individual items in the box are not actually labeled with individual numbers. Describing the thoughts of a gentleman observer at this conference on the debate between Angwin and Stirling, the recorder for the conference wrote: "The latter gentleman speaking of the paper on Heredity said we had two sides of the question presented – Dr. Angwin's theory was 'As in Adam all die' – Miss Stirling's was 'so in Christ shall all be made alive.'" See: Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. For information of Maria Angwin see: Carlotta Hacker, *The Indomitable Lady Doctors* (Toronto: Goodread Biographies, 1984), 76-78 and Lois K. Kernaghan, "'Someone wants the Doctor': Maria L. Angwin M.D. (1849-1898)." *Collections of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, Vol. 43 (1991): 33-48. Further, exploration on Stirling's position on the heredity versus environment debate deserves further analysis. Further analysis would allow the historian to place Stirling within this historical debate and see if she differed or conformed to the views seen in either her WCTU or child migration contemporaries. However, to explore all the implications of the debate between Stirling and Angwin would be another project in itself. For a brief discussion of the heredity/environment friction within women's social change movements in Canada around the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century see: Alison Prentice et al, *Canadian Women: A History*. (Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988), 192-193.

<sup>80</sup> For discussion of some of the societal concerns around abortion in Canada during the 19<sup>th</sup> Century see: Constance Backhouse, "Chapter 5: Abortion." *Petticoats and Prejudice: Women and Law in Nineteenth Century Canada* (Toronto: The Women's Press, 1991), 140-166 and Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada," 61-130.

<sup>81</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S), 6 April 1895

## Chapter 1

### Responses to the 1895 Fire at Emma Stirling's House: A Reflection of Support

But that the penalty for a woman doing what the law requires in defence of another woman should be that she and her unoffending household, comprising a number of young children, could be set fire to in the middle of the night, having only time to escape with life, hardly even with that, but to continuing to exist through great suffering and with permanently impaired health, seems a strange episode in a professedly free country like Canada; even for the purpose of “*getting rid*” of so peculiar and inconvenient a person as Miss Stirling, whose only crime (as set forth by the counsel for the prisoners at the mock trial at Bridgetown) was that ‘she had come from Scotland some years ago, and had ever since been posing as a Reformer;’ in plain English, had actively done all the good she could.<sup>1</sup>

The above quotation is taken from the end of the “1895” chapter in Emma Stirling’s 1898 book, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel*. It exemplifies the intense anger Stirling felt about the fire of 1895. It also exemplifies the fact that Stirling was assured that the fire was retribution for her part in the legal proceedings against Robert Parker and Samuel Nelson Miller. The “1895” chapter of Emma Stirling’s 1898 book is filled with similar expressions of anger about the abortion trial of Parker and Miller and the fire of 1895.<sup>2</sup> The intense anger that Stirling expressed in her writings over the fire of 1895 hides a crucial fact – that initially she had supporters after the fire. It is the purpose of this chapter, therefore, to explore the expressions of support found in the newspapers of the day – particularly the *Halifax Herald* and the *Fredericton Daily Gleaner* – in an effort to uncover some of the reaction to the 1895 fire at Stirling’s house. Questions of origins aside, the fire was viewed as unfortunate. Furthermore, while it remains impossible to determine how long Emma Stirling’s support endured after she left the province, initially she did have supporters. Finally, in the

aftermath of the fire of 1895 support remained amongst groups and professions that Emma Stirling had previous affiliations with.

In discussing some of the social factors that encompassed the local reaction to Parker and Miller's arrest and the fire, Girard has written:

The circumstances surrounding Stirling's exit from Nova Scotia reveal that she breached another taboo, but this time one which casts her in a more favourable light in modern eyes. By bringing to light scandalous allegations about two prominent citizens of the Annapolis Valley, Stirling revealed herself to the locals as an interfering outsider who had no right to stir up trouble where residents were content to turn a blind eye. Stirling's experience with rough justice in the Annapolis Valley provides a fascinating window on an insular society with its own subterranean legal order, one understood by the local community but not apparent until its norms were breached by an unsuspecting outsider. When a subscription was started to aid Miss Stirling after her loss, it was, revealingly, begun by a former inhabitant of the county, Pastor J. Clarke of Turner's Falls, Massachusetts.<sup>3</sup>

Appeals for Stirling appeared in the Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* and in three Halifax newspapers. They may have been the same appeal but there is the possibility that these are two different appeals.<sup>4</sup> Whatever the case, evidence from newspapers outside of Bridgetown indicate that it was not just a minister in Massachusetts who deemed Stirling worthy of support. By looking at newspapers further afield and a greater number of newspapers, one discovers that expressions of support abounded and monetary support came in from England, Ontario, the Maritimes, and throughout Nova Scotia, including the Annapolis Valley.<sup>5</sup>

Regardless of whether or not they thought the fire was caused by arson, a number of papers were quite certain that it was a tragedy and that Emma Stirling's enterprise was worthy of support.<sup>6</sup> Many of the newspapers outside of the local area that reported on the fire took their reports from local sources in either Berwick or Annapolis.<sup>7</sup> All these

papers discussed what belongings were destroyed and the reports that came out of Berwick invariably stated: "The children and other inmates were fortunately all saved."<sup>8</sup> Early reports may have been more about the details of what the fire destroyed, but very quickly a sentiment of condolence started to appear in the papers. By the time the *Presbyterian Witness* reported the fire on 6 April 1895 they were expressing a sentiment of "regret" at the event.<sup>9</sup> From the Kentville *Western Chronicle's* first report of the fire there was a sense of outrage on Emma Stirling's behalf. The *Western Chronicle* reported: "Miss Sterling has the sympathy of the better class of people."<sup>10</sup> By 13 April 1895 three of the Halifax papers have published quite long appeals to help Stirling and two of them are entitled "THE CHARITABLE SHOULD HELP."<sup>11</sup> By the 24 April 1895 the Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* was noting that "the destruction of Miss Stirling's Home at Aylesford by fire must have awakened wide-spread feelings of regret" and calling Stirling's work "this most praiseworthy charity".<sup>12</sup> But even the Fredericton *Daily Gleaner* had published an appeal by the WCTU in Fredericton for Stirling's cause two days before one appeared in Bridgetown. This appeal described Stirling's situation as an "emergency" and asked readers to "assist her in this time of need", because "of her work for helpless little ones".<sup>13</sup> By the end of April 1895 people had responded to the newspapers' appeal for Stirling. People had not forgotten her philanthropic work on behalf of children.

Nowhere was this sentiment more apparent than in the papers of Halifax and Fredericton. While the *Herald* was clearly Stirling's Halifax paper of choice, even its competitor the *Morning Chronicle* was willing to publish a request for aid for Stirling's work.<sup>14</sup> On 13 April 1895, the *Morning Chronicle* reports:

About a week ago the asylum for children at Hillfoot, Aylesford, which was established and maintained by Miss Stirling, was totally destroyed by fire. A correspondent thus speaks of the occurrence and urges help for Miss Stirling's house from the charitable public! Miss Stirling was awakened by a noise from the children's apartments. As it increased, she arose, but with no fear that it was anything but the fun of a little fellow, who in his wakeful hours was mischievously bent upon frightening all his comrades. On reaching the long hall where eighteen little ones, all under twelve, slept in rooms adjoining each other, she found the smoke so thick that, as she said, she could not see her hand before her. She found some awakened and up, others in a fright had gone back to bed and covered themselves with the covering. It was impossible for her to move, as she was afraid she would lose her way, but there she stood entreating and encouraging the little ones to come to her until the eighteen has passed before her. Meanwhile the others in the house were aroused, but so rapid was the progress of the fire that they were obliged to flee in their night clothes. Not an article of clothing was saved with the exception of a fur cloak which Miss Stirling has brought for a little boy with rheumatism, and which she threw around him. All her clothing, everything belonging to the children, bedding, furniture, and many articles of value from her home in Scotland were devoured in the flames. Miss Stirling has had 4,000 children under her care. Before she left Scotland she spent \$60, 000 of her private fortune in the work. The property was insured for two-thirds its value, but the loss in furniture, bedding, clothing, food etc, is enormous. It calls for practical sympathy from all who have money to spare.<sup>15</sup>

The correspondent in this was clearly either someone who was close enough to talk to Stirling or was possibly Stirling herself writing in third person. The above quotation is less religious and has slightly different details than the account of the fire in Stirling's 1895 book. However, both the overall tenor and the depth of knowledge of the "correspondent" make it impossible to discount the possibility that the author of the appeals was in fact Stirling.<sup>16</sup>

It is particularly interesting that this request for assistance is found in the *Morning Chronicle*. It was essentially an edited version of the one found in the *Herald* and the *Evening Mail* a couple of days earlier. While it is not surprising that an appeal published originally in the *Herald* should appear in its evening counterpart the *Evening Mail*, it is



more notable that it appeared in its competitor, the *Morning Chronicle*. While the *Herald* and the *Morning Chronicle* were competing newspapers, they also represented different political allegiances. The *Herald* was Conservative and the *Morning Chronicle* was Liberal.<sup>17</sup> Stirling clearly did not approve of Liberals. How individual Liberals felt about her is not clear. The only opinion one has of how Liberals felt towards her is Stirling's own suspect claims that they were responsible for the difficulties she encountered.<sup>18</sup> What the publishing of the appeal for aid in the *Morning Chronicle* would suggest is that at least initially the idea that the fire was a tragedy and that Stirling's enterprises were worthy of aid was not a politically partisan one. Posterity is not privy to what exactly the *Morning Chronicle*'s editors were thinking when they included this request or what exactly the editors thought of the "correspondent's" opinions, but that they were willing to publish it suggests that they were willing to at least entertain the idea that Stirling was deserving of help.

While one cannot determine exactly how supportive the editors of the *Morning Chronicle* were of Stirling's cause, the *Herald* was completely and firmly behind Emma Stirling's cause and the "correspondent's" appeal. On 12 April 1895, the day after its longer version of the appeal was published, the *Herald* stated: "The story of the loss of Miss Stirling's home for children at Aylesford, was told in the HERALD yesterday. Her self-denying and philanthropic work deserves well of the public. Any subscriptions sent in to enable Miss Stirling to rebuild and carry on her work will be acknowledged by the HERALD."<sup>19</sup> The *Herald* was assuredly convinced of Stirling's good character and the good character of her efforts. It described her as "self-denying" and fully commits to reiterating the "correspondent's" appeal for monetary support. The public responded.

The first monetary donation was received and reported by Monday, April 15 and by the end of that week 27 dollars worth of donations had already been recorded in the *Herald*.<sup>20</sup> Stirling's cause and character draws in monetary support almost immediately after the appeals for aid were made and her reputation at least to the *Herald* remains the untarnishable reputation of a "self-denying" woman who works to improve the life of children.

Unlike the Halifax papers, the two Fredericton papers surveyed did not initially report the fire immediately after it happens. Nor were they all that interested in the Parker and Miller abortion case.<sup>21</sup> But some citizens in Fredericton were very interested in helping to restore Stirling's work once they learnt about the fire. The *Daily Gleaner* carried reports of not one but two separate efforts made by different people to raise funds for Stirling's home. The first was started by the Fredericton Union of the WCTU. The second was started by Mr. Z. R. Everett. Both appeals raised 25 dollars each.<sup>22</sup> "The Women's Christian Temperance Union of Fredericton, assisted by many friends" also contributed "two large boxes of made clothing".<sup>23</sup> That Z. R. Everett raised 25 dollars is even more impressive given that the ticket prices to his "lime light views" show were "35 and 25 cents, students 15 cents."<sup>24</sup> Even if everyone paid the most expensive price that was roughly 75 people who would have had to attend and if one considers the average price of 25 cents closer to 100 people would have to have attended. While 25 dollars may not appear large to modern eyes, the *Daily Gleaner* thought that the ticket prices were reasonable and that "with a large attendance" they "would aggregate a handsome donation to any institution."<sup>25</sup> This would indicate that 25 dollars was a fairly substantial donation. Twenty-five dollars was the largest single amount donated by one person or

one group even amongst the donations reported in the *Halifax Herald*.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, the citizens of Fredericton raised more money in two appeals combined than any other specific location with the exception of Halifax. What makes Fredericton outstanding is that they did not care about Stirling's involvement in the Parker and Miller abortion case; they only cared what they could do to help her charitable work.

The fact that Emma Stirling's charitable reputation was considered stellar is made clear in the reports of the two fundraising campaigns in Fredericton. Certain elements of Fredericton society embraced Stirling when she was there for the WCTU convention in 1894. The Fredericton WCTU did not forget this.<sup>27</sup> Nor did they lessen their laudatory view of Stirling's work. The final report of how much the WCTU of Fredericton contributed to Stirling's "Orphanage" read:

Miss Sterling, who has given herself and a large inherited property to the work of caring for these little ones may be remembered by the citizens of Fredericton as a delegate to the Maritime W.C.T.U. Convention held in this city last September. The philanthropic work now so well-known on both sides of the water drew an interested audience on that occasion to listen to her trials and triumphs.<sup>28</sup>

The use of the term "given herself" suggests that like the *Halifax Herald* the WCTU of Fredericton saw Stirling as "self-denying." The last line of the above quote is important, however, because it indicates not only that Stirling's efforts were seen as humanitarian, but that they had garnered her some fame. It also suggests that given the 50 dollars (plus clothing) that the two appeals in Fredericton were able to raise that Stirling was able to present herself in such a way the September previous that people would regard her favourably just over half a year later when she required assistance. That Stirling should be well "remembered" in her time is particularly interesting given what Philip Girard has termed the "subsequent obliteration" of Emma Stirling's history.<sup>29</sup> Whatever happened to

Stirling's reputation later, in Fredericton in the spring of 1895 the WCTU and their supporters were still utterly convinced of the goodness of Stirling's child-saving operation.

The reports on Z.R. Everett's fundraising drive reiterated these sentiments with an even greater degree of fervor. The *Daily Gleaner* reported Mr. Everett's reasons for putting together such a fundraising event as: "He wished to assist a charitable institution in Nova Scotia, which is of incalculable benefit to poor orphans and which at present time is much in need of help."<sup>30</sup> Here is the recurring theme that Emma Stirling was worthy of largesse because of her work with children. Before Mr. Everett's event takes place, the *Daily Gleaner* extolled its readership that because the monetary sums collected would be given to Stirling's efforts "for that reason alone the citizens should give Mr. Everett a liberal patronage."<sup>31</sup> Further, the *Daily Gleaner*, moralizing in the midst of its report of how the event went, stated that "people should, like Mr. Everett, consider it a duty to attend things got up for charity's sake."<sup>32</sup> In essence, assisting Stirling was portrayed as something akin to a moral "duty". Her efforts were associated with philanthropy and that was considered a "duty". Therefore, for citizens of Fredericton such as Z. R. Everett and the writer of the *Daily Gleaner* articles Stirling's reputation was without question a favourable one.

By June 1895, over two hundred dollars had been raised in response to these various appeals that extolled the virtues of Emma Stirling's work for children. Roughly half the funds came from groups or individuals in the two cities of Halifax and Fredericton.<sup>33</sup> Donations showed pockets of support in Truro, Pictou, Great Village and Arichat, Nova Scotia. A substantial donation also came in from London, Ontario and a

donation came in from London, England as well.<sup>34</sup> More significantly, about an eighth of the money raised came from the three counties of Hants, Kings and Annapolis -- three counties in close proximity to Aylesford. In fact, of the 30 dollars from these three counties two thirds of it came from within the immediate vicinity of Aylesford. Ten dollars came from Morden in Kings County and ten dollars came from Aylesford itself.<sup>35</sup> Also coming from these three counties was "20 yards of dress goods from Mrs. Goodfellow, Annapolis".<sup>36</sup> Support did come from various locations within and outside of Nova Scotia. There were also still people within the communities surrounding Aylesford who still believed Stirling had done good works and would continue do so and they offered her monetary and other support demonstrating their belief in this.

Just over two hundred dollars may not seem a substantial amount of money, but it must be remembered that the amount in dollars does not tell the entire story of support for Stirling. But when one considers another of Stirling's fundraising options the two hundred dollars is substantial. At the 1894 conference of the Maritime WCTU, it was reported that the "literature committee would be very glad to take orders for Miss Stirling's book, price 53 cents."<sup>37</sup> As Rippey and Harvie have noted Stirling's *Our Children* books "were sold to raise money for the cause."<sup>38</sup> To raise the amount that the appeals in the newspapers did, Stirling would have had to sell around 400 books at the WCTU's 1894 price, and, therefore, over two hundred dollars in donations was quite substantial.<sup>39</sup> There are also indications that not all donations made it into the *Herald*. Z. R. Everett's donation, which was submitted to the bank at the end of May, was not referenced in the *Herald*. Twenty-five dollars was acknowledged in the *Herald* from Fredericton in connection what has been established as the WCTU appeal, but the

donations of clothing from the WCTU in Fredericton were missing from the *Herald's* report.<sup>40</sup> These omissions, whatever the reason for them, may indicate that there were other donations that were not recorded at all or simply not recorded in the same place and have yet to be uncovered.

More important, however, than possible omissions is the fact that these single records of donations sometimes hide the number of people behind the donation. The "22.50 from Truro, per Miss Jessie C. Smith", reported on 21 May 1895, was actually a combined donation of smaller donations from 14 different people, whose names were duly recorded in the acknowledgement.<sup>41</sup> But this was not the case with other group donations. It was reported on 16 May 1895 that twenty-two dollars had been received "[f]rom staff of the bank of Nova Scotia, Halifax."<sup>42</sup> One has no clear picture of how many members of the staff of the bank donated to the cause. Furthermore, although Mr. Everett's donation was not recorded at all in the *Herald*, the one of the WCTU of Fredericton was, but once again no indication was given of how many people were behind the 25 dollars donated. The WCTU donation out of Fredericton was simply described as "per Mrs. A. F. Randolph".<sup>43</sup> As was noted, one can estimate that between 75 and 100 people roughly attended Everett's event, but the WCTU report from Fredericton gave no clear indication of numbers.<sup>44</sup> "The Women's Christian Temperance Union of Fredericton, assisted by many friends," as the line in the *Daily Gleaner's* report of the WCTU contribution to Emma Stirling's cause read, does not indicate how many "friends" or members there were.<sup>45</sup> In addition, donations such as the ones from the "Great Village W.C.T.U." or the "Great Village children of Golden Age band of hope" were clearly group donations.<sup>46</sup> What this indicates is that clearly there were more

people in numbers that support Stirling than counting the individual donations would indicate. There are pockets of support that would be missed if one does not consider the group dynamic of some these donations.

Further, while monetary donations are a tangible way to measure support, there are many ways of expressing sympathy that are not as tangible. There may very well have been people who had great respect and admiration for Stirling, but could not afford to donate money. As the appeals in the three Halifax newspapers all tellingly read: "It calls for practical sympathy from all who have money to spare."<sup>47</sup> There may have been those who could not afford such "practical sympathy" even if they had wanted to.

Further, three donations of clothing are known about, but only one was accounted for in the *Herald's* acknowledgements. There may have been other donations of clothing that went unacknowledged in the *Herald*.<sup>48</sup> Clothing was no less important than money as a donation. In Stirling's 1892 book, she requested "[c]ontributions of money and clothing" with equal emphasis and a significant number of the donations noted in the appendix to the 1892 book were ones of clothing.<sup>49</sup> In 1895, clothing was definitely required. Emma Stirling noted that those who experienced the fire had no pieces of apparel left.<sup>50</sup> It is much harder to place an exact value on those three donations of clothing. Considering, however, the people who had survived the fire had almost no clothing one can conclude that donations of clothing were valuable. While to some extent clothing donations are tangible, in that they are occasionally recorded although their exact value is impossible to determine, there are other forms of more intangible aid for which the value or potential value cannot be determined.

Not all the appeals asked solely for money or clothing. The appeal in the *Weekly Monitor* of Bridgetown exemplified this. It read: "Pastor J. Clark, suggests that all who can do so volunteer their assistance by giving their time and labor in the work of re-construction. It would be a grand thing to do."<sup>51</sup> Here was an appeal to which someone who could not give money could have responded. The problem for the historian is that it is completely immeasurable. There is no way to determine how many people would have donated "their time and labour in the work of re-construction"<sup>52</sup> if Emma Stirling had stayed. Clearly, her supporters such as the *Herald* assumed she was staying. The *Herald's* call for donations read: "Any subscriptions sent in to enable Miss Stirling to rebuild and carry on her work will be acknowledged by the HERALD." Further, the acknowledgements found in the *Herald* suggested that Stirling herself originally believed she was staying. The acknowledgement of donations in the *Herald* for the 16 May 1895 began: "Miss Stirling acknowledges the following subscription to her new 'home' in Aylesford...."<sup>53</sup> The word "new" at least hints at the possibility that Stirling was going to rebuild. Clearly, those who published and put forth the appeals thought she was staying. The use of the terms "re-construction" or "rebuild" in the *Weekly Monitor* and the *Herald's* calls for aid are illustrative of this. The call for physical contributions to the actual work of restoring the house at Hillfoot farm, exist, but they depended on the assumption that Stirling was going to stay and because Stirling did not stay posterity will never know how much support this particular appeal might have garnered.

Stirling's support was certainly concentrated amongst certain groups of people. It has not yet been possible to identify conclusively the majority of those whose names were listed among the people who gave monetary donations. However, it is possible to



identify the profession or group affiliations of some of the donors. Roughly between a quarter and a fifth of all known monetary donations and two thirds of the known clothing donations came from either individuals in the profession of ministry or groups that were explicitly Christian such as the WCTU.<sup>54</sup> One can identify five ministers who made individual donations and two of these donations were substantial ones of ten dollars each. Further, one other minister lent his name to an appeal on behalf of Emma Stirling's rebuilding project.<sup>55</sup> That heavy support came from the WCTU and the profession of ministry is not surprising. As was discussed in the last chapter, Stirling was a member of the WCTU, she shared some of the same goals with the WCTU and she was writing her 1898 book, in part, as an appeal to the WCTU. Ministers or their wives, particularly Methodist ministers or their wives, had always been amongst the Stirling's supporters in Nova Scotia as well.<sup>56</sup> Methodists were also strong supporters of the WCTU.<sup>57</sup> As of yet, it has not been possible to determine what denomination the ministers who sent monetary support to Emma Stirling after the fire were affiliated with.<sup>58</sup> It is also quite possible that other known monetary donations were given by people who were affiliated with the WCTU as that affiliation was not always identified in the *Herald's* acknowledgements.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore, it could be argued that the Z.R. Everett donation also had a connection to the WCTU. The response Everett achieved probably was dependant in part on the reputation Stirling built in Fredericton while at the WCTU convention in September of 1894.<sup>60</sup> What the donations after the fire clearly show is that Stirling continued to find support among groups with which she had an affiliation.

It cannot be claimed that Emma Stirling's reputation was stellar amongst everyone. Nor can it be claimed that she did not have her detractors. There may still

have been people in Nova Scotia who did not appreciate her efforts or her attitudes.

There may still have been pockets of people who harboured resentment against her from incidents earlier in her time in Nova Scotia.<sup>61</sup> The 1895 newspapers and other sources do not, however, highlight her detractors. Emma Stirling believed that she had opponents who were vicious enough to burn down her house and drive her out of Nova Scotia.<sup>62</sup> However, how much of a threat to Stirling and her children really existed with the court's refusal to punish Parker and Miller is immeasurable.

The other unknown is how people reacted when the donations they had sent were not used to rebuild in Nova Scotia as some people clearly expected. One also does not know what impact the court's verdict and Emma Stirling's refusal to accept it had on people's opinion of her.<sup>63</sup> In September 1895, the Maritime Union of the WCTU was still supportive of her even after the trial of Parker and Miller was over. They even formed a committee to consider monetary donations.<sup>64</sup> Clearly, Stirling still thought the Maritime WCTU would support her and her opinion of events when she wrote her book published in 1898 several years later. However, as of yet, their reaction to the more virulent and fanatical aspects of Stirling's 1898 book remains a mystery.<sup>65</sup> One cannot form conclusions regarding whether or not some of her supporters remained sympathetic once she left the province. One can conclude that she still had the support of the WCTU after she left the province, but how long their support endured remains unclear.

Initially, however, Emma Stirling had support surrounding the fire. Notwithstanding questions about the origin of the fire, newspapers of the day viewed the fire at Stirling's home as a tragedy. People responded to the newspapers' calls for aid for Stirling in the wake of the fire. Furthermore, people responded to appeals put forth by

groups such as the WCTU and individuals such as Z.R. Everett. It remains impossible to determine how long Stirling's support continued once she departed Nova Scotia. However, initially she had support. Furthermore, support initially remained amongst religious groups that Stirling had previous connections with. Particularly important was the support of the Maritime WCTU and some of its affiliated unions. Sympathy remained for Stirling within the Maritime WCTU even after the end of the Parker and Miller abortion trial and Stirling's removal of herself from Nova Scotia. The support of segments of the Maritime WCTU in the aftermath of the 1895 fire confirms the importance of Stirling's connection to the WCTU. Thus, this thesis now turns to exploring Stirling's work with the WCTU.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (Coatesville, PA: C.N. Speakman, 1898), 173-174. (Italics in the original). The term "getting rid" comes from an 1897 article from the *Witness* (Montreal) that came from Halifax and was republished in Stirling's 1898 book. See page 171.

<sup>2</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-177.

<sup>3</sup> Philip Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95." *Myth, Migration and the Making of Memory: Scotia and Nova Scotia c. 1700-1990*. Edited by Marjory Harper and Michael E. Vance, (Halifax: The Gorsebrook Research Institute, 1999), 226.

<sup>4</sup> The Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* read: "A subscription list has been opened at the agency of the Bank of Nova Scotia here". It is unclear, however, whether "here" was Bridgetown, where Pastor J. Clarke was located or somewhere else. See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 24 April 1895. The "correspondent" in the Halifax papers was anonymous so it could have been Pastor J. Clarke. However, the detail in the appeals suggests someone who was in close proximity to the fire and to Emma Stirling. The writer in the Halifax appeals, which were obviously from the same source, seem to have either taken what they composed from the story Stirling told them about the fire or the writer may have even been Stirling herself. The detail in the papers is similar in tenor to Stirling's account published in the 1898 edition of *Our Children*. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 April 1895; and the *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895. For comparison see: Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 159-177. The way the resulting donations were acknowledged may also indicate that some donations were put through the bank, while others were sent to Emma Stirling directly or to the *Herald*. Some of the donations were acknowledged as "per bank of Nova Scotia" while others were simply "Miss Stirling acknowledges" with no mention of the bank. There were also those with "The HERALD acknowledges". See *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 12 April 1895, 15 April 1895, 17 April 1895, 10 May 1895 and 22 May 1895. This may indicate that there were different appeals with different methods of achieving donations for Miss Stirling or that it was all part of one appeal in Nova Scotia that had different ways people could donate. Whatever the case the money was all going to Stirling.

<sup>5</sup> These places were collected from the acknowledgements in the *Herald* (Halifax, N. S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>6</sup> The Halifax *Herald* did not state its opinion on whether the fire was set with malicious intent or not. However, the *Herald* took up the cause of assisting Emma Stirling to a great degree. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 4 April 1895, 11 April 1895, and 12 April 1895. The *Morning Chronicle*, on the other hand, did suggest arson, but also published an appeal for Emma Stirling. See: the *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 6 April 1895 and 13 April 1895. Unfortunately, however, a number of the Annapolis Valley newspapers such as Berwick no longer have copies from the 1895 period still in existence. For what newspapers still exist see: *Nova Scotia Newspapers: A Directory and Union List 1752-1988*. Compiled by Lynn Murphy. Catalogued by Brenda Hicks. With assistance from Anjali Vohra. (Halifax: Dalhousie University School of Library and Information Studies, 1990).

<sup>7</sup> The *Herald* carried two reports of the fire, one from Annapolis and one from Berwick. The rest of the Halifax papers below all carried reports from Berwick. Whether these were actually the same reports that appeared in the Annapolis and Berwick papers cannot be determined. (See previous footnote). The *Daily Sun* out of St. John referenced Halifax as its source, but in discussing the losses in the fire and the people affected it revealed itself as basically the report the Halifax papers gathered from Berwick. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 4 April 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 3 April 1895; *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), 3 April 1895; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 3 April 1895 and the *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), 4 April 1895.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), 3 April 1895. See also: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 4 April 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 3 April 1895; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 3 April 1895 and the *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), 4 April 1895. The Annapolis report found in the *Herald* had different phrasing and was actually more likely to elicit sympathy for Miss Stirling and the children. It also claimed there were 80 children in the house, which was about 60 over the actual number. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 4 April 1895. The phrasing of the report was different in both Kentville and Bridgetown as well and Kentville was the only paper surveyed not to make specific reference to the danger the people in the house endured. See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 3 April 1895 and *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895.

<sup>9</sup> *The Presbyterian Witness* (Halifax, N.S.) 6 April 1895.

<sup>10</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.) 6 April 1895. Both *The Presbyterian Witness* and the *Western Chronicle* were weeklies as opposed to the Halifax dailies or tri-weeklies so by the time they made their first reports of the fire the events had a little time to percolate among the people.

<sup>11</sup> This column appeared in both the *Herald* and the *Evening Mail* on April 11, under the title mentioned. A shortened version appeared in the *Morning Chronicle* on April 13 under a different title. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895 and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 April 1895.

<sup>12</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 24 April 1895.

<sup>13</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 22 April 1895.

<sup>14</sup> The *Halifax Herald* was where all donations were acknowledged by Stirling. They were often repeated in the *Herald's* evening counterpart the *Evening Mail*. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895. However, the *Morning Chronicle* did pick up the specific appeal made in the other two papers. See: *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 April 1895.

<sup>15</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 April 1895. There are paragraph breaks in the original, however, they have been removed to assist with the flow of the paper.

<sup>16</sup> For comparison see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with Sequel* (1898), 159-165. Differences may also be accounted for in that the 1898 book was written with the benefit of hindsight and with the fact that there was a substantial time gap between these accounts. However, it cannot be proven whether Stirling herself was the anonymous correspondent or not. The impressiveness of how much detail the “correspondent” seems to have is greater when one considers the *Herald's* version of this same appeal. The two appeals obviously were from the same “correspondent”, but the *Herald's* earlier account was even longer and provided more detail. One extra passage from the *Herald* account read: “The little ones were quickly sent to the boy’s home under the charge of a matron, about a mile away; but Miss Sterling was obliged to remain in the open air until six o’clock, to watch the barn that sheltered the cattle and horses. Thirty barrels of flour, supplies of food and clothing for future use, have all gone. Ten minutes after they left the building the floor of the children’s apartments fell in.” See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April, 1895. While compared to Stirling’s account this passage from the *Herald* overestimates the time before the building collapsed and how far the other house was and underestimates how long Stirling had to wait to ensure nothing else caught on fire, the specific information just this one passage contained was substantial. Exact timing and distance discrepancies could certainly be considered a difference caused by the time difference between the accounts. For comparison see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 162-163.

<sup>17</sup> See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895 and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 April 1895 for the column. It is quite clear from reading the *Herald* and the *Morning Chronicle* that they were not particularly enamoured with each other. My thanks to one of the duty archivists at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management for confirming the political

---

allegiances of the Halifax papers. References to the *Chronicle* and the *Herald*'s political allegiances can also be found in: E. R. Forbes, "Battles in Another War: Edith Archibald and the Halifax Feminist Movement." *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 82 and David Frank, "The 1920s: Class and Region, Resistance and Accommodation." *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*. Edited by E. R. Forbes and D. A. Muise (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 254. That the *Evening Mail* and the *Herald* were both published by the *Herald*'s publishing company can be seen in the *Nova Scotia Newspapers: A Directory and Union List 1752-1988*. Compiled by Lynn Murphy. Catalogued by Brenda Hicks. With assistance from Anjali Vohra. (Halifax: Dalhousie University School of Library and Information Studies, 1990).

<sup>18</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel....* (1898), 168 for these views on "Liberals".

<sup>19</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 12 April 1895.

<sup>20</sup> Some of these early donations were recorded as "The HERALD acknowledges" and others were recorded as "Miss Sterling thankfully acknowledges" suggesting perhaps that some donations were going to the *Herald* and others going to Emma Stirling directly. See *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 15 April 1895, 16 April 1895, 17 April 1895 and 18 April 1895. There is no 13 April 1895 edition in the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management collection of the *Herald* possibly because it was the Easter Weekend. Other papers such as the *Acadian Recorder* did not publish on Friday the 12<sup>th</sup> (Good Friday).

<sup>21</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), April – June 1895 and *The Reporter and Fredericton Advertiser* (Fredericton, N.B.), April – July 17, 1895. These papers did not initially mention the fire at Emma Stirling's home although they did mention another fire that happened in Aylesford later in the spring almost immediately after it happened. See: *The Reporter and Fredericton Advertiser* (Fredericton, N.B.), 23 May 1895 and *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 17 May 1895. These two Fredericton papers were also supremely uninterested in the Parker and Miller abortion case. Only one reference to the case could be found while surveying these two papers for the months of April – June (into July in the case of the weekly of these two papers) 1895. See: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 1 April 1895 (misprinted March first) for the one time found that the Parker and Miller abortion case was reported. The Halifax papers reporting of the fire has been noted, but the lack of interest in Fredericton paid to Miller and Parker case is remarkably different than that of Halifax. The newspapers of Halifax, particularly the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Echo*, were excessively diligent in their reporting on this case. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>22</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 22 April 1895, 22 May 1895, 25 May 1895, 27 May 1895, 28 May 1895 and 8 June 1895. Where the donations from these Fredericton appeals end up may also indicate that there were different ways to donate to Stirling's cause. The WCTU donations seemed to have gone to Stirling herself and the donations that Mr. Everett collected went to the Bank of Nova Scotia to be "placed to the credit of Miss Sterling's home for destitute immigrant children..." *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 8 June 1895. See also: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895.

<sup>23</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895.

<sup>24</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 22 May 1895.

<sup>25</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 28 May 1895.

<sup>26</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>27</sup> Emma Stirling is treated quite well by the citizens of Fredericton during the 1894 convention. See *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 21 September -- 27 September 1894 and 22 April 1895.

---

<sup>28</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895.

<sup>29</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 222. For further discussion of this topic, see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231.

<sup>30</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 28 May 1895.

<sup>31</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 27 May 1895.

<sup>32</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 28 May 1895.

<sup>33</sup> There were 218 dollars in donations between what was reported in the Halifax *Herald* and the 25 dollars from Z.R. Everett that did not make it into the *Herald*. Plus there was a donation of 2.25 pounds sterling from Emma Stirling's London publishers. As of yet, the conversion rate of 1895 has not been located. There were 50 dollars from Fredericton and at least 62 dollars from Halifax. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 8 June 1895. There may have been 10 dollars more from Halifax if the "Rev. Dr. Gordon" referred to in the 18 April 1895 *Herald* was Daniel Miner Gordon who held a substantial position at the Presbyterian College (Halifax) in 1895. See: "Gordon, Daniel Miner." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*. [www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=42297&query=Gordon](http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=42297&query=Gordon). (accessed on various dates 2007).

<sup>34</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895. The exact connection between "E. Leonard & sons, London Ontario" who sent a \$20 donation and Emma Stirling remains unclear. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 21 May 1895. The donation from London, England was "John Townsend & Co." who were the publishers of Emma Stirling's 1892 book.

<sup>35</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – May 1895. See particularly: 17 April 1895 and 14 May 1895.

<sup>36</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 21 May 1895.

<sup>37</sup> *Annual Report*, The Maritime WCTU, 30 [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, NSARM.

<sup>38</sup> Mary Louise Rippey and Leland Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm". *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999), 6.

<sup>39</sup> Stirling could not rely on her books either to generate revenue in their own right in 1895 nor could she count on the sale of those books to entice people to send other support. In the preface to 1898 edition of *Our Children*, Stirling noted that what "few copies were left on hand" of the 1892 book "shared the fate of all my other books and effects in the terrible fire...." See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia with Sequel....* (1898), 3.

<sup>40</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895. See particularly: 27 May 1895. *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895 and 8 June 1895. Emma Stirling did send a note "of grateful thanks and acknowledgement" to the WCTU in Fredericton, but whether she mentioned the clothing donation in that letter is unknown. The WCTU in Fredericton seemed assured that the clothing went along with the money, however. See: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895. But the clothing donation was not recorded in the *Herald*. Why Z.R. Everett's donation and the clothing donation from Fredericton are missing is not known. It may have been that by the end of May when the Parker Miller abortion trial was becoming busier Emma Stirling missed a few details in what donations came in. On the other, it may be that with what seems to be three different locations for money to go the *Herald*, the Bank of Nova Scotia and Emma Stirling directly there may have been some confusion over what donations came in etc.

<sup>41</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 21 May 1895.

- 
- <sup>42</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 16 May 1895.
- <sup>43</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 27 May 1895.
- <sup>44</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895 and 8 June 1895.
- <sup>45</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895.
- <sup>46</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 10 May 1895.
- <sup>47</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895 and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 April 1895.
- <sup>48</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 21 May 1895 and 27 May 1895; *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 May 1895. The only reason the two parcels of clothing from Fredericton are known is because they were referenced in the Fredericton paper. It is possible there were other donations of clothing that were mentioned in local papers that either no longer exist or have not yet been surveyed concerning Emma Stirling.
- <sup>49</sup> Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (London: John Haddon & Co., 1892), 154-158.
- <sup>50</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 163.
- <sup>51</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 24 April 1895.
- <sup>52</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 24 April 1895.
- <sup>53</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 16 May 1895. From Emma Stirling's accounts it would appear what really caused her to leave was her fear in the aftermath of the Parker and Miller abortion case when it did not end the way she anticipated. The fire in itself might not have driven her away from Nova Scotia. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia with Sequel....* (1898), 159-177. See also: Philip Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia." *Children's Voices in Atlantic Literature and Culture: Essays on Childhood*. Edited by Hilary Thompson, (Guelph: Canadian Children's Press, 1995), 18.
- <sup>54</sup> See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.) April – June 1895.
- <sup>55</sup> See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Halifax, N.S.), 24 April 1895.
- <sup>56</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia* (1892), 135-143.
- <sup>57</sup> See: Marlene J. Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society." (M.A. Thesis, Saint Mary's University, 2001), 158-159 & 169.
- <sup>58</sup> See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Halifax, N.S.), 24 April 1895.
- <sup>59</sup> See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.) April – June 1895.
- <sup>60</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 21-27 September 1894 and April – June 1895.
- <sup>61</sup> Philip Girard would contend there were those who Emma Stirling did not impress in Nova Scotia. See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18



---

and Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231.

<sup>62</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-184. For other discussion of this topic in the secondary literature see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231.

<sup>63</sup> So far no evidence of reaction to the 1898 book has been found

<sup>64</sup> *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, 19 [1895], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 3, NSARM.

<sup>65</sup> The Maritime WCTU turned into three unions to represent each province (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island) at the end of their 1895 conference. Emma Stirling's book received no mention in the reports of the annual conventions of the Nova Scotia WCTU of the late 1890s. Nor was her death noted in the 1908 annual convention report of that organization as Stirling died in 1907 after the date of the Nova Scotia WCTU's 1907 convention. More work would have to be done in later WCTU records in the Maritime provinces to see if Stirling's book is mentioned anywhere. See: *Annual Reports*, Nova Scotia WCTU [1896-1908], microfilm no. 16926, NSARM.

## Chapter 2: Emma Stirling and the WCTU

In the issue of the Union Signal, Aug. 6<sup>th</sup>, Miss Willard contributed a most interesting article entitled "Six Weeks of Work in Queen's Dominion," in which she gives a bright and racey account of her visits to the various towns in which she held meetings while in Canada. We subjoin a few extracts: --

'To Aylesford in the Acadian valley, came some years since, Miss Emily [sic] Maitland Sterling, of Edinboro [sic], a cultivated and wealthy Scotch woman, who has expended of her own funds, fifty thousand dollars to bring out friendless boys and girls from her own country, training them on the farm she had here bought and fitted for their use, and finding homes for them. Greatest of all Miss Sterling has given herself to this cause and does not hesitate to perform any task to help her children. Miss Sterling is president of the local W.C.T.U., and will, I hope come to Boston to the great convention in November next (13 to 18). It was good to hear her speak as she did in my meeting in Annapolis, N.S., about her work, and to hear the "three times three and a tiger" given by her audience. Surely in the beautiful blossoming of modern philanthropy our Heavenly Father has 'set the solitary in families' after a new order, and to thousands of children worse than parentless the mother-hearts of women turn who never has little ones whom they could call 'their very own.'<sup>1</sup>

The above quotation is taken from the 20 August 1891 issue of the *Chignecto Post* of Sackville, New Brunswick. The article was excerpts from an article written by Frances Willard, an American who was the World President of the WCTU. Willard clearly chose to highlight Stirling in her article. This indicates that by 1891 Stirling had become involved enough with the WCTU to bring herself and her child migration work even to the attention of the WCTU's World President. Thus, this chapter will explore Stirling's WCTU work, particularly after she became Kings County Superintendent in 1893.<sup>2</sup> It will illustrate that by her last few years in Nova Scotia, Stirling's work for children had broadened – it had moved beyond child migration – into improving the lives of Nova Scotian children and young people, both native and transplanted, in an effort to protect the children against apparently sinful influences.

By Stirling's last few years in Nova Scotia the number of children she was receiving from Scotland had lessened. Girard has noted that "the steady supply of children which she needed for Hillfoot Farm had dwindled over the years, imperilling its future."<sup>3</sup> One must be careful, however, not to over exaggerate this trend. At the time of the fire in 1895, there were still "nineteen children, of these eighteen below twelve years old" in the main house at Hillfoot Farm.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the report of the federal immigration agent out of Halifax for the year of 1894 noted that eleven children came under the auspices of Stirling that year.<sup>5</sup> It is also possible that children sent under the auspices of other organizations availed themselves of Stirling's already existing amenities.<sup>6</sup> However, when one compares the numbers of children specifically registered to Stirling from 1894 to the numbers from a year such as 1887 the difference is striking. Over eighty arrived in the year of 1887 alone.<sup>7</sup> While it is important not to overestimate the decline in the number of children that were sent to Stirling, there was a significant difference in numbers between her early years in Nova Scotia and her later years.

However, when Stirling reports on her WCTU work a clear progression of increasing activity can be seen, which corresponds to the reduction in the number of migrant children that arrive on a yearly basis. In her 1898 book, Stirling briefly recounts her experiences with the WCTU from April 1888 to March 1894. Commenting on the initial plea in April 1888 to start a WCTU group in Aylesford, Stirling wrote:

I said NO. First, because at the time I did not know anything about the W.C.T.U.; secondly, because I had enough to do in looking after so large a party; thirdly, because, being a stranger, I did not feel that my efforts were likely to do any good until I had time to get acquainted with the inhabitants. However, even then I was frequently asked to give temperance addresses in various places; and was always willing to do this, or anything else to help the cause of temperance.<sup>8</sup>

Aside from unfamiliarity with the WCTU and the area, her other major reason for not becoming involved with the WCTU was that her time is being taken up by her child migration work. The “party” Stirling was referring to was a group of around 25 children who arrived in late March 1888. By May 1888 another 17 children had arrived.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, by May 1888 there were between 40 and 50 new arrivals added to however many children still remained at Hillfoot farm from previous groups of immigrant children. Suffice to say that a large group of migrant children was partially responsible for Stirling’s refusal to take up any WCTU work in 1888.

Even when Stirling first became involved with the WCTU there are indications that other work may have reduced the amount of time that she had available to carry out her WCTU activities. In her 1892 book, when writing about the 1890 formation of the Aylesford WCTU, Stirling stated: “The members asked me to become president, to which I agreed, on condition that I should be excused if hindered by causes over which I had no control. To this they agreed, and have been most forbearing, and we have quite a flourishing though small Union.”<sup>10</sup> Given that child migration was what brought Stirling to Nova Scotia and was part of her work that was mentioned in newspapers even when they are talking about her connection to the WCTU, the “causes over which I had no control” Stirling refers to likely have to do with child migration.<sup>11</sup> Whatever the reason, clearly in 1890 when Stirling first joined the WCTU there were other matters that could take away from her ability to perform WCTU responsibilities.

However, by the mid 1890s the situation had changed. In 1893, Stirling became Superintendent of Kings County, Nova Scotia for the WCTU, thereby, taking on greater responsibilities for work with the WCTU.<sup>12</sup> In her 1894 report as Superintendent of the

Kings County, Nova Scotia WCTU, Stirling noted that aspects of her WCTU work was “a steady and increasing demand on my time and will continue to be so unless the very pressing work in our rural district is to be ignored, and consequently left to die a natural death.”<sup>13</sup> This highlights how important Stirling felt her WCTU work was, but it also highlights that more and more of her time was being devoted to efforts under the auspices of the WCTU. In 1894, gone are the concerns about the WCTU interfering with her child migration work or other work interfering with her WCTU efforts. While it would be incorrect to say that Stirling’s work with the WCTU replaced completely her work in child migration, one can see a shift to an increased volume of WCTU work. Moreover, by 1894 Stirling no longer felt that her WCTU work would impact negatively on her work with child migration, and this may be because she was receiving fewer child migrants.

If her child migration work brought her into contact with government officials such as George Lawson, Secretary for Agriculture for Nova Scotia<sup>14</sup>, Stirling’s WCTU work brought her into contact with prominent female historical figures. As was noted in the quotation at the opening of this chapter, Frances Willard, World President of the WCTU, invited Stirling to the World Convention of the WCTU in 1891.<sup>15</sup> Stirling did go to that convention and she was quite pleased at this invitation. Stirling wrote:

Last November I was much honoured by being sent at the request of Miss Willard, as the delegate from Nova Scotia to the World’s Convention of the W.C.T.U., held in Boston, which can never be forgotten by any who witnessed it, and the words spoken there by many of God’s servants must surely bear fruit for many days to come.<sup>16</sup>

The *Western Chronicle* of Kentville even noted that at “the recent W.C.T.U. convention in Boston” Stirling “was one of the speakers.”<sup>17</sup> The invitation to the World Convention

is quite impressive. This invitation was issued in 1891 and Stirling was not even the Superintendent of Kings County yet. She was merely the president of a town's WCTU. Frances Willard was clearly impressed by Stirling's child migration work, but it is not clear whether this is the reason Stirling was invited to the convention or whether it has to do with Stirling's abilities to speak on the temperance cause. Likewise, it is unclear as to what exactly Stirling spoke on in Boston.<sup>18</sup>

By 1894, Stirling's work on prohibition tasks was being complimented by Edith Archibald, then president of the Maritime WCTU and women's suffrage proponent, in her 1894 report as president of the Maritime WCTU.<sup>19</sup> In June 1894, at the convention of the District WCTU of Nova Scotia, Stirling actually critiqued a paper given by Dr. Maria Angwin, the first female medical doctor in Halifax and at one time Maritime Superintendent of Hygiene and Heredity for the WCTU. The debate centred around whether "moral qualities" were hereditary. It particularly focused on the subject of whether there was an "alcoholic heredity". Maria Angwin's paper argued the side for heredity. Stirling argued the side for environment.<sup>20</sup> By 1894, therefore, not only had Stirling's work garnered the attention of prominent women within the Maritime WCTU, but Stirling was not afraid to critique the views of prominent members either.

Moreover, by 1894, amongst the circles of the Maritime WCTU and their supporters, Stirling's opinions, speeches, and work with children had gained some renown and respect. In June 1894, at the District Union of Western Nova Scotia Convention, Stirling gave two speeches.<sup>21</sup> One of them was described by the convention recorder in great detail. The recorder wrote: "Sunday afternoon fully 600 children from the different Sunday Schools assembled in the Methodist church and were addressed by

Miss Stirling. Old and young listened to her remarks with great interest.”<sup>22</sup> When Stirling joined a meeting of the Executive of the Maritime WCTU in Halifax in July 1894, “it was arranged that Miss Stirling address a Gospel Temperance meeting in the evening.”<sup>23</sup> In Fredericton, at the annual convention of the Maritime WCTU, not only did Stirling provide a scripture reading at a “Gospel Meeting”, but when she declined to give a lecture on her child migration work as originally intended people involved or observing the convention are so “disappointed” that Stirling had to set up a special second lecture on her efforts with children as the convention was drawing to a close.<sup>24</sup> Clearly, she was in much demand as a speaker and her lectures were well received.

At the annual convention of the Maritime WCTU in 1894, Stirling was definitely involved in the business of the convention. Stirling seconds three motions. In addition, a rule regulating local member unions of the Maritime WCTU was changed “upon the suggestion of Miss Stirling”.<sup>25</sup> Stirling was “on the platform” during at least three evening meetings during the convention, including the Sunday night “Gospel Meeting” and the Monday night “Symposium on Woman’s Suffrage.”<sup>26</sup> Stirling’s efforts on behalf of children were even brought up by other people in the convention. The convention report states: “Miss Saanders (sic) directed attention of members to the fact that literature committee would be very glad to take orders for Miss Stirling’s book, price 53 cents.”<sup>27</sup> Stirling had evidently become very involved in the Maritime WCTU by 1894. This involvement spans everything from presenting possible regulation changes, to being one of the recognized figures on the platform to other people in the WCTU willing promoting her published works on her efforts with children.

The Fredericton *Daily Gleaner* provided a generous amount of coverage on the Maritime WCTU convention of 1894. They also provided a generous amount of coverage specifically on Emma Stirling during that convention. In one article, Stirling was even described along with people such as Maritime WCTU president Edith Archibald as one of the "PROMINENT VISITORS".<sup>28</sup> Aside from headlining two articles about her hastily rescheduled lecture on her child migration work, Stirling's name was in the headlines of two other articles about WCTU convention happenings. Further, Stirling was mentioned in numerous other sections of the *Daily Gleaner's* reports on the WCTU convention, including her thoughts on how to proceed in the fight to obtain suffrage, and her vote on whether the Maritime WCTU should break apart and become Provincial Unions.<sup>29</sup> When the WCTU convention travels to Marysville, the headline of the article section on that visit reads "Miss Stirling Received the Honors of the Afternoon" and the article reports that Alexander Gibson, the mill owner, "personally conducted her through the Cotton Mill."<sup>30</sup> That Stirling should receive such accolades and press coverage not only for her child migration work but also for her involvement with the WCTU convention proper is fascinating and is worthy of study in itself.<sup>31</sup> However, for the purposes of this chapter suffice to say that by late 1894 Stirling had definitely become involved in the WCTU and her involvement had clearly garnered her some positive attention both in reports within the organization and news organs from without.

By her last few years in Nova Scotia Emma Stirling had become substantially involved in work with the Maritime WCTU. This thesis can now turn to the specific WCTU efforts Stirling was involved in. The first aspect of Stirling's work with the WCTU to study is her work for the causes of temperance and prohibition. Stirling



lectured on the subject of temperance and the religious devotions held at Hillfoot Farm on Sunday nights had a tendency to become devotions against the horrors of alcoholic consumption.<sup>32</sup> However, Stirling's involvement in the fight against liquor went beyond lectures or religious devotions. Writing on a plebiscite on provincial prohibition in Nova Scotia in 1894, Joanne Veer has written: "Led by Kings County WCTU superintendent, Miss Emma Sterling [sic], Kings County was the banner county of Nova Scotia, polling 3,370 in favor to only 249 against."<sup>33</sup> Stirling was extremely proud of this accomplishment for the temperance cause and highlighted it both in her 1894 report for the WCTU as Superintendent of Kings County and her 1898 book.<sup>34</sup> This accomplishment also results in the complimentary remarks provided by Edith Jessie Archibald, president of the Maritime WCTU, in Archibald's 1894 report to the WCTU. Archibald writes:

Kings County, N.S., is the banner county as regards to majorities, the total vote cast there being 3,170 in favor as opposed to 29 against Prohibition. Much of the success of this county record is to be placed to the credit of our Co. Superintendent, Miss Emma Stirling, who so thoroughly organized and canvassed every district.<sup>35</sup>

This both indicates that Stirling was deeply involved in battles for prohibition and also that her efforts were substantial enough and well-known enough to garner credit from people at the very upper echelon of the Maritime WCTU.

Alcohol was severely restricted in Nova Scotia at this time. E.R. Forbes has written:

*The Report of the Dominion Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic* in 1895 described Nova Scotia as 'a strong temperance province.' It noted that liquor could be legally sold only in Halifax City and the two counties of Halifax and Richmond. Of the remaining 16 'dry' counties, sales were prohibited in 12 under the Canada Temperance Act (Scott Act) of 1878 and in the other four by a stringent provincial act which required an annual

petition by two-thirds of the local electorate to permit the renewal of liquor licences.<sup>36</sup>

The WCTU was undoubtedly supportive of such laws, although they wished them to go further. Joanne Veer has written:

The Maritime WCTU emerged as an early promoter of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, commonly known as the Scott Act. This was a local option device that allowed citizens of municipalities to vote yes or no on whether liquor outlets would be allowed to remain in their communities. The WCTU viewed this Act as a valuable means of gradually drying up each province by isolating wet areas and reducing them to increasingly smaller fragments. As soon as a large proportion of a province had voted dry, the WCTU hoped to persuade provincial authorities to inaugurate provincial prohibition. There was little doubt in the minds of Maritime WCTU members that the Scott Act, despite its defects – it did not prohibit the manufacture or importation of liquor, did not provide the machinery for its own enforcement and was full of loopholes that encourage litigation – was preferable to the existing liquor license system which gave to the traffic the sanction of law. The Scott Act, on the other hand, not only made the sale of liquor illegal and therefore less respectable, but its local plebiscites, which could be held every three years, also fostered an agitation that promoted public education. Each extension of the Act reminded Maritimers that the prohibition sentiment was growing. The WCTU, however, never regarded the Scott Act as more than a compromise, a stop-gap measure until full prohibition could be obtained.<sup>37</sup>

While alcohol was restricted, the laws were not perfect. While the WCTU recognized that the laws such as the Scott Act were not as restrictive as they would like, they did find them useful in the temperance and prohibition causes.

Nor were the WCTU or Stirling afraid to become involved in attempts to punish those who violated the law. Concerning the enforcement of the laws regulating alcohol, Joanne Veer has written that “[t]o ensure that inspectors had no excuse to be negligent, the WCTU supplied them with evidence to secure convictions.”<sup>38</sup> Citing a specific instance of this, Veer states: “For example, in 1894 the Kings County WCTU

superintendent reported that she had given ‘information and pressed the prosecution in a very bad case of selling liquor in Kentville which resulted in the first conviction under the Scott Act in that town. Other convictions followed.’”<sup>39</sup> At this time, Stirling was the Superintendent of the WCTU in Kings County, Nova Scotia. In fact, part of the above quotation from Veer is a direct quotation from Stirling’s report as Superintendent.<sup>40</sup> Clearly Stirling was involved in both the political fight for temperance and prohibition and the fight to force the punishment of those who did not follow the laws in that were already in place.

This work is undoubtedly about – to borrow the Kentville *Western Chronicle*’s phrase – “prosecuting vice”.<sup>41</sup> Writing on the WCTU, Wendy Mitchinson states:

The WCTU has few qualms about supporting prohibition. Its members believed it to be a radical reform but an essential one. The atrocities of war were negligible besides the atrocities of the liquor trade. As a foe of morality ‘it turns men into demons, and makes women an easy prey to lust.’ Because the majority of convicted criminals were known to drink, the WCTU concluded that alcohol caused crime and argued that supporting such a criminal population was uneconomical. Intemperance was ruining the physical health of Canadians as well, one member of the WCTU even linking the spread of cholera with the consumption of alcohol.<sup>42</sup>

The remaining written documentation that is known to exist on Stirling’s views of temperance does not express sentiments that are ardent as some of those mentioned in above quotation. Posterity is not privy to the sort of rhetoric Stirling used in her speeches to promote the temperance cause.<sup>43</sup> But Stirling’s belief that her fellow human beings should take “the pledge against drink, tobacco, and swearing” is suggestive that she saw the tendency to consume alcoholic beverages as an unenviable habit in which to indulge.<sup>44</sup> In addition, the fact that she performed so much work to promote prohibition

and to ensure that those who broke the laws against inebriating beverages were punished illustrate that Stirling saw consumption of spirituous beverages as a vice.

How much of this work specifically on the general temperance cause and prohibition directly affected children is difficult to determine. Some of her speeches under the auspices of the WCTU were delivered to audiences including numerous children. However, for most of Stirling's known lectures the age range of the audience is impossible to ascertain from accessible sources.<sup>45</sup> Stirling also reported that "[t]he Sunday evening service" at Hillfoot Farm "has very often been used to spread the cause of Temperance".<sup>46</sup> Stirling's writings do say that Hillfoot Farm's resident children were at the Sunday evening services, however, the writings do not specify how the Temperance aspect of those Sunday services affected the children.<sup>47</sup> It can, therefore, be difficult to determine how much direct impact Stirling's general temperance and prohibition work with the WCTU had on children.

When considering the relationship between children and the general temperance work done by Stirling under the auspices of the WCTU it is more crucial and more instructive to look at Stirling's reasons for engaging in temperance work. In the introduction to her 1892 chapter entitled "Temperance Work", Stirling stated: "This has been a most helpful and blessed adjunct to the work for our children. We have been enabled at Hillfoot Farm to maintain a united and steady protest against drink in all its forms. It will be obvious that this is the only safety where so many young people are concerned."<sup>48</sup> Implicit in this statement is that part of the reason Stirling engaged temperance work is to protect children, specifically in this case the migrant children on her farm. Stirling may have had other reasons for supporting the temperance cause in

general, however, a crucial part of her reasoning was because she saw it as a way to improve the lives of children.

One cannot argue conclusively that all of Stirling's work with the WCTU was closely related to her work with children. There were two facets of Stirling's WCTU work that she was very involved in personally, but were at best tangentially related to children. This was the work for the departments of "Raftsmen and Lumbermen" and "Sailors, Fishermen, and Lighthouse Keepers". Stirling and her Aylesford Union were very involved in both of these facets of WCTU work. The work of these two departments involved preparing "comfort bags" for sailors and providing reading material for men working at lumber camps. In the 1894 annual report of the Maritime WCTU, both the women responsible for overseeing the efforts of these two departments throughout the Maritime provinces noted that Stirling was very involved personally in these departments and gave Stirling much credit for carrying on the work with vigour. In fact, in 1895 the work that the Aylesford WCTU does in these categories was postponed in its completion because some of the articles necessary for this work go up in flames along with Stirling's house.<sup>49</sup> Despite Stirling's preoccupation with work for children, the WCTU had a "do everything" mentality<sup>50</sup> and Stirling embraced this. In 1894, the Wolfville *Acadian* noted that Stirling "is a woman of broad culture, and is strongly interested in many subjects."<sup>51</sup> Stirling's commitment to the work for 'Lumbermen' and 'Sailors' is an indication that her attention was not always solely devoted to work with children.

While Stirling's efforts on behalf of 'Lumbermen' or 'Sailors' may not have directly involved children<sup>52</sup>, they did involve efforts to stop the spread of possible

immoral behaviour. In her 1892 book, Stirling noted part of her efforts with the WCTU was “to take literature of a *good kind*, Temperance and otherwise, to the lumber camps” and that the “large number of men are employed in these camps, all winter, being cut off from home comfort and amusement, and are most thankful for the reading supplied.”<sup>53</sup> The emphasis on the words “*good kind*” suggest a moral judgement involved in this work. In other words, from Stirling’s point of view this reading material was justifiably being supplied to prevent the men from indulging in other less elevated and, from Stirling’s point of view more sinful, pursuits. Stirling’s writings do not indicate what Stirling considered to be the wrong ‘kind’ of reading material or “amusements”.<sup>54</sup> However, what is clear is that part of her reason for bringing items to read to the lumber camps was to ensure that the men’s pastimes were morally uplifting and morally upstanding.

One can conclusively state that aspects of her WCTU work extended Stirling’s work for children and young people beyond her child migrants. There are two areas of Stirling’s WCTU work that illustrate this perfectly. That is Stirling’s involvement with the WCTU departments of Scientific Temperance Instruction (STI) and Narcotics.

Referring to the Maritime WCTU’s fight for STI, Joanne Veer has stated:

The WCTU in the Maritimes had been among the earliest in Canada to begin the campaign for scientific temperance instruction. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia they were the first in the country to secure legislation requiring it and they seem to have won the consistent support of teaching professionals necessary for effective implementation. In this way the Maritime WCTU succeeded in harnessing the school system as an agency for at least some of the reform which it hoped to achieve.<sup>55</sup>

Evidently, the Maritime WCTU was able to affect what was legally supposed to be taught in the public school classroom. The question remains, however, what exactly is STI?

Referring to a law passed in 1892, Marlene Willigar has written:

The Nova Scotia STI act met the highest standards that the WCTU aimed for with hygienic instruction on both alcohol and tobacco in all the grades. The approved temperance books for the early and intermediate grades were the *Health Readers No. 1 and 2*, which represented the Canadian version of the American *The Pathfinder Series*, while the high school levels used *Hamilton's Human Body*. School officers and inspectors supervised the strict enforcement of the STI act to ensure compliance of both the trustees and teachers with the possibility of legal penalties and loss of public money to the schools that failed to comply. The school inspectors' reports to the Education office every month evaluated each school's work progress in hygiene and temperance reading as well as the other academic studies. In 1894, the Maritime WCTU expressed approval for the excellent manner in which the school inspectors performed their duties. Furthermore, the act guaranteed that the teachers were prepared adequately for the teaching of STI. It required teachers to file a certificate that verified their compliance with the provisions of the act before they received any provincial or county grant. After January 1, 1893, no teaching license was to be granted to any person who had not passed an examination on physiology and hygiene with special references to alcohol and narcotics. The new STI law provided a significant and effective means through which to transmit temperance values to Nova Scotia children.<sup>56</sup>

In essence, Scientific Temperance Instruction was about teaching children about the negative effects of spirituous liquors and drugs. It also had the full force of the law behind it. Crucially, for this thesis, it was also focused directly on children.

While the main thrust of STI may have been against alcohol, the above quotation makes clear that it also involved other noxious and addictive substances in its purview.<sup>57</sup> However, the WCTU also had a separate division that looked at "Narcotics".<sup>58</sup> Much of the work that Stirling did for the department of Narcotics replicated the focus on children found in the department of STI. At the District WCTU of Western Nova Scotia Convention in 1894, Stirling was considered enough of an authority on the subject of drugs that she was elected to a committee that was supposed to vet a paper. It was Stirling who gave the committee's report and indicated that she was not overly impressed

with the paper. In addition, Stirling indicated that “she and the other members” were not prepared to support unsubstantiated claims and so they “had taken out everything that could not be vouched for by eminent authorities.”<sup>59</sup> This illustrates that Stirling’s opinions carried at least some semblance of weight in certain WCTU circles.

More importantly, Stirling’s report of her work against drugs suggests a focus on children. In her 1894 report, as Superintendent of Kings County, Nova Scotia, Stirling wrote: “I have been enabled to do something for Narcotics in persuading several young men to leave off using Tobacco, and have pressed the Minors’ Protection Act on the notice of store-keepers in the neighbourhood.”<sup>60</sup> It is not clear who these “young men” were, whether they were child migrants on the cusp of adulthood still at the farm or whether they were young men in the community at large. It is clear, however, that an effort made to ensure that shop owners did not sell tobacco to young people who were not supposed to have it was an effort to protect a wider audience of children and young people from an apparent moral vice. It is impossible to determine how much influence Stirling had on the shop owners’ habits but an attempt was certainly made to protect a broad spectrum of children and youth from indulging in a habit that Stirling considered unhealthy.

While it is difficult to determine how successful Stirling was in her attempt to force shop owners to obey the law in regards to tobacco and minors, the school inspectors and Stirling were more successful in seeing the STI laws enforced. It has been noted in research on the WCTU in the Maritimes that substantial efforts to assist the WCTU in their goals of obtaining STI were made by school officials and government officials.<sup>61</sup> From the point of view of members of the WCTU, Colin W. Roscoe the inspector of



schools for the counties of Hants and Kings was an excellent officer in regards to STI. In her 1894 report, the Maritime WCTU Superintendent of STI notes:

Windsor – Reports no necessity for White Ribboners looking after the enforcement of the Temperance Education laws in Hants and Kings counties, as the Inspector does the work most thoroughly. He says ‘more is being done through the agency of the schools to instill temperance into the minds of the people than in any other way.’ This is solid encouragement and, sisters, we must pray for more inspectors like the one of Kings and Hants counties, N.S.<sup>62</sup>

In Stirling’s county, the WCTU had reason to be optimistic that their goal of STI was being promoted.

Colin W. Roscoe was undoubtedly a temperance supporter and he was undoubtedly active for the STI cause. In his 1894 annual report to the provincial Superintendent of Education, Roscoe wrote:

At my first visit to the schools for the year I called special attention to a law recently passed, requiring instruction to be given in all the schools upon Health and Temperance. At my second visit I found the prescribed Health Readers in general use. They were used as readers, and then the pupils questioned upon lessons read. A good elementary knowledge of the structure of the human body, and its principal organs and their functions, has thus been given. The chapters on foods, alcohol, tobacco and other narcotics, have been dwelt upon. I believe an impression is being made in regard to the injurious effects of narcotics more lasting than that made by the lectures upon these subjects to adults, because given at an age when impressions are easily made. The aim is to *prevent*, not to *cure*. I believe success will result.<sup>63</sup>

Here was an inspector of schools who was most assuredly behind the cause of STI.

Furthermore, he believed it is crucial to educate children against these apparent moral vices. Work on the Maritime WCTU has illustrated that within the region, the WCTU believed it was crucial to educate children against these apparent moral vices.<sup>64</sup> In this way, Roscoe and Stirling’s goals of moral reform were closely aligned on this issue.

Even if Stirling saw Colin Roscoe as an ally, she likely would not have agreed with her WCTU counterparts in Windsor that the WCTU did not need to take an active hand in STI. In her 1894 report to the Maritime WCTU, Stirling wrote: "I sent a circular in Feb. to each of the 103 section schools in the County on Scientific Temperance Instruction and the thoroughness of the work done was especially commended by the Inspector of Schools in his report."<sup>65</sup> As the earlier quote from Roscoe's 1894 report to the Superintendent of Education indicates he was impressed by the efforts teachers were making in the schools of Kings and Hants for STI in 1894. However, it is not clear whether Stirling meant that Roscoe "especially commended" her personal efforts on behalf of STI or the efforts of those instructing students in the public schools.<sup>66</sup> The crucial fact in all this is that while Stirling recognized that Roscoe was a supporter of STI she was not inclined to delegate all the responsibility for promoting this subject to him. Her effort to send a pamphlet to all the schools illustrates that she still believed the she, as member of the WCTU, still had an active role to play in the crusade for STI.

The 1894 report of the Maritime WCTU Superintendent of STI's confirms Stirling's insistence on not allowing the Inspectors of Schools to do all the work when it came to STI. The 1894 report states:

Aylesford – Health Readers were introduced into this school as soon as they were in circulation and the teacher is doing earnest temperance work. The County Superintendent, Miss Stirling, has taken a great interest in this department and in January issued a circular to all the teachers of that County (Kings) imploring them 'to give in time earnest, true and loving instruction in what it concerns the children to know for the protection of their health, physical, moral and spiritual.'<sup>67</sup>

This illustrates not only Stirling's commitment to STI, but also illustrates that, for Stirling, STI was about ensuring that no part of a child's being was corrupted. It was in

essence about protecting children against apparently sinful influences and shaping them into morally upstanding human beings.

Critical to any discussion of STI, however, is that this was “STI in the Public Schools.”<sup>68</sup> There is evidence to suggest that some of the migrant children that Stirling placed out went to public schools. Stirling also had education facilities at Hillfoot Farm.<sup>69</sup> Certainly it was Stirling’s intention that the children she placed out under the age of 14 go to school.<sup>70</sup> However, in discussions about the general child migration movement it has been noted that “[i]mmigrant children who came to Canada through organizations such as the Barnardo Homes were less likely to attend school than Canadian-born children.”<sup>71</sup> With respect to Nova Scotia, there was a more general problem. Marlene Willigar has written: “In 1895, Nova Scotia passed the Town’s Compulsory Attendance Act that provided stiffer attendance requirements for those communities that chose to enact the law, but province-wide compulsory school attendance was not passed until 1915.”<sup>72</sup> Given these difficulties it is difficult to determine how many of Stirling’s migrant children might have received the benefit of STI training in government sponsored schools.

Child migrants were not the target audience in this case. This was, after all, “STI in the Public Schools.”<sup>73</sup> Even if all the migrant children under the age of 14 that Stirling brought to the Maritimes went to school regularly as she hoped, they would have been greatly outnumbered in public schools by other children. This illustrates a broadening of Stirling’s work for children. Her interest in securing what she believed would be strong, morally upstanding children with bright futures had come to encompass vast groups of Nova Scotia children. By her work with the WCTU on the issue of STI, Stirling had

become a force who was trying to improve the lives of children, both native and transplanted, by “prosecuting vice; etc.”<sup>74</sup>

As 1895 approaches, therefore, Stirling had become immersed in WCTU work. It had all been about fighting what Stirling saw as sinful influences. Some of it was possibly only tangentially related to protecting children. However, some of Stirling’s work with the WCTU had widened her philanthropic focus to include children and young people outside of child migrants. But the events of 1895 force Stirling to view another aspect of her WCTU work as one that was about attacking immorality to protect young women and children. This recognition allows this chapter to look at the WCTU department of suffrage and to segue into the final chapter of this project on the Parker and Miller abortion case.

Writing of Edith Jessie Archibald and her tenure as Maritime WCTU president, E. R. Forbes has written: “During her term as president, the franchise department became the most active in the organization.”<sup>75</sup> This thesis’ time frame is right in the middle of Archibald’s tenure as Maritime WCTU president.<sup>76</sup> Stirling and her Aylesford WCTU were behind the fight for suffrage. Referring to her successful tactics from the provincial prohibition plebiscite of 1894, Stirling wrote in her WCTU Superintendent’s report that “[w]e are now hard at work on the same plan for Suffrage.”<sup>77</sup> As has been noted Stirling’s tactics in the plebiscite for prohibition were quite successful and well complimented. That she would decide to use the same tactics for Suffrage suggests quite strongly that she placed an importance on the fight for suffrage. The reports of the Maritime WCTU convention in Fredericton in 1894 only confirm this. Stirling was even on the podium for the “Symposium on Woman’s Suffrage.”<sup>78</sup> *The Daily Gleaner*

reported: "Miss Sterling gave some suggestions on how to conduct a suffrage campaign. Her plan is to reach every house in the country, putting suffrage literature in the hands of every voter."<sup>79</sup> This "plan" would have been a monumental undertaking if it had been put into practice, which reinforces the idea that Stirling believed suffrage was an important issue. Unfortunately, none of the sources offer any insight into why Stirling supported suffrage before April of 1895.<sup>80</sup>

Different scholars have suggested different reasons why Maritime WCTU desired the vote.<sup>81</sup> In the aftermath of the fire that burned down her house and the Parker and Miller abortion trial, Stirling, however, had a very personal reason for wishing women had voting rights. In her 1898 book, Stirling wrote:

*It much concerns the women of Canada to exert themselves to prevent the possible recurrence of such proceedings by doing all they can to have a voice in the election of those WHO MAKE as well as of those who ADMINISTER the LAWS OF THE COUNTRY; that those laws shall no longer be made the 'ministers of sin,' and by judicial injustice and audacious maladministration ACTUALLY BE MADE a PROTECTION to CRIMINALS.*<sup>82</sup>

For anyone familiar with Stirling, the "proceedings" she was commenting on was the Parker and Miller abortion trial, where the courts refused to apply any punishment to the accused. Stirling was in complete disagreement with this result. She continued to believe that Grace Fagan, a young woman and former child migrant, was the victim even when the courts found for the defendants, Parker and Miller.<sup>83</sup> The above passage, however, is in the midst of a three page call-to-arms addressed to the WCTU found in Stirling's 1898 book.<sup>84</sup> The passage itself indicates that Stirling had come to believe that fight for suffrage was very much about fighting gross indiscretions towards moral rectitude. The call for the vote's placement within that plea to the WCTU reinforces,

however, that Stirling believed what she had been doing with the WCTU -- and also what any WCTUer should be doing in Stirling's mind -- was to "oppose immorality in every shape" for the sake of "young girls" as well as the "dear little children."<sup>85</sup> Furthermore, this call for suffrage was not just a call to protect home children. It was addressed to "the women of Canada", which includes groups of young women and children who need protecting far beyond the boundaries of the home child movement. Stirling's call for suffrage in the aftermath of the events of 1895 reaffirms that for Stirling the WCTU work she did in the years just prior to 1895 was about preventing apparently wicked habits and actions from destroying the lives of a broad based section of young people and children in Nova Scotian society. It also hints to fact that Stirling's final melee in Nova Scotia -- the Parker and Miller trial -- was seen by her to be as much about protecting young women and children in general as it was about protecting one specific child migrant.

By her last few years in Nova Scotia Stirling was increasingly immersed in work for the Maritime WCTU. Her work was well regarded and sometimes very successful. All of Stirling's WCTU activities were about fighting substances, habits and actions that might degrade the moral fibre of society. Much of the work had a connection to young people in an effort to make what Stirling saw as improvements to their lives. Some of the work with the departments of the Maritime WCTU, particularly the department of narcotics and, most definitely the department of STI, clearly indicated work for children and young people extended to diverse groups of children beyond the boundaries of the child migration movement. Stirling's call for suffrage in the wake of the events that consumed her life in 1895 reaffirms that for Stirling her WCTU efforts were about battling vice that could affect an expansive group of young women and children.

Stirling's call for suffrage also hints that her final engagement in Nova Scotia was for her an extension of this WCTU work. It is to this final engagement – the abortion trial of Robert S. Parker and Samuel Nelson Miller – that this thesis now turns.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> *Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), 20 August 1891.

<sup>2</sup> Emma Stirling does not join the WCTU until 1890. Before July 1891, Stirling was heavily embroiled in a court case in Nova Scotia that involved a Catholic father named Arthur Delaney who wanted his children returned. Therefore, child migration related work was still a substantial part of her focus. There are also extra facets of this case that continue in Scotland up until 1893. Philip Girard has also suggested that the Delaney case was part of the impetus for why fewer children came in from Scotland as Emma Stirling's work in Nova Scotia drew nearer to a close. See: Philip Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95." *Myth, Migration and the Making of Memory: Scotia and Nova Scotia c. 1700-1990*. Edited by Marjory Harper and Michael E. Vance, (Halifax: The Gorsebrook Research Institute, 1999), 223. For further information on the Delaney case see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231 and Philip Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia." *Children's Voices in Atlantic Literature and Culture: Essays on Childhood*. Edited by Hilary Thompson, (Guelph: Canadian Children's Press, 1995) 14-18. For Emma Stirling's discussion of the Delaney case see: Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (London: John Haddon & Co., 1892), 147 and Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (Coatesville, PA: C.N. Speakman, 1898), 130-152. Since it is the purpose of this thesis to explore Stirling's last few years in Nova Scotia and particularly the period after her migration work lessened it makes sense to look at Stirling's WCTU work after July of 1891. Further, her ascension to the position of Superintendent of Kings County in 1893 means that she is officially in a more prominent position within the WCTU and must submit reports of her work to be published in the *Annual Reports* of the Maritime WCTU. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to locate the reports of 1892 and 1893. The copies of reports from 1894 and 1895 do exist, however, and are housed at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management. For Stirling's recollections of her work with the WCTU in her *Our Children* books see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 151-153 and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 156-157. For the *Annual Reports* of the Maritime WCTU from 1894 and 1895 see: *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management [hereafter NSARM] and *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1895], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 223. See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 223 for possible reasons for this trend.

<sup>4</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 159.

<sup>5</sup> *Sessional Papers of Canada* [hereafter SP], 58 Victoria (13) 1895, 105.

<sup>6</sup> Marjorie Kohli has suggested that John Middlemore availed himself of Emma Stirling's already existing amenities between 1893 and 1895. However, given the paucity of Kohli's footnotes it is to determine where she is taking this information from. See: Marjorie Kohli, "Young Immigrants in Nova Scotia", *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999), 13 and Marjorie Kohli's *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939* (Toronto: Natural Heritage Books, 2003), 135 & 225. Some connection has also been suggested in *Middlemore Memories*, however, again because of the rarity of footnotes or references it is impossible to determine where this information is taken from. See Michael Anthony Staples, *Middlemore Memories: Tales of the British Home Children* (Fredericton, N.B.: Unipress Limited, 2003), ix.

<sup>7</sup> Exact numbers are always a bit of a problem with home child immigration records. However, the reports on the numbers of Emma Stirling's children seem to be relatively in agreement in 1887. The immigration agent's report suggests parties of 54 and 32. Emma Stirling's numbers say the party of 54 was a party of



56. However, the immigration agent from Halifax has written on her list, sent on to Ottawa, "Certified to be Correct", suggesting perhaps a deference to Emma Stirling's numbers. However, it is safe to say over 80 children came in in 1887 alone. See SP, 51 Victoria (4) 1888, 71 and Letter from Emma Stirling to Mr. Lowe, [May 23, 1887]; RG 17, vol. 540, File 60268, National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC]. For discussions of the problems of records on home children see for example, Marjorie Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 112

<sup>8</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 156

<sup>9</sup> Again there is a discrepancy in numbers. For the first party Marjorie Kohli quotes a number of 27, while the immigration agents report seems to indicate a number of 24. Both agree that the second group was 17. However, it is unclear where Kohli is taking her numbers from. See: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 225 and SP, 52 Victoria (5) 1889, 41. Stirling does not give exact numbers when accounting for the arrival of these two parties in her 1892 book. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 102-103.

<sup>10</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 152

<sup>11</sup> See Stirling's 1892 book for her discussion of how she ended up in Nova Scotia. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892). See: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, NB), 25 September, 1894 for a reference to Stirling's child migration work in an article connecting her to the WCTU. The author of this thesis suspects that one of the "causes over which I had no control" that Stirling is referring to is the Delaney cases, which involves a Catholic father who wanted his children returned and which did involve courts in both Nova Scotia and the British Isles. The case lasts over the space of several years and will continue in the Nova Scotia courts until July 1891. For more discussion on the Delaney case, see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231 and Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18.

<sup>12</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 157.

<sup>13</sup> *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1894], 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM. Stirling perhaps exaggerates her own importance here, however, she does do much work for the local WCTU herself. After she leaves in 1895, the Aylesford Union is in somewhat of disarray in regards to certain of its projects that Stirling took a large personal hand in, but the Aylesford Union soldiers on. Information that would have gone into the Superintendent's report for the 1895 Maritime WCTU convention and temperance "literature" that would have gone out to the surrounding communities is lost in the fire of Stirling's house, but how crucial that was to the actual continued working of other unions in Kings County such as Kentville, Berwick, Canning and Wolfville is unclear. Even Aylesford continues to be active in WCTU work well after Emma Stirling leaves. See *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1895], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 3, NSARM and *Annual Reports*, Nova Scotia WCTU, [1896-1900], Microfilm Reel no. 16926, NSARM.

<sup>14</sup> Stirling suggests a connection to George Lawson in her 1892 book. She also encloses a letter written by Lawson to her in the 1892 book. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 137-139. However, the Minute books of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge Society, Emma Stirling's original child assisting organization in Scotland, show that George Lawson wrote to them about the benefits of Nova Scotia for the child migration scheme. See: Minute book of Directors' Monthly Meeting Stockbridge Day Nursery, Infant Home & branches, Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, [May 1, 1884-September 5, 1889], GD 409/1, vol. 1, National Archives of Scotland [hereafter NAS].

<sup>15</sup> *Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), 20 August 1891. Although she is an American, Frances Willard appears frequently in the Nova Scotia newspapers of the day as a result of her role as President of the World WCTU. For example, see: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 19 June 1895.

---

<sup>16</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 153

<sup>17</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 25 November 1891.

<sup>18</sup> The excerpt about Stirling written by Frances Willard and reprinted in the *Chignecto Post* out of Sackville, New Brunswick clearly shows that Frances Willard was impressed by Stirling's work and had heard her discuss it in a public speech. However, Emma Stirling also gave speeches on Temperance. So exactly why Emma Stirling was invited to Boston is not absolutely clear. In addition, Stirling, may very well have spoken on her child migration work in Boston during the convention as she did give a speech on her child migration work in Fredericton, a few years later, while she was in Fredericton in conjunction with the Maritime Convention of the WCTU in 1894. See: *Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), 20 August 1891; *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 25 November 1891 and *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 27 September 1894.

<sup>19</sup> "President's Report", *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], 50, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM. For information on Edith Archibald and her suffrage and other activities see: E. R. Forbes, "Battles in Another War: Edith Archibald and the Halifax Feminist Movement." *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 67-89.

<sup>20</sup> Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. The book that this exchange is found in is the reports of meetings of the District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia 1892-1899. In the inventory list at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management, where this record is housed, it is given a number 2 after the volume number. However, the individual items in the box are not actually labeled with individual numbers. Describing the thoughts of a gentleman observer at this conference on the debate between Angwin and Stirling, the recorder for the conference wrote: "The latter gentleman speaking of the paper on Heredity said we had two sides of the question presented – Dr. Angwin's theory was 'As in Adam all die' – Miss Stirling's was 'so in Christ shall all be made alive.'" See: Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. For information of Maria Angwin see: Carlotta Hacker, *The Indomitable Lady Doctors* (Toronto: Goodread Biographies, 1984), 76-78 and Lois K. Kernaghan, "'Someone wants the Doctor': Maria L. Angwin M.D. (1849-1898)." *Collections of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, Vol. 43 (1991): 33-48.

<sup>21</sup> "Informal Remarks", Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>22</sup> "Informal Remarks", Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. Discussion of this speech provides one of the oblique references to Stirling found in works on the WCTU without Stirling's name every being used. Marlene Willigar writes: "At the WCTU District of Western Nova Scotia Convention in Lunenburg, a WCTU member addressed a combined Sunday school gathering of six hundred children." See: Marlene J. Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society." (M.A. Thesis, Saint Mary's University, 2001), 83.

<sup>23</sup> "Reports of the Meetings of the Executive", *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], 14, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>24</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 24 and 25 September, 1894.

<sup>25</sup> *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], 25 & 29, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM. Stirling's involvement in the convention business can also be seen in the reports in the *Daily Gleaner* of the WCTU convention. See: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 22 & 26 September 1894.

<sup>26</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 24 & 25 September 1894.

<sup>27</sup> *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1894], 30, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM. The "Miss Saanders" is quite possibly Margaret Marshall Saunders, author of *Beautiful Joe*, who was at the convention that year. See: *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1894], 27. However, further confirmation cannot be found yet to prove this. Philip Girard has suggested an earlier possible connection between Stirling and Marshall Saunders. See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 230. For further information on Margaret Marshall Saunders, see: Margaret Conrad, Toni Laidlaw and Donna Smyth. (Eds.). *No Place Like Home: Diaries and Letters of Nova Scotia Women 1771-1938*. (Halifax, N.S.: Formac Publishing Company Limited, 1988), 227-241.

<sup>28</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 September 1894. (Capitals in the original). For the vast amount of general coverage the WCTU convention receives see: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 21—26 September 1894.

<sup>29</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 21—27 September 1894.

<sup>30</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 September 1894.

<sup>31</sup> This treatment of Stirling is particularly intriguing given other comments that have been previously been made in the secondary literature on Stirling. Philip Girard has argued that "it was some time before Stirling came to realize that neither her class position nor her religious beliefs commanded the kind of automatic deference in Nova Scotia that she had been accustomed to at home." See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 225. It is unclear exactly why Stirling was accorded the coverage by the *Daily Gleaner*, the position on the Platform during WCTU evening meetings or the treatment by Alexander Gibson she was during the Maritime WCTU convention in Fredericton in 1894. All these realities, however, suggest that exactly how different segments regarded Stirling and why they regarded her as they did needs to be examined further. For what the *Daily Gleaner*'s reports would indicate is that for some reason some groups or individuals did treat her with a certain amount of reverence, perhaps forcing one to augment Philip Girard's conclusions. See: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 21—27 September 1894

<sup>32</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 151-152.

<sup>33</sup> Joanne Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900 (Ph. D. Thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1994) 133.

<sup>34</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 156 and *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], p.140, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>35</sup> "President's Report", *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], 50, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>36</sup> E. R. Forbes, "Prohibition and the Social Gospel in Nova Scotia", *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 14. Forbes has also noted, however, that one must careful not to over extended arguments about how "dry" Nova Scotia was citing holes in the regulations and an unwillingness by some to ensure the rules were followed. See: Forbes, "Prohibition and the Social Gospel in Nova Scotia," 14.

<sup>37</sup> Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 97-98.

<sup>38</sup> Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 102-103.

<sup>39</sup> Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 103.

---

<sup>40</sup> *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], p. 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>41</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895.

<sup>42</sup> Wendy Mitchinson, "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism." *A Not Unreasonable Claim*. Edited by Linda Kealey. (Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1979), 154.

<sup>43</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 151-153 and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 156.

<sup>44</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 151.

<sup>45</sup> One lecture Stirling gives at the District WCTU of Western Nova Scotia convention in 1894 contains an audience of roughly 600 children. However, it is unclear what the composition of the audience is at the Gospel Temperance Meeting in Halifax in the summer of 1894 that Stirling speaks at. It is also unclear whether there were any children or at least youths present when she gave her bible reading and devotions at the WCTU Convention in Fredericton in 1894 or whether there were any children or young people present when she spoke about her migration work in Fredericton at the end of the WCTU convention. Even in the case where the historian knows there were children present, the records do not indicate what exactly Emma Stirling's "remarks" consisted of. See: "Informal Remarks", Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM; *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 21-27 September 1894; "Reports of the Meetings of the Executive", *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], p. 14, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>46</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 151. By 1894 Emma Stirling was considering these Sunday night devotions as "Evangelistic" and connected enough to her WCTU work to report them in her Superintendent's report for the WCTU. See: *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], p. 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM. It is quite clear Emma Stirling spearheaded the "evangelistic work" in Aylesford. In her 1895 report, the Maritime WCTU Superintendent of Evangelistic and Jail Work stated: "Aylesford - Reports Miss Sterling attended to the evangelistic work when she was here, and held a service at her home every Sunday evening. Nothing has been done since she left." See *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1895], MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 3, NSARM.

<sup>47</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 104-106 & 151.

<sup>48</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 151.

<sup>49</sup> The 1894 Annual Report of the Maritime WCTU contains detailed information about how much is being done in these two departments in Kings County and particularly in Aylesford. It also contains indications of how much of this was being spearhead out of Emma Stirling's Hillfoot Farm. The 1895 Annual Report of the Maritime WCTU reinforces these 1894 trends by indicating the kinds of problems caused by the fire in Emma Stirling's house for these two categories of WCTU work. Reading material and "comfort bags" were both lost in the fire in fairly substantial amounts. See: *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM and *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1895], MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 3, NSARM.

<sup>50</sup> Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 374.

<sup>51</sup> *Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), 25 October 1894.

---

<sup>52</sup> There is no direct indication that Stirling's work in these areas involved children or young people in the known existing sources. A further project could perhaps look at the averages ages of sailors and lumbermen and compare them to the law's definitions surrounding work age and adulthood and Stirling's definitions of work age and adulthood. However, that is a substantial undertaking that cannot be further explored in the confines of this thesis. Suffice to say Stirling's work with lumbermen and sailors through her work with the WCTU was not clearly demarcated as being specifically about children or youths. Stirling did discuss her work with "lumbermen" in both her 1892 book and her 1894 report to the WCTU, however, in neither case did she use any terms that would indicate she was talking about young adults. This differs from her 1894 report on her work for the division of "narcotics" where she clearly defined the men she was referring to as "young men". See *Annual Report, Maritime WCTU* [1894], 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, NSARM and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 152.

<sup>53</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 152 (Italics in the original)

<sup>54</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), 152.

<sup>55</sup> Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 89.

<sup>56</sup> Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 61-62. For further discussion about STI see: Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 48-70 and Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 70-94.

<sup>57</sup> For details on the general purpose of STI teaching see Marlene J. Willigar's work. Willigar's evidence illustrates that STI was also geared towards showing the negative effects of addictive substances other than alcohol such as tobacco. See: Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 48-70.

<sup>58</sup> *Annual Report, Maritime WCTU* [1894], 4, MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, NSARM.

<sup>59</sup> Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 11, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>60</sup> *Annual Report, Maritime WCTU* [1894], 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, NSARM. Philip Girard has noted that one of the laws adopted around this time period in 1892 was "an act preventing the use of tobacco and opium by minors". See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 17

<sup>61</sup> For further details on STI enforcement and problems see: Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 48-70 and Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 70-94.

<sup>62</sup> *Annual Reports, Maritime WCTU*, [1895], 56-57, MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 3, NSARM. Colin Roscoe's name can be found in the *Journals and Proceedings of the House of Assembly of the Province of Nova Scotia* [hereafter JPNS], 58 Victoria (5) 1895, 76.

<sup>63</sup> JPNS, 58 Victoria (5) 1895, 76. (Italics in the original).

---

<sup>64</sup> See: Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 48-142 and Joanne Veer, "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900," 70-94.

<sup>65</sup> *Annual Reports*, Maritime WCTU [1894], 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, NSARM.

<sup>66</sup> Roscoe did not mention Stirling in his annual report in 1894, but there are indications there may have been more interim reports. Marlene Willigar has suggested that there were monthly communiqués between the inspectors and the department of education. Subjects of the STI curriculum were apparently mentioned. However, Marlene Willigar's references would indicate that she is taking this information from the *Annual Report* of the Maritime WCTU of 1894. Whether these interim reports might still exist is not clear. See: Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 61-62. If Stirling was referring to Roscoe's Annual Report it is likely she was commenting that he thought the teachers are doing a good job. See: JPNS, 58 Victoria (5) 1895, 76 and *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, NSARM. Whether there was any personal contact between Stirling and Roscoe at any time is not discernable. Roscoe's published reports that exist in the *Journals and Proceedings of the House of Assembly of the Province of Nova Scotia* never mention Stirling. In fact, Stirling does not appear in the Education section of the *Journals* in all her time in Nova Scotia. See: JPNS, 50 Victoria – 60 Victoria, 1887-1897. See specifically the sections on education.

<sup>67</sup> *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], 108, MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2.

<sup>68</sup> Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 48. This is the subtitle of Willigar's chapter on STI.

<sup>69</sup> See: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 15. Stirling also had a school at her home. The 1891 census records the occupation of one the people at Hillfoot Farm as "a teacher in a private school." See: "The People of Western Kings 1785-1901: references for: Sterling Emma." [www.rootsweb.com/~nskings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm](http://www.rootsweb.com/~nskings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm). (accessed on various dates 2006-2007).

<sup>70</sup> *New Star* (Kentville, N.S.), 11 October 1887. In 1891, the *Chignecto Post* takes an article out of the *Halifax Herald* about children who had not obtained the age of 14 illegally working at a factory in Halifax. The tenor of this article would suggest that 14 was typical age where working life could begin. See: *Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), 24 September 1891.

<sup>71</sup> Alison Prentice et al, *Canadian Women: A History*. (Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988), 155. For other discussion of child migrants in public schools see: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 15; Joy Parr, *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994 (1980)), 108-111; Phyllis Harrison (Ed.), *The Home Children: Their Personal Stories* (Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer Publishing Ltd., 1979), 20.

<sup>72</sup> Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 65. By the end of 1895 53 schools in Kings County have decided to take up the 1895 option for compulsory attendance. See: JPNS, 59 Victoria (5) 1895, xv. Aylesford chooses to adopt this option for enforced school attendance in the summer of 1895. See: *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 8 August 1895.

<sup>73</sup> Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 48. This is the subtitle of Marlene Willigar's chapter on STI.

<sup>74</sup> This is the *Western Chronicle*'s phrase. See: *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895.

<sup>75</sup> Forbes, "Battles in Another War: Edith Archibald and the Halifax Feminist Movement," 70

---

<sup>76</sup> Marlene Willigar gives Archibald's tenure as the years 1892-1895. See: Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 161.

<sup>77</sup> *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1894], p. 140, MG 20, Vol. 357, No. 2, NSARM.

<sup>78</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 25 September 1894.

<sup>79</sup> *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 26 September 1894.

<sup>80</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898),

<sup>81</sup> See for example: E. R. Forbes, "The Ideas of Carol Bacchi and the Suffragists of Halifax: A Review Essay on *Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English-Canadian Suffragists. 1877-1918*" *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 94 and Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 143-171.

<sup>82</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 175-176. (Italics and capitals in the original).

<sup>83</sup> There is an entire chapter in Emma Stirling's 1898 book devoted to her view of the Parker and Miller trial and the 1895 fire. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-177.

<sup>84</sup> Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 174-177.

<sup>85</sup> Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 175-177.

**Chapter 3**  
**Defending Grace Fagan:**  
**Exploring the Parker and Miller Abortion Trial and the Merging Between Two**  
**Facets of Emma Stirling's Efforts**

In Jail at Annapolis  
(Special Despatch to Chronicle)

Annapolis, April 1 – Robert S. Parker, of Aylesford, who was arrested on Saturday, charged with procuring an abortion on Miss Grace Feagan, and Dr. S.N. Miller of Middleton, who is charged with performing the operation, was also arrested on Saturday by Deputy Sheriff Gates, who brought both prisoners here and lodged them in jail. The girl who lies in critical condition, was formerly an inmate of the orphans home at Aylesford, having been brought from Scotland by Miss Stirling, at whose instance the proceedings have been instigated. Mr. Roscoe, of Kentville, was brought here on Saturday evening and made application to have the prisoners liberated on bail, but without success. It is understood that he has been retained to defend the prisoners.<sup>1</sup>

The above passage appeared on the front page of the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* on 2 April 1895. It sums up nicely the basic facts of the Parker and Miller court case.

The apparent victim was Grace Fagan, a grown home child. The accused were Robert S. Parker and Dr. Samuel Nelson Miller. Emma Stirling was responsible for chivying the authorities into action. These are the basic facts on which the various primary sources agree.<sup>2</sup> After three months of court actions, there is one other fact all primary sources can agree upon. That fact is that the courts refused to punish Parker and Miller, although Stirling believed this was a miscarriage of justice.<sup>3</sup> After that the reader is left to piece together what happened in three months that the legal proceedings took to finish.

By 2 April 1895 papers in Halifax, Saint John and as far away as Fredericton have reported this arrest for abortion in the Annapolis Valley.<sup>4</sup> In Halifax, the arrests were reported in five different newspapers. In the three months it took to resolve the legal proceedings against Parker and Miller, however, none of the newspapers in Halifax was



more diligent in their reporting of the case than the *Morning Chronicle* and its evening counterpart the *Echo*.<sup>5</sup> Yet, when the arrest first took place it was the *Morning Chronicle*'s competitor the *Herald* and its evening counterpart the *Evening Mail* that provided much more information to their readers. The reports on 2 April 1895 in both the *Evening Mail* and the *Herald* read:

ANNAPOLIS, April 1 – One of the most serious cases ever in Annapolis County is about to be tried in the courts. A well known M.D. of Middleton and, a young man from Aylesford, have been arrested on the advice of Miss Sterling of Aylesford, who alleges that these two are guilty of one of the worst crimes in the calendar. The girl who was their victim, Miss Sterling brought out from England, is now lying in a very precarious condition, and, though two doctors are attending her, it is not thought possible she can live. The alleged guilty ones, were taken to Annapolis on Saturday and came up before Stipendiary Magistrate Lovitt, who remanded them until next Saturday. No bail is allowed, and they must need wait for one week at least in duration vile. Feeling runs high not only here, but in Annapolis and opinion is much divided. A few days ago the girl, whose name is Miss Grace Fegan, confessed to Miss Sterling the cause of her illness. The services of a justice of the peace were procured and the girl's deposition was duly taken and executed. Armed with this Miss Sterling went immediately to Halifax and employed a legal firm there to set the machinery of the law in operation, which resulted in Dr. Miller's arrest. The author of the girl's trouble is said to be R.S. Parker, of Aylesford, where the girl has been living until within the last few weeks. He had been reported to have disposed of his property and left the country. Drs. Sponagle and Andrews are attending the sick girl and they have considerable hopes of saving her life, although the case is very critical as yet. It is understood that the doctor claims that he merely made an examination of the girl's condition without performing any operation, and that her illness is caused by drugs which she herself procured elsewhere and took. W. E. Roscoe, of Middleton, and W.G. Parsons, of Middleton, have the defence in hand, and it will be in the direction above indicated. It is felt that Miss Stirling will spare neither trouble nor expense in having the case sifted to the bottom and the law vindicated.<sup>6</sup>

These two differing reports in the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Herald* are symptomatic of the reporting of the Parker and Miller abortion case in 1895. One report provided more or differing information from the other. Even the contradictory reports

contained this time within the *Herald/Evening Mail* article itself were not unusual. The *Herald/Evening Mail* article above at one point concluded “it is not thought possible she can live” and then a few lines later concluded that the doctors “have considerable hopes of saving her life”.<sup>7</sup> Nor are the mistakes in spelling or location of where in the British Isles Stirling’s children actually came from entirely unusual. In later reports about the trial, however, the *Morning Chronicle* would make the same sort of errors its competitor the *Herald* had made in its initial reports.<sup>8</sup>

The *Herald/Evening Mail*’s assumptions about Stirling’s character, however, were fairly accurate. The last line of their introductory article on the Parker and Miller abortion case read: “It is felt that Miss Stirling will spare neither trouble nor expense in having the case sifted to the bottom and the law vindicated.”<sup>9</sup> In this, the *Herald* and the *Evening Mail* were not mistaken. Stirling was still fighting to have Parker and Miller punished long after the court case was over and in her 1898 book she remains utterly convinced that the verdict that freed the two men was the wrong verdict.<sup>10</sup>

Unless one is to rely entirely on Stirling’s opinion of the events, which is problematic to say the least, one must turn to the newspapers of the time and the limited court records to try and piece together the history of the Parker and Miller abortion case.<sup>11</sup> What follows in this chapter, then, is an attempt to reconstruct the sometimes contradictory, sometimes incomplete surviving records of the time in effort to discover what happened, or perhaps in some cases, what people thought happened in the trial of Parker and Miller from March to June 1895. Nova Scotian newspapers and the court records provide the historian with a chance to tell a more nuanced, although still incomplete, history of the events. While it remains impossible to determine whether the

courts saw, to use the *Herald* and *Evening Mail*'s phrase, "the law vindicated"<sup>12</sup> when they refused to punish Parker and Miller, the contemporary reports of the case provide the historian with the opportunity to examine Stirling's efforts to protect women and children in Nova Scotia and attitudes towards home children during the 1890s. In essence, what the Parker and Miller case represented was an amalgamation of the two facets of Stirling's 1890s work in Nova Scotia – a combination of Stirling's work to protect women and children in Nova Scotia through the WCTU and her work with home children.

It was noted in the introduction that there is much confusion in much of the secondary literature on Stirling on the events of 1895. Occasionally, the newspapers of the day published completely false information. Nowhere is this clearer than in the *Morning Chronicle*'s report of Fagan's death. On 11 April 1895 an article appeared in the *Morning Chronicle* which read: "Grace Fegan, the young woman whose case has aroused much attention in connection with the arrest of G. S. Barker [sic] and Dr. Miller, of Annapolis died on Wednesday last. This will seriously affect the case of the prisoners."<sup>13</sup> In this one very short article, the newspaper managed to completely change Robert S. Parker's identity, misspell Fagan's name and report an event that never happened. Fagan did not die. She survived to give testimony at the trial and to be married in June 1895. What happened to her after June is not known at this juncture.<sup>14</sup>

The *Morning Chronicle* was quickly forced to recant its report that Fagan had died. On 13 April 1895, under the title of "Not Dead, as Reported", the *Morning Chronicle* reported:

The girl Grace Fegan in the Nictaux abortion case, is not dead, as reported last week, but is getting better. Dr. Miller and Robert Parker are yet in Annapolis jail and their examination will not take place until the girl is able to attend. Dr. Miller claims he performed no operation, nor in anyway laid himself open to the law, and Parker denies that he is in anyway responsible for the girl's condition. The defendants are confident of clearing themselves in the matter – Kentville Advertiser.<sup>15</sup>

The *Acadian Recorder* also took it upon themselves to correct the report of Fegan's death.<sup>16</sup> Despite initial misleading reports of her death, the newspapers of the time soon confirm that Fegan lived at least long enough to see the outcome of the trial and get married.<sup>17</sup> The existing secondary literature, however, does not say much on what happened to Fegan, despite the fact that she was the impetus for the legal proceedings against Parker and Miller.<sup>18</sup> Yet, even with the new primary sources uncovered by this project, to date Fegan remains an enigma.

Fegan was a home child. Her marriage record says that she was 19 years old at the time of her marriage on 21 June 1895. Her parents were reported as having been named Peter and Mary and she was apparently born in India. She married a Stanley Vidito who was 25 years old, a farmer and resided in West Somerville, Massachusetts. Stirling was one of the witnesses who signed Fegan's marriage certificate.<sup>19</sup> Fegan arrived with Stirling's first boatload of children on 5 June 1886. She was listed as being 11 years old at the time.<sup>20</sup> If she was in fact 11 when she arrived, Fegan would have been 20 at the time of her marriage in 1895. However, the ages of the children as reported by child immigration societies and on the ships' manifests are notorious for being incorrect.<sup>21</sup> The *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor* suggests during her stay in Nova Scotia, Fegan "has been knocking round from pillar to post".<sup>22</sup> Where exactly Fegan was between 1886 and 1895 has not been determined. She was not with Stirling at Hillfoot

Farm in 1891 when the census was taken. However, it would not be surprising if Fagan had moved to several different locations during the period she was in Nova Scotia as this happened to home children with some frequency.<sup>23</sup> Both Stirling and the newspapers impart the information that Fagan had been resident under the roof of Robert S. Parker during the months preceding the launch of legal proceedings against Parker and Miller.<sup>24</sup> That is the only place of habitation that can be pinpointed for Fagan in her nine years in Nova Scotia. Newspapers also reported that immediately after her marriage, Fagan “left for Boston.”<sup>25</sup> How Fagan felt about the events that subsumed her life in the first half of 1895, however, posterity cannot determine, since no record has been found that tells the story from Fagan’s point of view.<sup>26</sup>

If Fagan remains embroiled in mystery, then historical records illustrate that Samuel Nelson Miller was a man embroiled in legal proceedings. There was quite a difference in status between Fagan and the men Stirling had charged in defence of Fagan.<sup>27</sup> Samuel Nelson Miller was, as the newspapers describe him, “a well known M. D.”<sup>28</sup> His drugstore and his remedies were well known enough to receive attention in the newspapers.<sup>29</sup> When Samuel Nelson Miller died in 1935, his obituary painted a picture of a provincially respected physician, a respected local citizen and he was memorialized as the “Valley’s Grand Old Medical Man”.<sup>30</sup> The doctor that Stirling had charged was clearly a far more respected citizen than a 19 year old grown home child. As Girard has noted, Stirling may very well have been seen “as an interfering outsider” for her attempts to incarcerate Dr. Miller.<sup>31</sup> However, Miller was not without his detractors and during 1894 and 1895 he had already run afoul with the law four times before he was charged with abortion.<sup>32</sup> Though he was a respected person, Miller was having some problems.

Miller's four convictions revolved around misusing the license that gave him permission to prescribe alcoholic substances to his patients as medicine. After Miller had been convicted of this four times, a man named Isaiah Dodge wrote to the Lieutenant Governor to ask that the government take away this license from Dr. Miller. The Lieutenant Governor wrote to the Honourable W. S. Fielding and suggested that government had no choice but to remove Dr. Miller's permission to prescribe alcoholic remedies for his patients. Whether the license was actually revoked is not clear. Isaiah Dodge was clearly a temperance supporter. Curiously, Isaiah Dodge waited several months after Dr. Miller's 1895 convictions for selling alcohol before sending proof to support his request for removing Samuel Nelson Miller's license to the Lieutenant Governor. He sent this proof in June of 1895 right in the midst of the well publicized Parker and Miller abortion case. However, whether the abortion trial had anything to do with Isaiah Dodge's actions in this instance is also not clear.<sup>33</sup> As a fervent temperance supporter, Stirling would have approved of Samuel Nelson Miller not being able to sell any alcoholic substances since he was misusing his license. However, Stirling gave no indication of whether or not Miller's anti-temperance actions affected her view of his character. Nor did she indicate any connection to Isaiah Dodge.<sup>34</sup> What is clear, however, is that although Dr. Miller may have been a respected physician his reputation was not untarnished and he was not without people who disliked his actions.

Robert Parker's reputation was also not portrayed in the most positive light at the beginning of the trial. The *Herald's* initial report of the arrest of Miller and Parker stated: "The author of the girl's trouble is said to be R.S. Parker, of Aylesford, where the girl had been living until within the last few weeks. He had been reported to have

disposed of his property and left the country.”<sup>35</sup> Whether Robert S. Parker was actually fleeing from Nova Scotia is not clear. There is some evidence to suggest that this was what people thought. One of the witnesses for the court case was a baggage master in Saint John, New Brunswick. Further, when Parker and Miller were finally granted bail at the end of May and beginning of June 1895, the amount that Parker and his guarantors would have had to pay if Parker did not show up in court was considerably higher than that which Dr. Miller and his guarantors would have had to pay. Dr. Miller was responsible for paying 500 dollars if he missed court. The combined total his guarantors would have had to pay was only 200 dollars. Robert Parker was responsible for paying 1500 dollars if he missed court. The combined total his guarantors would have to pay was 1500 dollars. Parker would have had to pay three times the amount of Dr. Miller owed if he had failed to be present at his trial. The people who vouched for Parker would have had to pay seven and half times the amount those who vouched for Dr. Miller. The court records do not indicate why this discrepancy.<sup>36</sup> This would indicate that there was quite possibly a suspicion that Parker would not stay to be tried.

The *Morning Chronicle*, however, had an alternate suggestion of who might have been the person to have fled to the United States. This was Stanley Vidito – the man Fagan marries.<sup>37</sup> It was front page news under the title of “DAMAGING TO THE PROSECUTION” when on 18 May 1895 the *Morning Chronicle* reported: “Stanley Vidito, who was paid to go to the United States, was brought here at the insistence of Miss Sterling and gave evidence very damaging to the prosecution.”<sup>38</sup> Other papers have described Stanley Vidito as “the leading witness for the prosecution.”<sup>39</sup> No other paper surveyed except for the *Morning Chronicle*’s evening counterpart *The Evening Mail* calls

Stanley Vidito's testimony "damaging to the prosecution."<sup>40</sup> If one were to peruse the court records on the Parker and Miller trial, Vidito would never come to the historian's attention. He is never mentioned in the "Recognizance of Witnesses" in the actual specific court records. Nor is Vidito mentioned in the listing of who actually testifies in the "Supreme Court Record of Proceedings".<sup>41</sup> These are the records of the Supreme Court section of the legal proceedings and the *Morning Chronicle's* report of Vidito was from the preliminary stages of the legal proceedings before they get to the Supreme Court.<sup>42</sup> However, the newspapers were still reporting Vidito as "the leading witness for the prosecution" around the time of the Supreme Court trial.<sup>43</sup> Thus, his impact on the Parker and Miller case remains somewhat of an enigma.

The *Morning Chronicle's* opinion of Vidito's testimony aside, clearly his testimony did not change Stirling's opinion of who were the guilty parties. In her 1898 book Stirling wrote:

The preliminary examination lasted three weeks, with the result that the prisoners were committed for trial, the evidence of their guilt being most clear and convincing. While the girl had been employed as servant by one of the prisoners, she had been subjected to the most revolting cruelty, the marks of which were still visible when the doctor first sent for me to go and see her.<sup>44</sup>

The "prisoners" were Parker and Miller. The girl was Fagan. As far as can be discovered from any reports of the trial, Vidito was at most a "witness", but he was never an accused.<sup>45</sup> It is also highly unlikely that Stirling would have been a witness at Fagan's marriage to Vidito if she had thought that he had been part of the abuse Stirling believed Fagan had suffered at the hands of Parker. While the *Morning Chronicle* did not report what was harmful to the crown about Vidito's testimony, it is unlikely that it made him a potential accused at least in Stirling's eyes. Vidito's evidence may have related to



Miller's involvement in the case, but the firm evidence for this association is limited.<sup>46</sup>

Vidito's testimony remains somewhat mysterious, but one can be almost assured that it did not cause Stirling to see him in a negative light.

Vidito himself remains as much as an enigma as the woman he marries – Fagan. Stirling mentioned a "Counselor Vidito" in reference to people who assisted her with trying to protect Fagan, but it is not clear whether this had anything to do with Stanley Vidito.<sup>47</sup> According to his marriage certificate, Vidito was 25 years old, a farmer and resided in West Somerville, Massachusetts. He was apparently from Nictaux, Nova Scotia originally and his parents were James and Ruth.<sup>48</sup> Attempts to find Stanley Vidito after his marriage have met with little success like efforts to find Fagan.<sup>49</sup> What happened to Vidito and what he thought about these events remains as much of a historical mystery as what happened to his wife.

Stirling called her account of the fire and the Parker and Miller trial a "strange tale of Evangeline's Land."<sup>50</sup> In a sense, from the point of view of someone trying to piece together the history over a century later, Stirling was correct about the Parker and Miller trial. Depending on whose report of the trial one believes the historian is presented with different rationales as to the decision of the jury. Arguing the verdict was incorrect, Stirling cited jury tampering.<sup>51</sup> She also seemed to have had some legal support that there should have been a different outcome and that even though Fagan did not die, her dying declaration should have been given all due credit "on the principle that the person making the declaration is at the point of death, and every hope of this world is gone, and every motive to falsehood silenced, and the mind induced by the most powerful considerations to speak the truth."<sup>52</sup> On the other hand, if one is to believe the

newspapers the failure to convict was the result of witnesses such as Vidito, medical expert Dr. Andrews and even Fagan herself. In other words, the case failed in part because of shaky medical evidence and the credibility of the apparent victim.<sup>53</sup> Thus, in the absence of official testimony in the court records<sup>54</sup>, the historian is left with two opposing views on the end result of the Parker and Miller case and several different reasons as to why the case failed. However, both of these sources have their faults. As has been noted throughout this work Stirling was most assuredly not a disinterested party and, as has been seen, the newspapers did not always report fact.

When compared with research done on other late 19<sup>th</sup> century abortion cases, however, the Parker and Miller case was still a little unusual. That the people accused were a physician and the apparent father of the unborn child was typical. That they were not punished was a little more atypical, particularly in the 1890s. However, many of these other cases that have been studied had obstacles to overcome such as legally questionable dying declarations, apparent victims of questionable reputation and shaky medical evidence. They, unlike the Parker and Miller trial, often ended with guilty verdicts.<sup>55</sup> As the end result of the Parker and Miller case is a little atypical and the testimonial sources somewhat suspect, are any of the given reasons plausible for why Parker and Miller were not punished?

In their article on Stirling, Rippey and Harvie have noted that “[t]he trial was held in the summer sessions of the Supreme Court at Annapolis Royal and the verdict by a panel of twelve jurors recorded 20 June 1895 was “Not Guilty.”<sup>56</sup> This is only part of the story. The “Not Guilty” verdict only referred to Robert Parker. In fact, “in the case of Dr. Miller the grand jury found no bill” — meaning that the grand jury did not feel that

there was substantial enough evidence to send Miller's case to trial.<sup>57</sup> There were also two different kinds of juries involved. There was the grand jury which was enabled to decide whether there was enough proof to suggest the possibility that a person should be convicted and there was the petit jury which actually was enabled to decide whether the accused go to jail or not. Dr. Miller's freedom was affected only by the decision of the grand jury. Parker's freedom was affected by both the decision of the grand jury and the petit jury.<sup>58</sup> Further, there were two different charges involved. First, there was a charge for causing the abortion by one's own actions. Second, there was also a charge for endeavouring to have someone else partake in actions that would cause an abortion. These were both criminal actions and could be punished under existing law if it had been proven that Parker and Miller were guilty.<sup>59</sup> Newspapers, court records and Stirling all agreed that the petit jury never had the opportunity to convict anyone of the first of these charges.<sup>60</sup> These are all important factors to keep in mind when trying to determine plausible explanations for the failure to achieve convictions.

The case against the Miller never went beyond the grand jury stage. One possible witness against Miller might have been Stanley Vidito, but as far as posterity can tell, his evidence was not helpful in obtaining a conviction though it is not clear what that evidence was.<sup>61</sup> Another possible witness against Miller was Fagan. But this creates problems, with the testimony coming from conflicting accounts. On the one hand, there was the testimony from a powerful doctor, while on the other hand, there was testimony from a young woman whose child migrant background caused some to see her in a negative light. One also has the dying declaration of a person who does not die. Now arguably all these potential problems had been overlooked at times in other late 19<sup>th</sup>

century court cases, but they could have been concerning for those trying to secure the conviction of Dr. Miller nonetheless.<sup>62</sup> If it was simply Dr. Miller's word against Fagan's, the doctor could claim, as he did, "that he merely made an examination of the girl's condition without performing any operation, and that her illness is caused by drugs which she herself procured elsewhere and took" and leave it up to the jury to decide who to believe.<sup>63</sup> This sort of defence did not always work in 19<sup>th</sup> century abortion cases, but it might have depending on who seemed more believable to the jury.<sup>64</sup> However, the testimony of other medical experts could have stood in the way of such a defence.

In the absence of official court testimonial records, Dr. Alfred R. Andrews' testimony is the only testimony that was extensively recorded and is still in existence today. Further, aside from the accused and the apparent victim, Dr. Andrews is the only witness who was consistently recorded as being present at various stages of the trial. He was also mentioned in both the surviving newspaper and the trial records in the midst of the proceedings and also at the end of the proceedings. He was recorded by the *Morning Chronicle* and its evening counterpart the *Echo* as giving testimony in the preliminary hearings in mid May. Andrews was one of the witnesses who has to sign a recognizance of witness at the end May. Andrews was also one of two witnesses for the crown that both the "Supreme Court Record of Proceedings" and the *Weekly Monitor* report at the end of June 1895 when the time comes for the petit jury to decide whether or not Robert Parker would walk away a free man.<sup>65</sup>

By late June 1895, in fact, Andrews held the position of being the most likely person whose evidence would condemn Parker to jail. The crucial factor was that the petit jury must decide if Parker was guilty of originally having asked Dr. Andrews to

cause Fagan to lose her unborn child. This was why the grand jury moved Robert Parker's trial forward to the petit jury stage. In the end, the major threat to Parker's freedom had nothing to do with his supposed interactions with Miller.<sup>66</sup> Andrews' medical evidence was also crucial proceedings against Dr. Miller.

Dr. Andrews was described by the newspapers as "an expert in the diseases incidental to women".<sup>67</sup> He was one of two medical experts known to have given their testimony on behalf of the prosecution in the preliminary hearings in May. The other was a Dr. Sponagle, who had been Andrews' partner in the effort to try and keep Fagan from dying in early April.<sup>68</sup> Not much was said about either Dr. Sponagle's expertise in medicine or his testimony in the records available. Concerning Dr. Sponagle and his testimony, the *Morning Chronicle* reported: "His evidence was to some extent corroborative of that given by Dr. Andrews."<sup>69</sup> The *Morning Chronicle* later reported: "Nothing of importance was elicited further than his treatment of the girl Feagan."<sup>70</sup> This is the most extensive information on Dr. Sponagle's testimony that is known to remain. Further, unlike Dr. Andrews, Dr. Sponagle's testimony is not mentioned again in the records dated from the end of June 1895.<sup>71</sup> If this is all posterity knows about Dr. Sponagle's evidence and it "was to some extent" similar to Dr. Andrews<sup>72</sup>, then what sort of medical evidence did Dr. Andrews give?

The *Morning Chronicle* reported on the medical testimony of Dr. Andrews thusly:

He had examined the girl shortly after the abortion was said to have been performed, and in conjunction with Dr. Sponagle had treated her. He had formed an opinion, but as he had not made the proper tests he would not swear that her illness was the result of an operation having been performed. On cross-examination he stated that abortions often occur from natural causes such as a fall, fright, shock to the nervous system, etc. He was rigidly questioned, but nothing further of importance was elicited.<sup>73</sup>

In other words, on the stand Dr. Andrews would not commit to saying that there was a physical medical procedure that had caused Fagan to almost die. If this was what the “expert in diseases incidental to women”<sup>74</sup> was saying then, what medical evidence stopped the jury from believing Dr. Miller’s defence “that he merely made an examination of the girl’s condition without performing any operation, and that her illness is caused by drugs which she herself procured elsewhere and took”?<sup>75</sup> The *Weekly Monitor* reported that “the grand jury...found no bill against either Parker or Dr. Miller for performing the operation itself.”<sup>76</sup> It seems highly possible that Dr. Andrews’ refusal to be conclusive in his medical evidence did nothing to deter the grand jury from this decision. Although cases of such medical inconclusiveness were not detrimental to the successful prosecution of other 19<sup>th</sup> century abortion cases, Constance Backhouse has noted that in such cases juries were “using loose standards of factual poof and legal analysis” when they sent the accused to jail in such cases.<sup>77</sup> Given the content of the testimonial records that survive it is quite plausible, therefore, that in the trial of Dr. Miller the medical evidence could have caused the prosecution to fail.

As has been noted, Dr. Andrews was also fundamental to the court’s decision in the case against Robert Parker. However, this time the crucial factor was not Dr. Andrews’ medical expertise, but his power of recollection. Concerning the final installment of the trial of Parker, when there is the possibility of Parker going to jail for asking Dr. Andrews to cause Fagan to have an abortion, the *Weekly Monitor* reported:

The success of the case for the crown depended on the certainty with which Dr. Andrews could identify the prisoner as the man who came to his office last March to solicit medical aid for Grace Fagan. The only other evidence against him was the testimony of Miss Fagan, who swore to

some admissions alleged by her to have been made by Parker in her presence concerning his visit to Dr. Andrews.<sup>78</sup>

In this the *Weekly Monitor* was right. According to the “Supreme Court Record of Proceedings,” there were only two witnesses for the prosecution at this point in the legal proceedings. Fagan and Dr. Andrews.<sup>79</sup> The *Weekly Monitor* also noted: “The defence was an *alibi* but the weakness of the case for the crown contributed more to the verdict than the strength of the defence.”<sup>80</sup> Certainly, the *Weekly Monitor*, which seems to have had a negative opinion of Fagan at least in part simply because she was a grown home child, did not believe Fagan helped her case on the stand.<sup>81</sup> If the petit jury saw Fagan in the same light as the *Weekly Monitor*, her testimony might not have helped her case. However, the above passages from the *Weekly Monitor* would suggest that Dr. Andrews was fundamental to the outcome and, therefore, imply that his powers of recollection were not strong enough to convince a jury that Parker was guilty. Unfortunately, this interpretation of events does not seem to concur with the only testimonial source that specifically discusses Dr. Andrews’ memories of his interactions with Parker.

It must be remembered that the grand jury placed Parker at the risk of imprisonment at the hands of petit jury because of his interactions with Dr. Andrews. This illustrates that the grand jury thought it possible that Parker should be sent to jail on account of these interactions. Further, it is important to remember that the grand jury chose this charge to go forward when they disallowed other abortion related charges that were against both Parker and Miller. Unfortunately, the court records do not indicate what convinced the grand jury to allow this charge relating to Dr. Andrews but not others.<sup>82</sup> Thus, one has to turn back to newspapers. The *Morning Chronicle*’s reports of testimony in the preliminary hearings give some indication as to who might be key to this

charge being sent forward when others failed. It was – once again – Dr. Andrews. On 18 May 1895, the *Morning Chronicle* reported:

Yesterday the evidence of Dr. Andrews, of Middleton, an expert in the diseases incidental to women, was taken. He stated that Parker had called upon him some time about the end of February and asked him to perform an operation on a girl whom he stated was in trouble, or words to that effect, to which he replied that he would not do such a thing at the request of his own brother.<sup>83</sup>

If this was Dr. Andrews' testimony on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, what happened in June? Here was a fairly clear indication that Dr. Andrews could pinpoint Parker as the person who wanted him to cause someone to have an abortion. But if, as the *Weekly Monitor* contended, it was the failure of the prosecution in June and not a iron-clad case by the defence that led to Parker's acquittal and Dr. Andrews was, as court records show, the main witness why do earlier testimonial accounts not match with the result? There are several possibilities. First, Dr. Andrews changed his testimony for some reason between May and June. Second that Dr. Andrews was not seen as a credible witness by the petit jury. Third, that the petit jury believed Andrews but had more sympathy with Parker than they did with Fagan and acquitted him. Fourth, that the *Morning Chronicle* did not well represent Dr. Andrews' May testimony. Fifth and finally, that the jury was affected by some factor other than the evidence.

It is possible that Dr. Andrews changed his testimony. It is possible that his inability to be conclusive in his medical opinions cast doubt on his credibility in other ways. It is possible that the petit jury had greater sympathy for Parker than they did for Fagan. The court records unfortunately do not provide insight into why the petit jury chose to acquit.<sup>84</sup> It is also possible that the *Morning Chronicle* incorrectly reported or omitted crucial parts of Dr. Andrews' testimony in May. Certainly, the *Morning*



*Chronicle* had given incorrect reports before, such as when the paper prematurely noted Fagan's demise. However, Dr. Andrews reported identification of Parker was contained in the same issue and even the same article as reports of testimony that could have caused problems for the crown. It is unlikely that the *Morning Chronicle* would have missed an opportunity to expound on evidence that provided further hindrances to the prosecution of Parker and Miller. While it is possible to read too much into possible reasoning why the *Morning Chronicle* decided to highlight the pitfalls of the crown's case, the fact remains they did so more often than any other paper aside from their evening counterpart, the *Echo*.<sup>85</sup> While all these factors are possibilities as to why the petit jury failed to convict Parker, at this juncture more than a century later the historian cannot form a definite conclusion. Stirling, however, had another possibility – jury tampering.

Is it plausible that there might have been interference with the jury? Can one find any support for this claim without giving too much credence to Stirling's decidedly partial views? The answer is that it is plausible, but most assuredly not provable. In her 1898 book, Stirling wrote:

When the case of the two prisoners came before the grand jury at Bridgetown on the 18<sup>th</sup> of June following (1895), the judge opened the proceedings by giving the strongest possible charge to the grand jury that they find no bill against the prisoners, thus effectively protecting them. He said that the prisoner, at whose instigation the evil had been done in the first instance, had gone to another doctor, who had refused to do it, and they might indict him for *attempting* to have it done. This they did. The petit jury in the case was most obviously and infamously packed, the judge being aware of it; *yet* he allowed the trial to proceed, and, *of course*, the verdict was not guilty.

In order to create a sentiment in favour of his impartiality, the judge fined the sheriff \$100 (one hundred dollars) ostensibly for contempt of court, but *really (he said)* because the sheriff had packed the jury. One strong bond among the members of this gang is strong political influence; they are all Liberals, and most of them very useful to the Liberal interest.

The judge said to me, 'The fact is, no one can be convicted in this country *unless* certain people please.'

I think, however, they should be fairly *tried* in the interest of the public.<sup>86</sup>

It is of fundamental importance to note that it was petit jury that Stirling claims was tampered with. She faulted the judge's instructions for why the grand jury only chose to send forth only Parker, and not Miller, on only one of the possible abortion related charges that they faced. It is this specific reference to the petit jury, however, that makes Stirling's claim of jury tampering remotely plausible.

The petit jury did change in the midst of the June sitting of the Supreme Court in Annapolis County in 1895. There were several cases tried at these court sittings. If one is to compare the jury lists of *The Queen vs. Burrill* decided on the 19 June, versus *The Queen vs. Parker* decided on the 20 June, they are two almost completely different lists except for a couple of people.<sup>87</sup> If one examines the "Supreme Court Docket" book from June 1895 for Annapolis, one has a further illustration of this difference. The grand jury list has men noted as serving three days and having one more day to serve in October, which shows a consistent pattern of continuity in the membership of the grand jury during the June session. Aside from special circumstances, most of the members on the petit jury list, however, are noted as having served four days with no notice of service needed in October. The crossovers between the petit jury lists of *The Queen vs. Burrill* and *The Queen vs. Parker* are men like Edward Armstrong and John Warwick who are noted in the "Supreme Court Docket" book as only having served three days.<sup>88</sup> At the bottom of the page concerning the June members of the petit jury in the "Supreme Court Docket" book, however, is a list of nine men who are only recorded as having served one

day. Besides their names is the word “Tales”. It was these nine men that made up the vast majority of the petit jury who decided Parker’s fate.<sup>89</sup>

What does the term “Tales” imply? The term “tales” as it refers to legal matters has been defined as: “1. A writ for summoning additional jurors to make up a deficiency when the regular panel is exhausted by challenges or otherwise. 2. A list or supply of persons to be summoned as jurors in case of such a deficiency.”<sup>90</sup> In other words, the men who made up the majority of the panel against Parker were late additions to the petit jury during the June session of the Supreme Court in Annapolis.<sup>91</sup> While this in no way proves Stirling’s contention of the petit jury being tampered with, it does indicate that the opportunity mold a jury specifically for Parker’s trial was there.

The other component to Stirling’s accusation is political interference, specifically by the Liberals. Can anything be found to support this insinuation? One must look at figure of Sheriff Morse – the only person actually legally punished for actions related to the Parker and Miller case. Court records illustrate Sheriff Morse was given a monetary punishment for being in contempt of court and he had to pay one hundred dollars. This does not seem to have greatly inconvenienced the Sheriff as “the same was forthwith paid by John Morse.”<sup>92</sup> Newspapers from places such as Kentville, Halifax and Middleton all reported this news.<sup>93</sup> However, the Conservative Halifax *Herald* makes this headline and political news. The *Herald* reported on the front page, “SHERIFF MORSE IN CONTEMPT” -- with the subtitle “He Sets the Court at Defiance, and is Fined \$100 by Judge Weatherbe” added on for good measure.<sup>94</sup> The article itself read: “Sheriff Morse, the bosom friend of Attorney-General Longley, and who in the past has gained much notoriety in political matters, has been fined \$100 by Judge Weatherbe for contempt of

court.”<sup>95</sup> There is no indication that this had anything specifically to do with the *Herald*’s support of Stirling’s efforts with children. However, it was definitely a volley at the Liberals. J.W. Longley is the Liberal Attorney-General of Nova Scotia.<sup>96</sup> It is impossible to determine what individual Liberals thought of the Parker and Miller trial and its result. However, Stirling was not alone in suggesting men like Sheriff Morris, the only person punished legally in the Parker and Miller case, were quite capable exerting an improper sort of influence that had something to do with their political connections to prominent Liberals. Therefore, it is plausible there were political schemes behind the Parker and Miller trial, but without further evidence opinions on men like Sheriff Morse held by Stirling and even the Conservative Halifax *Herald* have to be regarded with at least a degree of skepticism.

In regards to potential interactions between Fagan, Parker and Miller, George Conway has written: “The incident involved two men and one girl: however there is not enough evidence to suggest what happened between the three people.”<sup>97</sup> In a sense, Conway is right. Posterity is left with two opposing accounts. Stirling’s version of the story and the court’s official ruling. The historian is not left even with what Fagan, the young woman at the centre of all of this controversy, thought about the events that consumed her life. In fact, one has two diametrically opposed views of Fagan to work from as well. Stirling describes her as “horribly ill-used” and “a helpless girl”.<sup>98</sup> Conversely, the Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* portrays Fagan as perfectly and completely irredeemable.<sup>99</sup> Therefore, this chapter now turns away from the specifics of the Parker and Miller trial to take a look at attitudes towards child migrants and what Stirling thought she was doing when she stepped in to defend Fagan.

In reporting the final outcome of the Parker and Miller trial, the Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* basically indulged in some character assassination of Fagan. The *Weekly Monitor* reported:

Miss Fagan is nineteen years of age this month, of Scotch extraction, having been brought to this province about ten years ago, and has been knocking around from pillar to post ever since. Her cross-examination by the skillful senior counsel for the defence, Mr. Roscoe, elicited from her own lips a sketch of a most licentious and shameless career. Nature has endowed her with a pretty face, and when at times some more merciless question than the rest drove the red blood to her cheeks she looked the picture of injured innocence and indignation; but as she freely and easily told of her vile degradation and womanly dishonor one could scarcely feel the necessity of importing to our fair Nova Scotia such a class of people, bearing, as did this girl, the pestilential seeds, not of a deadly disease, but of the foulest immorality lurking in their depraved and dissolute natures.<sup>100</sup>

The Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* has thus voiced a prejudiced attitude towards child migrants that abounded in Canada towards home children. Marjorie Kohli states: "The stigma attached to these children came through no fault of the children, but rather from the ignorance of the Canadian population of the time."<sup>101</sup> Michael Anthony Staples says this more bluntly when he states: "Intolerance made life a living hell for many Home Children."<sup>102</sup> The Maritimes were not immune to this blame the child and their background for societal problems mentality that existed towards home children. The memoirs of child migrants placed in the Maritimes make this perfectly clear.<sup>103</sup> The way the Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* treated Fagan's character simply reiterates for the historian that this prejudice towards child migrants existed in the Maritimes.

The *Weekly Monitor* was in a sense blaming the apparent victim, a young woman. Yet, this attitude was not uncommon in cases of sexual abuse and seduction with home children. There were plenty of cases, even within the Maritimes, where, young women,

young teenagers and even younger children were held to be the ones who were at fault for these highly indecent and abusive sexual encounters. Sometimes this attitude was explicitly stated, sometimes this was seen in the actions of the placement families who sent the teenage girls and young women away and sometimes this was seen in a failure to prosecute men who abused twelve year old girls.<sup>104</sup>

Migration organization workers were not immune to this attitude. Citing an incident in the Maritimes, Rooke and Snell have written:

In one case at least, an immigrant girl was not even protected from the profound psychopathic disturbance of a governor of the Middlemore Receiving Home in Halifax which distributed approximately 4,000 children in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia between 1872 and 1915. Mr. J. Sterling King, the governor concerned, defended his own lax supervision and questionable conduct by claiming that the dismal failures the Home appeared to place were due to Mr. J. T. Middlemore's dumping of undesirable children onto the Maritime provinces. His descriptions of the unfortunate children were gross, inhumane, and reprehensible, but he apparently knew that they would touch a sympathetic chord in Canada.<sup>105</sup>

This was a case where even people associated with the migration organizations became the abusers and the child migrants' chief detractors. It illustrates, however, how wide spread a negative attitude was towards home children and also how wide spread abusive situations could be.

Even some of Stirling's female contemporaries in the home child migration movement were not immune to expressing the negative attitude towards home children.<sup>106</sup> Occasionally, they even indulged in comments on a child migrant's lack of sexual morality. One example was the much maligned Maria Rye, whose operations in Canada were based out of the Niagara region in southern Ontario. When a woman tried to intervene to force Rye to act on behalf of a child migrant who was close to eighteen and who had been sent away from her placement because she was carrying a child, Rye

refused to act.<sup>107</sup> In response to this request for intervention, Rye wrote: ““If Mrs. Barclay thinks I am to turn my Home into a bad house for the reception of such girls during their confinements, all I can say is, she must think so, for I certainly shall never do it...””<sup>108</sup> From Rye’s perspective the young woman is clearly the one at fault and it is her morality that is in question. Gillian Wagner has noted that early child migration critic Andrew Doyle used this case against Rye “to show how little she cared for the welfare of her girls when they got into difficulties.”<sup>109</sup> Yet, this indifference and moralizing against the very migrant children she brought to Canada of Rye’s was in stark contrast to Stirling’s reaction to Fagan’s plight.

Philip Girard has argued that Stirling’s intervention on behalf of Fagan “casts her in a more favourable light in modern eyes” than some of her other actions in Nova Scotia.<sup>110</sup> It also presents a more positive picture of Stirling when compared to some of her counterparts in the child migration movement such as Maria Rye or J. Sterling King. This is not to argue that no other child migration agency tried to defend its children against accusations of sexual and other forms of apparent immorality. Barnardo’s, the largest child migration organization, certainly argued extensively with people who claimed their child migrants were morally corrupt.<sup>111</sup> At least Stirling took extensive actions to defend at least one of her grown child migrants when some other child migrant workers in similar situations would not, especially where there was some evidence of sexual relations involved.

Stirling believed in her migrant children. Her books and even newspaper appeals written by Stirling indicate this.<sup>112</sup> But a District WCTU of Western Nova Scotia record allows the historian to see this explicitly. The importance of this WCTU record,

however, is that it enables the historian to see Stirling's beliefs through the eyes of another person. It is rare that sources that express Stirling's views so explicitly are not penned by Stirling herself.<sup>113</sup> Concerning a debate between Dr. Maria Angwin and Stirling over the relative merits of heredity versus environment the recorder of the District WCTU of Western Nova Scotia convention proceedings wrote:

Miss Stirling of Aylesford made some remarks on Dr. Angwin's paper and said she did not agree with her views. She believed Heredity was physical – but the soul was born of God and there is no heredity there. She had had a great deal to do with children and she thought that in most cases if you take them away from their environment and given them good food and the best care they would grow up all right.<sup>114</sup>

Stirling believed that children are not inherently bad. Crucially, this is not from a source where Stirling was trying to garner support for her child migration work. Stirling stood in such staunch opposition to Maria Angwin's position that one of the men observing the conference actually granted her contrary position equal status to that of Angwin.<sup>115</sup> In this sort of encounter, written by someone else, the historian finally is able to see that Stirling was adamant about her belief in the potential of children without having to worry about whether she was saying it as fundraising or support raising propaganda.

This sort of philosophy advocating removal seen in Stirling's arguments at the District WCTU of Western Nova Scotia convention may also be the quintessential justification for child migration.<sup>116</sup> Substantial discussion of Stirling's reasons and justifications for her child migration work, await further exploration. Suffice to say at this juncture, Stirling's firm belief in the potential of children likely contributed to her willing defence of Fagan in a situation where others might not have done the same.

Stirling was committed to Fagan's defence long after the trial was over. Even a couple of years later when she penned the "1895" chapter of her 1898 book, Stirling was



still describing Fagan as the person who “had been subjected to the most revolting cruelty.”<sup>117</sup> Parker and Miller were still the “miscreants” who “got off scotfree”.<sup>118</sup> Now Grace Fagan may not have been perfect and the truth about her character may have been somewhere in the middle between how Stirling portrayed her and how the *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor* portrayed her. Neither were disinterested sources and no known source gives the historian a complete account of Fagan’s actions or her thoughts. However, Fagan did have a harrowing experience that summer, because everybody agreed that she almost died.<sup>119</sup> It is probably important to keep in mind a sentiment such as the one Scottish child migration operator William Quarrier once expressed about the child migration movement: “we do not claim to have brought angels into the country, nor do we place them among angels”.<sup>120</sup> Stirling certainly was not a saint. Fagan might not have been. Parker and Miller likely were not either.<sup>121</sup> But for Stirling, Fagan remained “one of my girls”<sup>122</sup> and regardless of whatever apparent virtues or faults Fagan may have had and the verdict the court gave Stirling continued to try and defend her.

Even within a couple of months of the end of the Parker and Miller trial Stirling had already tried to chivy both the WCTU and the Federal government in Ottawa into action to make sure that “[t]he horrible ingenuity and fiendish barbarity in this instance”, which to Stirling was “inconceivable in any but demons” did not occur another time.<sup>123</sup> By the time she wrote her 1898 book, Stirling had already exhorted the WCTU to try and change laws pertaining to trials to ensure that women involved in trials were not left to face male legal authorities and representatives without the company of another member of their sex. Stirling had also exhorted the WCTU to keep fighting for the vote, because otherwise men could make laws that favoured other men.<sup>124</sup> But why encourage the

WCTU to change laws regarding all women? Why not laws specifically as they related to child and young migrants? The Maritime WCTU had supported campaigns that were designed to primarily defend people such as “young immigrants, many of these poor girls are landed on Canadian shores without a friend or protector, utterly ignorant of the country and of the evil ways of men, and thus become easy prey to the seducer.”<sup>125</sup>

While “young immigrants” in this case may not specifically refer to home children, it most likely refers to young women akin to Fagan’s age. But to Stirling Fagan had become more than solely a representative of her child migrants. In her mind when Stirling went to Fagan’s assistance she believed she was “a woman doing what the law required in defence of another woman”.<sup>126</sup> In essence, while Fagan may have been important to Stirling because she was a grown child migrant, she also became a representative of womankind. This was where Stirling’s work for home children and her work for WCTU in protecting society against moral ills converged.

The WCTU did recognize that what they saw as social ills such as prostitution and illicit sexual relations were not the sole responsibility of the women involved. In fact, in some situations they were more likely to blame the men involved.<sup>127</sup> Describing the WCTU’s attitude, Wendy Mitchinson has stated: “Society was seen by them as dangerous to women; man was the seducer, woman his victim, and unfortunately the law favoured the former.”<sup>128</sup> About the Maritime WCTU specifically, Marlene Willigar has written that some of their “social purity work dealt with the promotion of one standard of morality for both sexes”.<sup>129</sup> It is these attitudes and efforts that Stirling was hoping to stir into action when she made the appeal to the WCTU in her 1898 book. According to Stirling when she went to the defence of Fagan, her actions were merely “*what everyone*

*of you has undertaken, AND IS PLEDGED TO DO, by the promise which she has signed as a member of the W.C.T.U., and which she openly confesses to the world by the white ribbon she wears.*"<sup>130</sup> From Stirling's point of view her actions were part of the WCTU efforts to "uphold the cause of social purity and oppose immorality in every-shape."<sup>131</sup> It is also quite clear that from Stirling's point of view the men were the problem and the women the ones who were vulnerable. For Stirling the way to solve this problem was for "*the women of Canada* to exert themselves" and that this must be done "sake of WOMEN EVERYWHERE."<sup>132</sup> Men on the other hand were clearly the problem. Men who supported Stirling and her views of the outcome the trial were referred to with statements such as "a sensible man" and "(actually a MAN)" as if there was some surprise that men, outside of people like her lawyer who were on the prosecution's side during the trial, should agree with her.<sup>133</sup> Men such as Parker and Miller and the "gang" that according to Stirling supported them, however, were described as the "miscreants", the cause of "evil" and even "demons".<sup>134</sup> Analysis of this gendering would be fascinating,<sup>135</sup> however, for the purposes of this chapter the wording Stirling used clearly shows that she was appealing to the WCTU sentiments that decry women's vulnerability to male sexual predators when she issues a call-to-arms to them in her 1898 book. Thus, Fagan was the motivation for another effort to protect society from moral vice.

While defending Fagan may have been the initial force for this call-to-arms to the WCTU, Stirling saw this case as having much broader implications. For Stirling, Fagan's plight was just one example of "the horrible condition of public morals" that had infested the area surrounding where Stirling made her Nova Scotia home.<sup>136</sup> According to Stirling other young women had died because of illegal abortions in the area in the months

proceeding Fagan's case and that it was an ongoing problem.<sup>137</sup> In fact, she contended "that one woman had been simply murdered from this cause at Middleton in the fall of 1894".<sup>138</sup> Stirling also contended that there was a prostitution ring in the area and that the victims of this "horrible trade" were "young girls" who were described as "unwary".<sup>139</sup> Stirling's claims are unsubstantiated. Certainly, abortions happened, women did die, prostitution occurred, young women were not knowledgeable about issues relating to sexual relations, both within the Maritimes and beyond and groups such as the WCTU, doctors and various others were concerned about this for various reasons.<sup>140</sup> Stirling's claims that such problems were prevalent in the borderlands of Kings County and Annapolis County Nova Scotia in the 1894-1895 period cannot be substantiated.<sup>141</sup> However, Stirling believed this was a problem. She perceived that something had to be done about it. For Stirling, Fagan's case was an attempt to try and fix the "public morals" of the area so that a broad spectrum of young women would not face the same danger.

In her 1898 book, as her chapter on 1895 was drawing to a close, Stirling wrote: "I now feel it right to speak for my own sake, for the sake of the women of Canada; yes, for the sake of WOMEN EVERYWHERE, I think it right to let these facts be known."<sup>142</sup> This highlights the point. For Stirling the events of 1895 were not merely about Fagan. They were not solely about protecting a child migrant. They were about combating something that could have affected a broad spectrum of women. The defence of Grace Fagan for Stirling was certainly about "prosecuting vice, etc."<sup>143</sup> However, for Stirling this fight against moral decay and crime took her attempts at protection beyond the realm of home children. For Stirling, Fagan's plight was an example of what she as member of

the WCTU should be fighting in society in general. Thus, the Parker and Miller case amalgamated Stirling's work for child migrants and her work with WCTU.

This chapter has explored two facets of the Parker and Miller case. One facet is the case itself, although aspects of the Parker and Miller case history remain incomplete because of the limitations of sources. In the end, one still has two diametrically opposed views of what happened. The courts refused to punish Parker and Miller. Stirling believed this was a miscarriage of justice. Newspapers provide greater detail of the case, what happened, what people thought happened and sometimes what did not even happen at all. However, given conflicting reports even the newspapers cannot reconcile the two opposite views on whether the court's verdict was justifiable. Thus, while the details of the Parker and Miller case still leave questions for the historian, they do provide the backdrop for the exploration of more ideological aspects of this case.

The second facet of the Parker and Miller case this chapter explored is the more ideological aspect of it. Again one has two diametrically opposed views presented in the more thematic elements of the case. Wrapped up in the themes to be drawn out of the Parker and Miller case is an ingrained prejudice towards child migrants' character, but also the indications that they had their defenders. While newspapers like the *Weekly Monitor* might have seen the Parker and Miller case as a reason to decry the character of child migrants, for Stirling it was not the character of the child migrant that was in question. For Stirling the character in question was that of society at large. This would propel Stirling to issue a call-to-arms to the WCTU as late as 1898. In her defence of Fagan, one sees that Stirling's efforts to improve the life of her home children have collided with her WCTU work to improve and protect the sanctity of life for a broader

spectrum of people, particularly children and youth. Thus, the Parker and Miller case, Stirling's final engagement in Nova Scotia, was her last effort to challenge moral decay and debauchery on behalf of not only child migrants, but children and young women in Nova Scotia whatever their place of birth.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>2</sup> See: Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (Coatesville, PA: C.N. Speakman, 1898), 155-184; *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management [hereafter NSARM] and various newspapers. See particularly: *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>3</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel....* (1898), 155-184; *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM and various newspapers. See particularly: *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>4</sup> *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 1 April 1895 and 2 April 1895; *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895; *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895; *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), 2 April 1895 and *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), 1 April 1895. Ironically, the *Daily Gleaner* reports the arrest on the first page on 1 April 1895 and then seems to become completely uninterested in the case. See: *Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), April – June 1895.

<sup>5</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895. That the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Echo* were published by the *Chronicle's* publishing company can be seen in *Nova Scotia Newspapers: A Directory and Union List 1752-1988*. Compiled by Lynn Murphy. Catalogued by Brenda Hicks. With assistance from Anjali Vohra. (Halifax: Dalhousie University School of Library and Information Studies, 1990), 158.

<sup>6</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895 and *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895. The magistrates name is actually Leavitt. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM.

<sup>7</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895 and *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>8</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895 and *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895. The magistrates name is actually Leavitt. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM. See *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895 for an example of how the *Morning Chronicle* commits these same sorts of errors.

<sup>9</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895 and *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>10</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-184. For discussion of Stirling's reaction to the Parker and Miller case in the secondary literature see: Philip Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95." *Myth, Migration and the Making of Memory: Scotia and Nova Scotia c. 1700-1990*. Edited by Marjory Harper and Michael E. Vance (Halifax: The Gorsebrook Research Institute, 1999), 218, 222-223 and 226-227; Philip Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia." *Children's Voices in Atlantic Literature and Culture: Essays on Childhood*. Edited by Hilary Thompson, (Guelph: Canadian Children's Press, 1995), 18 and George B. Conway, "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm." *Kings County Vignettes: Interesting Stories of Kings County (Volume 10)*. Compiled by Helen Hansford and Cathy Margeson. (Kentville, N.S.: The Community History Committee of the Kings County Historical Society, 2000), 49.

---

<sup>11</sup> Problems associated with taking Stirling's word as absolute truth have been discussed previously. See Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218 – 231 and Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 17 for discussion in the secondary literature as to why Stirling's opinions might be problematic. The court records for the abortion case against Parker and Miller are found at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management and while they provide some conformation of the story they are limited. For example, they provide no record of exactly what evidence was given in court. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM.

<sup>12</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>13</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 11 April 1895. There was an M.P. named Mr. G.B. Baker. Whether the newspaper amalgamated two names accidentally or whether the misspelling of Robert Parker's name was just a type setting error is not clear. For reference to G.B. Baker see: *Colchester Sun* (Truro, N.S.), 29 May 1895.

<sup>14</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. Efforts have been made to find records of Grace Fagan after her marriage but so far they have been unsuccessful. She did not appear to return to Nova Scotia under Grace Fagan or Grace Vidito. She does not appear to be in either of the 1901 or 1911 censuses for Nova Scotia. There was a Gracey Vidito in the 1901 census, but she was a child. This information can be obtained by searching the searchable databases for the 1901 and 1911 censuses on the automated genealogy site. See: [www.automatedgenealogy.com](http://www.automatedgenealogy.com) (accessed on various dates 2006-2007).

<sup>15</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 April 1895. Unfortunately, copies of the *Kentville Advertiser* from the period do not survive. See: *Nova Scotia Newspapers: A Directory and Union List 1752-1988*. Compiled by Lynn Murphy. Catalogued by Brenda Hicks. With assistance from Anjali Vohra. (Halifax: Dalhousie University School of Library and Information Studies, 1990) for lists of newspapers that still survive.

<sup>16</sup> *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), 15 April 1895.

<sup>17</sup> A lot of the newspapers seem to be more interested about the fact that Fagan marries one of the witnesses than they were in the fact that Parker and Miller were acquitted. Both the *Herald* and the *Echo* headline their reports of the trial's close with "IT HAD A ROMANTIC ENDING". See *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895 and *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895. The *Middleton Outlook*, the *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor* and the *Kentville Western Chronicle* also recited this sentiment in their articles. See *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895; *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895 and *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 11 July 1895.

<sup>18</sup> Even Philip Girard does not make it clear that Fagan did not die as a result of the apparent abortion. See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231; Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 18; Conway, "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm," 49 and Mary Louise Rippey and Leland Harvie. "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm." *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999), 10.

<sup>19</sup> Marriage of License of Stanley Vidito and Grace Fagan, Marriage Licenses (Annapolis County, Nova Scotia) [21 June 1895], Microfilm no. 16005, NSARM. This marriage license is also available by searching the new vital statistic database for Nova Scotia that is online. See: [www.novascotiagenealogy.com](http://www.novascotiagenealogy.com). (accessed on various dates 2007).

<sup>20</sup> The National Archives of Canada has a database devoted to helping people find the immigration records for home child ancestors. Fagan can be found by searching this database. This gives the date of her arrival, her age, her ship of arrival and that she was of Scottish origin among other information. See: [www.collectionscanada.ca/archivianet/02011003\\_e.html](http://www.collectionscanada.ca/archivianet/02011003_e.html). (accessed on various dates 2006-2007). That the



---

name of the ship and the date of arrival correspond to Stirling's first party of migrant children can be seen in the *Sessional Papers of Canada* [hereafter SP]. See: SP, 50 Victoria (12) 1887, 61.

<sup>21</sup> For examples of age discrepancies see: Marjorie Kohli, *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939* (Toronto: Natural Heritage Books, 2003), 112.

<sup>22</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Halifax, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>23</sup> As part of a section entitled "The People of Western Kings 1785-1901" the genealogical site rootsweb.com has compiled, from census data, all the people who lived at Hillfoot Farm with Stirling at the time the 1891 census was taken. Fagan is not on this list. See: "The People of Western Kings 1785-1901: references for: Sterling Emma." [www.rootsweb.com/~nskings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm](http://www.rootsweb.com/~nskings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm). (accessed on various dates 2006-2007). That home children moved often can be seen in the recollections contained in books recording memoirs of child migrants. See: Michael Anthony Staples, *Middlemore Memories: Tales of the British Home Children* (Fredericton, N.B.: Unipress Limited, 2003) and Phyllis Harrison (Ed.), *The Home Children: Their Personal Stories* (Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer Publishing Ltd., 1979). For an example of this trend in Stirling's child migration work, see: Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18.

<sup>24</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 167 and *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>25</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895.

<sup>26</sup> There are no testimonial records for Fagan that give her opinion of what happened in her own words. There is a generic recognizance of witness in the trial records, however, it is the same basic form all witnesses swear to. The only report of her testimony currently known is one that comes out of the *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor*. The *Weekly Monitor* clearly has a prejudice against home children and spends more time making judgements on Fagan's moral character than discussing what she actually said in court. Therefore, what Fagan felt about the trial and the events that took over her life in 1895 is unclear. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>27</sup> See Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 222 and 226 for other discussion of this and the reaction Stirling's actions may have incurred.

<sup>28</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895

<sup>29</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 16 January 1895 and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 27 April 1895 and 30 April 1895.

<sup>30</sup> Photocopy of the obituary of Samuel Nelson Miller [1935], MacDonald Museum, Middleton Nova Scotia [hereafter NSMM].

<sup>31</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 226

<sup>32</sup> Case against Dr. S. N. Miller for the sale of liquor in Middleton [1895], RG 7, Vol. 381, no. 123, NSARM.

<sup>33</sup> Case against Dr. S. N. Miller for the sale of liquor in Middleton [1895], RG 7, Vol. 381, no. 123, NSARM.

<sup>34</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-184.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>36</sup> The people who vouched for Dr. Miller were a hotel keeper and a jeweler. Both lived in Middleton where the doctor was from. Those who vouched for Parker were quite possibly related to him. They were both Parkers and they were both farmers. The fact that both of Parkers guarantors were from Aylesford suggests that this case had the makings of a town feud. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM. See Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 222 & 226 for other discussion of local implications and reactions.

<sup>37</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 and *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895.

<sup>38</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 (Capitals in the original).

<sup>39</sup> *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895.

<sup>40</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 and *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895. These reports are apparently coming out of Annapolis. However, a paper like the *Spectator* out of Annapolis no longer exists for the period as to be able to confirm where the Halifax newspapers were getting their reports. See: *Nova Scotia Newspapers: A Directory and Union List 1752-1988*. Compiled by Lynn Murphy. Catalogued by Brenda Hicks. With assistance from Anjali Vohra. (Halifax: Dalhousie University School of Library and Information Studies, 1990).

<sup>41</sup> There are some discrepancies between the numbers and names of witnesses in these two sources. But in neither does Stanley Vidito appear. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM and Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM. The *Weekly Monitor* out of Bridgetown described "Stanley Vidito" as "one of the principal witnesses for the crown in the case against Miller". See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. The Grand Jury felt that there was not enough evidence to move forward with the trial of Dr. Miller. This may give credence to the *Morning Chronicle's* claims that Vidito's testimony was harmful to the crown, but the fact remains that Stanley Vidito is not mentioned in the official court records as a witness. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895.

<sup>42</sup> See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895. It has not been possible to locate any court records from before the trial went to the Supreme Court.

<sup>43</sup> *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895.

<sup>44</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 166-167.

<sup>45</sup> See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>46</sup> It was not a secret that Stirling was at Fagan's wedding. It made at least one newspaper. See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. Stirling spent pages in her 1898 book railing against Parker and Miller and at the abuse Stirling believed that Fagan endured. She also spent those pages railing against the authorities that refused to punish them. Stirling also spent several pages extolling the WCTU that they

must continue this fight to protect women from being victims of such actions. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-177. It is hard to believe that Stirling would have been a witness of Fagan's wedding to Stanley Vidito if Vidito's testimony had made Stirling believe Vidito had been part of the maltreatment Fagan suffered. Considering, what Stirling went through to see Parker and Miller punished it is unlikely Vidito's testimony made him a potential accused. Unfortunately, the *Morning Chronicle* does not report what was harmful about the testimony. See: *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895. The *Weekly Monitor* hints that Vidito's evidence may have had something to do with whether or not Samuel Miller was rightly accused in the case. As noted in a footnote above, this may give a possible indication to what sort harm the *Morning Chronicle* is referring to, because the Grand Jury does not feel it has enough evidence to move forward against Miller. However, the existing evidence is far from conclusive that this was Vidito's impact on the case. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>47</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 166. There are numerous Viditos around the Annapolis and Bridgetown area. There is a Counselor Alfred Vidito in the Bridgetown/Annapolis area which would make sense with Stirling's discussion of a "Counselor Vidito." See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 25 April 1894 and *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895. However, any relation or connection with Stanley Vidito is unclear.

<sup>48</sup> Marriage License of Stanley Vidito and Grace Fagan, Marriage Licenses (Annapolis County, Nova Scotia). [21 June 1895], Microfilm no. 16005, NSARM. This marriage license is also available by searching the new vital statistic database for Nova Scotia that is online. See: [www.novascotiagenealogy.com](http://www.novascotiagenealogy.com). (accessed on various dates 2007).

<sup>49</sup> Efforts have been made to find Stanley Vidito, however, they have been inconclusive. There was a Stanley Vidito who was roughly the right age in the 1911 Census of Nova Scotia, however, he was described as single not a widow. This information can be found by searching an online database of the 1911 census. See: [www.automatedgenealogy.com](http://www.automatedgenealogy.com) (accessed on various dates 2006-2007).

<sup>50</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 177.

<sup>51</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 168.

<sup>52</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 170. The legal opinion comes from a letter to Stirling, which she had republished in her 1898 book. It was given by J.J. Ritchie who was "assisting counsel for the prosecution" in the Parker and Miller case. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 169. The Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* also referred to J.J. Ritchie as Stirling's "counsel". See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. For information on dying declarations and their use in other 19<sup>th</sup> Century abortion cases in Canada see: Constance Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada." *Windsor Yearbook Access to Justice* 3 (1983), 99-103.

<sup>53</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>54</sup> Any of the official court records do not actually contain what was said in court testimony. In process of looking at the records of this case, the author of this paper discovered some other court case records misfiled with the Parker and Miller case. The author of this paper then searched the case files in the box surrounding the Parker and Miller case. However, no other documents relating to Parker and Miller were found. The box that holds the Parker and Miller files at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management contains files from the Annapolis court for several years. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

---

<sup>55</sup> See: Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada," 61-130 and Constance Backhouse, "Chapter 5: Abortion." *Petticoats and Prejudice: Women and Law in Nineteenth Century Canada* (Toronto: The Women's Press, 1991), 140-166. While acknowledging that she did not have a plethora of cases available to study and commenting on the cases she did have to study of mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> century abortion, Constance Backhouse has written: "Convictions intensified as the century progressed. By the 1890s, four out of six abortion trials resulted in a conviction. Courts appear to have been using loose standards of factual proof and legal analysis, convicting despite evidence that would clearly have permitted acquittals if judges and jurors had been so inclined." See: Backhouse, "Chapter 5: Abortion," 163.

<sup>56</sup> Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 10

<sup>57</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895. The varying sources seem to agree that the trial of Dr. Miller never got to the point where the "petit jury" actually got to decide whether Dr. Miller should serve jail time or not. There is no indictment or jury panel in the court records towards Samuel Nelson Miller. There are towards Robert Parker. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.. Even Stirling agreed that only "the prisoner, at whose instigation the evil had been done" (Parker) went to the jury that could send him to jail if they so chose. Stirling was endingly unhappy about this, but she recognized this fact. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 167. Because of Rippey and Harvie's problematic footnoting it is not entirely clear where they are taking their information from. They may be taking it from the court files of the trial. But this is not directly referenced. They have failed to indicate clearly that this verdict only affected Robert Parker. See: Rippey and Harvie, "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm," 10-11 and *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM. Curiously enough, the *Western Chronicle* suggested that the grand jury might have had some trouble with deciding whether Dr. Miller should be sent to the petit jury on some abortion related charge. However, other newspapers did not report this. See: *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 20 June 1895; *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), 22 June 1895; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895 and *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895.

<sup>58</sup> *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM, Supreme Court Docket, October, 1877 to October, 1901 (Annapolis) [June 1895], NSARM and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895.

<sup>59</sup> For information on the changing abortion law in Canada during the 19<sup>th</sup> Century see: Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada," 61-130.

<sup>60</sup> The indictment against Robert Parker which is in the case files is one about endeavouring to get a doctor to cause an abortion in Fagan. This was what the jury verdict was about. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM; *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. Even Stirling admitted that the charge Robert Parker's case was sent to "the petit jury" was "for attempting to" coerce a doctor into facilitating an abortion on Fagan. Stirling was not happy that this was the only charge, but she admitted that it was. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 167

<sup>61</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>62</sup> For information about Fagan's dying declaration see: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 170. For information about other 19<sup>th</sup> Century abortion trials see: Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada," 61-130

and Backhouse, "Chapter 5: Abortion," 140- 166. To understand that Grace Fagan's background as a child migrant was important to how some people saw her see: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>63</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895 and *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>64</sup> Certainly, the *Weekly Monitor* was not convinced that Fagan's character made her worthy of believing. Although in other cases in the 19<sup>th</sup> century the young women's reputation had been tarnished and there was still a conviction. However, Fagan's character and reputation were probably still part of the decision. See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. For information on abortion convictions that deal with the young women's reputation and a doctor's claiming about seeing the patient without doing anything, see: Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada," 61-130.

<sup>65</sup> See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 17 May 1895 *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. Dr. Andrews even shows up in initial reports of the case in April of 1895 in conjunction with efforts to keep Fagan from dying. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895. That even preliminary testimony was still being taken in mid May is not necessarily surprising. There were unending delays at the beginning of the case. Depending on which source one chooses to believe and at what time there are a list of possible options such as Fagan's continuing illness, a judge's family crisis and the inability of the defence to prepare in time. For examples see: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), April – June 1895, *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>66</sup> The Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor*'s emphasis on the importance of Dr. Andrew's evidence matches well with the mentions of Andrews in the court records that are in existence. He is one of two crown witnesses seen in "Supreme Court Record of Proceedings". The interactions between Andrews and Parker over Fagan's situation were also the only ones the grand jury feels there is enough evidence to possibly get a conviction for and thus indict Parker for these interactions. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. Even Stirling agreed that Robert Parker's freedom hinged on whether or not it could be proved that he asked a physician other than Dr. Miller to cause Fagan to have an abortion. Stirling wanted Parker (and Miller) to be indicted for other criminal actions related to abortion. She also disagreed with the petit jury's decision. However, even Stirling realized that at the end of the trial the only possible threat to Parker's freedom was in the evidence of "another doctor" besides Miller and what the petit jury chose to do with that other physician's testimony. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 167-168.

<sup>67</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895. There are actually two articles in the *Morning Chronicle* about the Parker and Miller trial on May 18, 1895. One is on the front page about Stanley Vidito's testimony and the other is on page 7 about Dr. Andrews' testimony. The article about Dr. Andrews' testimony had already appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*'s evening counterpart the *Echo* on May 17. See: *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 17 May 1895. Further research needs to be done to validate the *Morning Chronicle*'s claim that Dr. Andrews was knowledgeable about women's health.

<sup>68</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 and 22 May 1895.

<sup>69</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895.

<sup>70</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 May 1895.

<sup>71</sup> Dr. Sponagle was amongst those who sign recognizances in late May and early June saying that they will show up at the June session of the Supreme Court. However, he was not mentioned by the newspapers

surveyed in late June nor was he called as a crown witness in the eventual final trial of Robert Parker. This does not mean that he was not part of the evidence the grand jury heard before its decision to not even send Dr. Miller's case to the petit jury, but if Dr. Sponagle did testify again in June so far as one can tell no records survive. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM; Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 - 20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>72</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895.

<sup>73</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895.

<sup>74</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895.

<sup>75</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895 and *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>76</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>77</sup> Backhouse, "Chapter 5: Abortion," 163

<sup>78</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>79</sup> Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 - 20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM

<sup>80</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>81</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. A letter that Stirling wrote to the WCTU suggested that she thought Fagan was treated inappropriately during the trial. Stirling suggested in this letter that all women needed to be protected and supported in court. See: *Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), 25 October 1895. The *Weekly Monitor*, however, suggested that the treatment Fagan received from defence attorneys was simply "skillful". See: *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>82</sup> *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>83</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 18 May 1895. The article this passage is taken from is also in the *Morning Chronicle*'s evening counterpart the *Echo* and in the *Acadian Recorder*. See: *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 17 May 1895 and *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), 17 May 1895. The *Echo* being an evening paper would have been able to publish the report before the *Morning Chronicle* if the report had come in after the *Morning Chronicle*'s May 17, 1895 edition had already been printed. Strangely enough though the *Acadian Recorder*'s article appears a day before the *Chronicle*'s report it says it got this article from the *Chronicle*.

<sup>84</sup> *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM

<sup>85</sup> The *Morning Chronicle* may have just been intrigued by the sensational aspects of the case. More so than any other newspaper the *Morning Chronicle*'s reports repeated in or proceeded by its evening counterpart the *Echo* have a feeling of sensationalism about them. Particularly, those that refer to Stanley Vidito's testimony and Fagan's death. The *Morning Chronicle* and the *Echo* are the only newspapers surveyed to have reported Fagan's death or the testimony of Stanley Vidito. The *Acadian Recorder*, quick to point out the folly of reporting Fagan's demise, is actually quick to pick up the report of Dr. Andrews' testimony. In fact, though they credit the *Chronicle* for it the report appears in the *Acadian Recorder* before the *Morning Chronicle* although not before it appears in the *Echo*. The *Acadian Recorder*, however, does not choose to pick up the article on the testimony of Stanley Vidito. This would suggest that the *Acadian Recorder* was satisfied with the veracity of the report of Dr. Andrews' testimony. And also,

perhaps, that they chose to be less sensational when it came to the testimony of Stanley Vidito. The *Herald*, which was clearly Stirling's Halifax paper of choice and its evening counterpart the *Evening Mail* actually were not interested in either the testimony of Stanley Vidito or Dr. Andrews. The *Herald* and the *Evening Mail* spend more time reporting the donations Stirling was receiving in the wake of the fire than they do in reporting the Parker and Miller trial. While it is not possible to determine why, the *Herald* and the *Evening Mail*, Stirling's paper of choice, are more thorough of their coverage of the Parker and Miller trial at the beginning and their competitors the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Echo* are more thorough in the middle of it as momentum appears to be shifting in favour towards the defence, the fact remains this is the case. Given particularly the *Morning Chronicle* and *Echo*'s voracious report of the legal proceedings in the middle of the on going saga, it is surprising how little the Halifax newspapers have to say about the Supreme Court portion of the trial in June. Particularly, when the complete opposite is true of the *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor*. The *Bridgetown Weekly Monitor* does not start commenting on potential problems in the prosecutions case until the trial is over. The reports of the *Saint John Daily Sun* and the *Western Chronicle* of Kentville are fairly neutral and not overly expansive, particularly those in the *Western Chronicle*. Unfortunately, one cannot tell much about the tenor of the *Outlook* out of Middleton's reports during most of the trial. Only one issue, June 28, 1895 still seems to be in existence and its report of the final installment of the legal proceedings against Parker and Miller is similar to generic reports found elsewhere. See: *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895, particularly 11 and 13 April and 18 May 1895; *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895, particularly 17 May 1895; *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895; *Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895, particularly 15 April and 17 May 1895; *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), April – June 1895, particularly 26 June 1895; *Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), April – June 1895 and *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), April – July 1895 and *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895.

<sup>86</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 167-168. (Italics in the original)

<sup>87</sup> *The Queen vs. Burrill* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 1, NSARM and *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM. Another case, *The Queen vs. Jacob Marshall* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 2, NSARM had no jury list because Jacob Marshall pled guilty.

<sup>88</sup> Supreme Court Docket, October, 1877 to October, 1901 (Annapolis) [June 1895], NSARM; *The Queen vs. Burrill* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 1, NSARM and *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM.

<sup>89</sup> Supreme Court Docket, October, 1877 to October, 1901 (Annapolis) [June 1895], NSARM; *The Queen vs. Burrill* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 1, NSARM and *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM.

<sup>90</sup> *Funk and Wagnall's New Standard Dictionary of the English Language*. A post 1921 edition, s.v. "tales". The volume that this definition was taken from sits on one of the researchers' tables at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management.

<sup>91</sup> The three men not marked "Tales" in *The Queen vs. Parker* have a different extra notation besides their names than eight of the men marked "Tales". The foreman who is also marked as "Tales" does not have another mark beside his name. However, the three men who are not marked "Tales" have x's beside their name and the eight other men marked "Tales" have check marks beside their name. Further, study on typical markings on jury panels would have to be done to determine what these mean. They at least suggest some sort of difference between those who are "Tales" and those who are not. It is, however, clear that the majority of those who were responsible for Robert Parker's fate were late additions. See: *The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 3, NSARM.

<sup>92</sup> Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM

---

<sup>93</sup> *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895; *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 4 July 1895 and *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895.

<sup>94</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895. (Capitals in the original).

<sup>95</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895. This comment of the *Herald's* on Sheriff Morse is particularly interesting when one compares it to the *Liberal Morning Chronicle's* comments. With the *Herald* Sheriff Morse's problems are the headlining feature and the acquittal of Parker and Miller is of secondary importance. With the *Morning Chronicle*, both the result of the Parker and Miller trial and Sheriff Morse's difficulties are lumped together amongst other Supreme Court news out of Bridgetown. This is on the first page, but the result of the Parker and Miller trial receives more attention than the contempt of court. The contempt of court is just added on the end of *Morning Chronicle's* article and unlike other papers that mention this incident Sheriff Morse's name does not appear. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895, *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), 22 June 1895; *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 4 July 1895 and *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895. My thanks to one of the duty archivists at the Nova Archives and Records Management for confirming the political leanings of the *Herald* and the *Morning Chronicle*. Confirmation of their political leanings can also be found in: E. R. Forbes, "Battles in Another War: Edith Archibald and the Halifax Feminist Movement." *Challenging the Regional Stereotype: Essays on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Maritimes* (Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989), 82 and David Frank, "The 1920s: Class and Region, Resistance and Accommodation." *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*. Edited by E. R. Forbes and D. A. Muise (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 254.

<sup>96</sup> J.W. Longley was also a man who was not in favour of women's suffrage and that puts him at odds with the WCTU at times. However, there is no indication of a connection between him and Stirling or a connection between Longley and the Parker and Miller case. For further information of J.W. Longley see: Colin Howell, "The 1900s: Industry, Urbanization and Reform." *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*. Edited by E. R. Forbes and D. A. Muise (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 159 and Forbes, "Battles in Another War: Edith Archibald and the Halifax Feminist Movement," 71-72.

<sup>97</sup> Conway, "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm," 48-49.

<sup>98</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 165.

<sup>99</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>100</sup> *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895.

<sup>101</sup> Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, xvii.

<sup>102</sup> Staples, *Middlemore Memories*, 188. This attitude towards child migrants is discussed both in works on child migrant specifically and also in works of children's history. For examples, see: Patricia T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum: From Child Rescue to the Welfare State in English-Canada (1880-1950)* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983), 223-269, Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 30-31 & 35; Joy Parr, *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 57-58 & 148-149 and Rooke and Schnell, Patricia T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell, *No Bleeding Heart: Charlotte Whitton, A Feminist on the Right* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987), ix & 52-53.

<sup>103</sup> See: Staples, *Middlemore Memories*, 1-183 for examples of recollections of Middlemore children placed in the Maritimes.

<sup>104</sup> See: Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, 235-236 and Gillian Wagner, *Children of the Empire* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982), 93-94 for Maritimes' examples of this attitude. Certainly this is not restricted to solely home children. Other young women who worked as household help experienced



this same sort of difficulty. They could be pressured into sexual relationships or sexually assaulted. If these situations were to become public knowledge it could very well be that it was the young women's reputation or chance at a livelihood that suffered. There were even cases where this situation ended in death for some of these women because of operations performed to end illicit pregnancies. See: Alison Prentice et al, *Canadian Women: A History*. (Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988), 124-125.

<sup>105</sup> Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, 236. They have the dates that Middlemore operated slightly wrong. See: Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 259. Also, Middlemore did not start operating in the Maritimes until the 1890s. His centre in Halifax was not built until the middle of that decade. Before that the receiving home he used was in London, Ontario. See: Kohli, *The Golden Bridge*, 225 and Staples, *Middlemore Memories*, ix

<sup>106</sup> Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 95

<sup>107</sup> Ironically, even the woman who asked for Maria Rye's intervention expressed this blame the young woman for the sexual relationship mentality to some extent. She claimed that the young woman in question was "rightfully dismissed". See Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 94 for a full accounting of this case.

<sup>108</sup> Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 94.

<sup>109</sup> Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 94. Andrew Doyle, an early critic of child migration, did not approve of Maria Rye's operation at all. See: Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, 81-97 for further discussion of this.

<sup>110</sup> Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," p. 226. Some of her more negative actions in Nova Scotia have to do with an earlier period in her Nova Scotia work than this thesis is covering. Particularly, they have to do with the Delaney case and Stirling's anti-Catholic religious prejudices. For further discussion, see: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 218-231 and Girard, "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia," 14-18.

<sup>111</sup> Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society*, 35

<sup>112</sup> See: Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (London: John Haddon & Co., 1892); Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898) and *New Star* (Kentville, N.S.), 11 October 1887

<sup>113</sup> There are plenty letters praising her work, supporting her cause or justifying her actions in both of her books. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work* (1892), and Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898). The WCTU record is: Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. In the inventory list at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management, where this record is housed, it is given a number 2 after the volume number. However, the individual items in the box are not actually labeled with individual numbers.

<sup>114</sup> Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>115</sup> Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. The book that this exchange is found in is the reports of meetings of the District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia 1892-1899. Describing the thoughts of a gentleman observer at this conference on the debate between Angwin and Stirling, the recorder for the conference wrote: "The latter gentleman speaking of the paper on Heredity said we had two sides of the question presented – Dr. Angwin's theory was 'As in Adam all die' – Miss Stirling's was 'so in Christ shall all be

made alive.” See: Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM.

<sup>116</sup>For a brief discussion of this sort of thinking affecting child migrant organizers see: Kenneth Bagnell, “Immigrant Children.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia Online*. [www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com](http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com). (accessed on various dates 2007).

<sup>117</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898) 167.

<sup>118</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898) 175.

<sup>119</sup> See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-184; *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895 and *Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April – June 1895.

<sup>120</sup> Quoted in Rooke and Snell, *Discarding the Asylum*, 244.

<sup>121</sup> George Conway has stated: “It was, perhaps, the very same generosity and kindness that Lady Stirling gave so freely that may have caused her to incur enemies and to have suffered the loss of the ‘Big House’.” See: Conway, “Lady Stirling’s Hillfoot Farm,” 48. This is probably comes a little too close to sanctifying Stirling. While this paper contends that Stirling went to Fagan’s aid because she believed in her, the author of this paper is not prepared to contend that it was simply out of “generosity and kindness”. This ignores the possible ideological predispositions that may have influenced Stirling’s belief in Fagan’s character. Conway’s description of Stirling also ignores the very real prejudices Stirling had in real life including ones such as her virulent prejudice against Catholics that affected other areas of her work. While there may have been “generosity and kindness” in Stirling’s character there were also more troubling aspects of Stirling’s character. For description of some of those character aspects see: Girard, “Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95,” 218-231 and Girard, “Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia,” 14-18. While this paper is less cynical than Philip Girard’s work on Stirling, it is more cynical than Conway’s. Further, the author of this paper is well aware that both Stirling’s assessment of Fagan’s character and the *Weekly Monitor*’s assessment of Fagan’s character are based on ideological predispositions that are grounded in attitudes of their time. Neither Stirling nor the WCTU would have faulted the *Weekly Monitor* for its apparent opposition to sex outside of marriage. Where Stirling would have disagreed with the *Weekly Monitor* in Fagan’s case was who was responsible for this indiscretion. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-184 and *Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 26 June 1895. For information on some of the WCTU attitudes towards sexual relations outside of marriage see: Wendy Mitchinson, “The WCTU: ‘For God, Home and Native Land’: A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism.” *A Not Unreasonable Claim*. Edited by Linda Kealey. (Toronto: Women’s Educational Press, 1979), 162. To argue that Fagan was not perfect is by no means to make a value judgement on sex outside of marriage or to deny the possibility that she was abused. However, to see Fagan’s entire character in the passive victim status that Stirling portrays Fagan in is to idealize Fagan, deny her any sort of agency and make judgement on her character with very little information. Moreover, whether or not Robert Parker and Samuel Nelson Miller were guilty of mistreatment of Fagan, they did have their detractors. Initially, newspapers believe Robert Parker may have tried to avoid facing the courts. See: *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895. Certainly, Samuel Nelson Miller had no qualms about breaking certain laws when it suited him. His convictions for selling alcohol in 1894 and 1895 were not because he was selling alcohol in the belief it would help his medical patients. His convictions were because he was selling alcohol to people who did not need alcohol for their medical ailments. See: Case against Dr. S. N. Miller for the sale of liquor in Middleton [1895], RG 7, Vol. 381, no. 123, NSARM.

<sup>122</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 157

<sup>123</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 169. Stirling claimed she had interactions with Ottawa and they failed to act. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 177, 181&182. Michael Anthony Staples makes some veiled comments about

---

Stirling's relationship with Ottawa. However, there is no indication where this information is from. See: Staples, *Middlemore Memories*, ix. More work in Ottawa will have to be done to see if this claim can be substantiated.

<sup>124</sup> *Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), 25 October 1895 and Stirling *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 175-176.

<sup>125</sup> "President's Address," *Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU [1890], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 1

<sup>126</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 173.

<sup>127</sup> Mitchinson, "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism," 162.

<sup>128</sup> Mitchinson, "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism," 162.

<sup>129</sup> Marlene J. Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society." (M.A. Thesis, Saint Mary's University, 2001), 13

<sup>130</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 174. (Italics and capitals in the original).

<sup>131</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 175.

<sup>132</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 175 & 177. (Capitals in the original).

<sup>133</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 175 & 176.

<sup>134</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), p. 167-169 & 175. These general sentiments can be seen from the tenor of Stirling's entire chapter on the year of 1895. See: Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 155-177.

<sup>135</sup> Philip Girard has done some "feminist analysis" on aspects of Stirling's child migration work, but not her WCTU work. See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 223-225.

<sup>136</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 168. Philip Girard has also commented upon the implications of these actions. See: Girard, "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95," 226.

<sup>137</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 168

<sup>138</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 168. Of course, Middleton is the place where Dr. Miller resides.

<sup>139</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 168-169.

<sup>140</sup> See: Mitchinson, "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism," 162; Willigar, "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society," 121-122; Backhouse, "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada," 61-130; Backhouse, "Chapter 5: Abortion," 140-166 and Mary Ellen Wright, "Unnatural Mothers: Infanticide in Halifax, 1850-1875." *The Nova Scotia Historical Review*, vol. 7, no. 2 (1987), 14-16.

---

<sup>141</sup> Certainly the newspapers of the time highlight abortion cases that came to the attention of the authorities both within the Maritimes and without. See: *Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), 30 October & 6 November 1890 and *Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), 13 May 1895. Certainly, newspapers have suggested houses of prostitution in Wolfville. *New Star* (Kentville, N.S.), 20 January 1888. However, nothing has obviously appeared in the newspapers surveyed to substantiate Stirling's specific claims. There may be other records that might substantiate these claims, but that is another research project in itself.

<sup>142</sup> Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (1898), 177. (Capitals in the original).

<sup>143</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895.

## Conclusion

And if by means of this strange story you are aroused to greater protection of your Homes, your young girls, and your dear little children; if you can really see sin as *it is*, and YOUR DANGER AS IT IS, looked at in the light of the flames of that burning house, I will almost feel reconciled to my share in the transaction, and will thank God that we have not suffered in vain nor laboured in vain.<sup>1</sup>

The above passage is part of Stirling's call-to-arms to the WCTU that was quoted at the beginning of this thesis, but it also seemed appropriate to end with it. This is quintessentially what Stirling hoped to accomplish when she rallied the WCTU in her 1898 book. She hoped that they could act so that Grace Fagan's plight (and Stirling's as well for coming to Fagan's defence) would not happen again. Even if the WCTU was able to act, for Stirling it was a consolation -- not a victory.

Moreover, the above quotation sums up precisely what Stirling's work with the Maritime WCTU was about. It was about the defence of primarily, though not exclusively, of children and young people, particularly young women. It was about protecting them, rightly or wrongly, from what Stirling saw as the perilous elements of society. Furthermore, Stirling's work with the Maritime WCTU illustrates that her efforts at this defence were not exclusively confined to her child migrants.

This work with the WCTU and the appeal to the WCTU in her 1898 book forces the historian to re-envision Stirling's last few years in Nova Scotia. The existing secondary literature on Stirling's life in the mid years of the 1890s is in large part incomplete, and at times some of it is confusing and misleading. There are basic details about the major events of 1895 that are convoluted and erroneous in much of the existing literature on Stirling, while the importance of her WCTU work is completely overlooked.

This thesis has endeavoured to expand the secondary literature on the events of 1895 and, particularly, the trial of Robert Parker and Samuel Nelson Miller. While known sources of the fire at Stirling's home in 1895, do not allow for much analysis beyond the possibility of arson and that Stirling had pockets of support, these sources do show that some of the WCTU remained amongst her supporters in 1895. How long the support lasted is unclear. Certainly, the Maritime WCTU still remained supportive in the fall of 1895 after the trial of Parker and Miller, but it is unknown whether they responded to Stirling's call-to-arms in her 1898 book.

The legal proceedings against Parker and Miller, however, provide fascinating ground for analysis. While this thesis has provided a clearer and more comprehensive overview of the various stages and events in the Parker and Miller trial than previously seen in the secondary literature, the story is by no means completely told. The known sources at times contradict each other and at times leave questions. While the newspapers of the day can expand greatly the details available on the Parker and Miller trial, the newspapers do not always agree and sometimes even create more mysteries than they solve. It remains impossible – to borrow the *Halifax Herald's* phrase – to determine whether the courts saw “the law vindicated”<sup>2</sup> when they refused to punish Parker and Miller. Are some of Stirling's accusations plausible? Yes. Are they provable? No. Thus, drawing conclusions on the guilt or innocence of Parker and Miller is unwise and unsupportable.

However, it is possible to see two different views on the character of home children within the Parker and Miller case. The Bridgetown *Weekly Monitor* expressed the ingrained prejudice towards child migrants in Canadian society. The *Weekly Monitor*

blamed the child migrant and the woman for any apparent sexual indiscretions. Such views were, unfortunately, all too common in Canada, including in the Maritimes. It was even seen amongst home child organizers themselves.

Stirling, however, had a different view. Grace Fagan was undoubtedly worthy of protection in Stirling's mind. Stirling would continue to believe this as late as the time that she wrote her 1898 book. For Stirling, in keeping with the tenor of sentiments often expressed by her WCTU counterparts, the young woman was the sufferer and the men were the guilty parties. Stirling was not without her faults, as existing studies of her child migration work clearly indicate. Further, it is hard to say how successful she was in general in preventing or protecting against the sort of treatment that Stirling felt Grace Fagan had suffered. Without the names and fates of all of Stirling's child migrants and most assuredly without the testimony of any of them it is difficult to determine how successful Stirling's efforts were in combating the typical problems that plagued the child migration movement.

There are many aspects of Stirling's work that remain unexplored. They provide fruitful ground for further research. Even within the events of 1895 there are questions that remain unanswered. Who are all the people who actually sent recorded donations to Stirling? Why did they personally decide to do so? What happened to Grace Fagan? Did her story really have, as the newspapers claimed, "a rather romantic ending"?<sup>3</sup> These questions may ultimately be unanswerable, but it is hoped that this paper has provided the ground work for such future research endeavours.

One previously forgotten aspect of Stirling's work, her efforts with the Maritime WCTU, has been explored. It is this exploration that provides the ability to re-envision

Stirling's last few years in Nova Scotia and even the Parker and Miller case itself.

Stirling's WCTU work grew in increasing importance as the 1890s progressed and encompassed a wide range of departments. All of her WCTU work was undoubtedly about – to borrow the Kentville *Western Chronicle*'s phrase – “prosecuting vice; etc.”<sup>4</sup>

While it is difficult to determine the exact effect the Stirling's general work for temperance and prohibition had on children specifically, it must be remembered that a large part of her justification for supporting temperance was to protect children from what she saw as the danger alcohol caused. Some of Stirling's WCTU efforts such as her work for the departments of STI and narcotics clearly involved children. Moreover, they clearly involved children who were born in Nova Scotia and were not brought to Nova Scotia by Stirling. In her WCTU work, one sees how by the mid 1890s Stirling's efforts to improve the lives of children and young people had transcended the boundary of immigrant child vs. Maritime born child. Stirling's efforts to protect children and young people through the WCTU brought her work into a sphere beyond child migration.

That Stirling's concern for children and young women had broadened is seen in her call for suffrage in her 1898 book. Stirling rallied the WCTU to fight even harder for suffrage, so that women could be protected from men. The impetus, for this call to suffrage may have been Grace Fagan, a grown child migrant, but for Stirling Fagan's plight had implications far beyond the treatment of one home child.

This is where one is forced to re-envision the Parker and Miller case. The case was Stirling's final campaign against moral “vice” in Nova Scotia. Undoubtedly, Fagan's defence was her responsibility because she was one of Stirling's home children. However, Fagan also became a representative of many young females, immigrants or



Nova Scotia born, who needed protection. This is where Stirling's work with the WCTU and her work with home children intertwine.

It was to the WCTU that Stirling wrote to continue the fight against the degradation of society's morals that Stirling felt the Parker and Miller case and its outcome represented. It was the WCTU that Stirling rallied to fight for suffrage and to change laws to protect women. But she did not write to the WCTU for the defence of home children. Stirling wrote to the WCTU against what she believed was a male led effort to propagate moral wrongs in society that threatened to consume all children, all youths and all women. In this case Stirling's efforts to protect all children and all females through her WCTU work overlapped with her responsibility for home children.

Stirling may have been exaggerating about the moral decay of society. She may have been wrong that the trial's verdict was incorrect. She may also have not always been entirely consistent in protecting her home children. Her morals may have been from a particular point of view. But what Stirling thought she was doing was "prosecuting vice; etc."<sup>5</sup> For Stirling, the Parker and Miller trial represented a "vice" that transgressed the sanctity of the lives of all members of the female gender wherever their birth place might have been.

Importantly, this thesis has illustrated that home child workers in the Maritimes cannot all be relegated to having a role only in the history of child migration. Stirling's work with the WCTU illustrates an interconnectedness between various philanthropic and social movements in the Atlantic region. Stirling's involvement in the WCTU and the Parker and Miller case also illustrates that at times, in the Maritimes at least, the world and work of child migration proponents was not isolated from that of the communities

receiving children. While these connections await further exploration, this project on Emma Stirling has illustrated that in Atlantic Canada the work of child migration operators has bearing on movements and issues in the broader context of the region's social history.

Thus, Stirling's WCTU work forces the historian to alter their picture of her final years in Nova Scotia. Stirling no longer remains a figure who can only be seen in relation to her child migration work. By the mid 1890s her work in Nova Scotia on behalf of children, youth and young women had crossed over into work that would effect populations of people far beyond child migrants. Stirling's efforts in her last few years in Nova Scotia were all about combating hindrances to the moral fabric of society that might harm the chances of children and young people to have moral lives. It did not matter whether those children were new or deep-rooted in Nova Scotia.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Emma M. Stirling, *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel* (Coatesville, PA: C.N. Speakman, 1898), 176.

<sup>2</sup> *Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), 2 April 1895.

<sup>3</sup> *Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895. This sentiment also appears in other papers as was noted earlier.

<sup>4</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895.

<sup>5</sup> *Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), 6 April 1895.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources (Books and Government Documents)

*Journals of the House of Assembly of the Province of New Brunswick*, 52 Victoria, 1889.

*Journals and Proceedings of House of Assembly of the Province of Nova Scotia*, 50 Victoria—60 Victoria, 1887-1897.

*Sessional Papers of Canada*, 50 Victoria – 59 Victoria, 1887-1896.

Stirling, Emma M. *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia: Being a History of Her Work*. London: John Haddon & Co., 1892.

Stirling, Emma M. *Our Children in Old Scotland and Nova Scotia, with sequel*. Coatesville, PA: C.N. Speakman, 1898.

### Primary Sources (Archival Sources)

*Annual Reports of the Edinburgh and Leith Children's Aid and Refuge for Prevention of Cruelty to Children*, Royal Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Edinburgh branch, [1886-1889], Royal Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, GD 409/5, vol. 1-4, National Archives of Scotland [hereafter NAS]. **Note:** The reports for 1886 and 1887 were written by Emma Stirling and are also entitled *Our Children*.

*Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1890], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 1, Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management. [hereafter NSARM].

*Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1894], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 2, NSARM.

*Annual Report*, Maritime WCTU, [1895], MG 20, Vol. 357, no. 3, NSARM.

*Annual Reports*, Nova Scotia WCTU [1896-1908], microfilm no. 16926, NSARM.

Case against Dr. S. N. Miller for the sale of liquor in Middleton [1895], RG 7, Vol. 381, no. 123, NSARM.

Circular of 1895 Sent to Agencies Involved with Immigrant Children, [1895], RG 76, Vol. 118, File 22857, microfilm reel C-4782, National Archives of Canada [hereafter NAC].

Constitution and Minute Book, 1892-1899, District W.C.T.U. of Western Nova Scotia, [June 9 - 11, 1894], MG 20, Vol. 3542, no. 2, NSARM. **Note:** The inventory list at the Nova Scotia Archives and Records Management has this book demarcated

as no. 2 after the volume number, however, the books in the box are not actually individually numbered.

*Delaney vs. Stirling* (Halifax Supreme Court) [1888 - 1891], RG 39C, Vol. 396, No. 3071 & 3080, NSARM.

*Eastern District Annual Reports*, Scottish National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (SNSPCC), Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Edinburgh branch, [1890-1894], RSSPCC fonds, GD 409/5, vol. 5-9, NAS.

Letter from Emma Stirling to Mr. Lowe, [May 23, 1887]; RG 17, vol. 540, File 60268, NAC.

Marriage License of Stanley Vidito and Grace Fagan, Marriage Licenses (Annapolis County, Nova Scotia). [21 June 1895], Microfilm no. 16005, NSARM.

Minute books of Directors' Monthly Meeting Stockbridge Day Nursery, Infant Home & branches, Royal Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (RSSPCC) fonds, [May 1, 1884- October, 1895], GD 409/1, vol. 1 & 2, NAS.

Photocopy of the obituary of Samuel Nelson Miller [1935], MacDonald Museum, Middleton, Nova Scotia [hereafter NSMM].

Supreme Court Docket, October, 1877 to October, 1901 (Annapolis) [June 1895], NSARM.

Supreme Court Record of Proceedings, October 17, 1884 – June 21, 1913 (Annapolis) [June 18 -20, 1895], 1996-235-018, NSARM.

*The Queen vs. Burrill* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7. No. 1, NSARM.

*The Queen vs. Jacob Marshall* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, No. 2, NSARM.

*The Queen vs. Parker and Miller* (Annapolis) [1895], RG 39, Vol. 7, no. 3, NSARM.

**Note:** This case and the two that immediately proceed it are all in the same box along with other Annapolis court records from the period.

### **Primary Sources (Newspapers)**

*Acadian* (Wolfville, N.S.), September - November 1894, April - November 1895.

*Acadian Recorder* (Halifax, N.S.), April - June 1895.

*Chignecto Post* (Sackville, N.B.), 1888-1891, April – December 1895.

*Colchester Sun* (Truro, N.S.), 29 May 1895.

*Daily Gleaner* (Fredericton, N.B.), September - October 1894, April - June 1895.

*Daily Sun* (Saint John, N.B.), March - April 1889, April - June 1895

*Echo* (Halifax, N.S.), April - June 1895.

*Evening Mail* (Halifax, N.S.), April - June 1895.

*Herald* (Halifax, N.S.), April - July 1895.

*Methodist Wesleyan*, April - June 1895

*Morning Chronicle* (Halifax, N.S.), April - June 1895.

*New Star* (Kentville, N.S.), 1886-1890. **Note:** There are severe gaps in the remaining issues of this paper, particularly for 1889-1890. The most complete set are the originals held by the Archives at Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.

*Outlook* (Middleton, N.S.), 28 June 1895. **Note:** This is the only issue of this paper for the year of 1895 known to be in existence. It is held by the MacDonald Museum, Middleton, Nova Scotia.

*Presbyterian Witness* (Halifax, N.S.), April - June 1895.

*The Reporter and Fredericton Advertiser* (Fredericton, N.B.), March - April 1889, April - June 1895.

*Weekly Monitor* (Bridgetown, N.S.), 25 April 1894, April - June 1895

*Western Chronicle* (Kentville, N.S.), February - September 1891, November - December 1891, October - November 1894, January - December 1895. **Note:** The most complete set of issues for this paper for this period are the originals held by the Archives at Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia.

### **Secondary Sources (Books, Articles, Theses and Compilations)**

Backhouse, Constance. "Chapter 5: Abortion." *Petticoats and Prejudice: Women and Law in Nineteenth Century Canada*. Toronto: The Women's Press, 1991. 140-166

Backhouse, Constance. "Involuntary Motherhood: Abortion, Birth Control and the Law in Nineteenth Century Canada." *Windsor Yearbook Access to Justice* 3 (1983): 61-130.

- Bagnell, Kenneth. *The Little Immigrants: The Orphans who Came to Canada*. Toronto: Dundurn, 2001 (1980).
- Coldrey, Barry. "A Charity which has Outlived its Usefulness': The Last Phase of Catholic Child Migration, 1947-56." *History of Education*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (1996): 373-386.
- Conrad, Margaret, Toni Laidlaw and Donna Smyth. (Eds.). *No Place Like Home: Diaries and Letters of Nova Scotia Women 1771-1938*. Halifax, N.S.: Formac Publishing Company Limited, 1988.
- Conway, George B. "Lady Stirling's Hillfoot Farm." *Kings County Vignettes: Interesting Stories of Kings County (Volume 10)*. Compiled by Helen Hansford and Cathy Margeson. Kentville, N.S.: The Community History Committee of the Kings County Historical Society, 2000. 45-49.
- Corbett, Gail H. *Barnardo Children in Canada*. Peterborough, ON: Woodland Publishing, 1981.
- DeCoste, John A. and Twila L. Robar-DeCoste, *A History of Aylesford and District: In Commemoration of the 200<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Aylesford Township*. Aylesford, N.S.: n.p., 1986.
- Forbes, E.R. *Challenging the Regional Stereotype*. Fredericton, N.B.: Acadiensis Press, 1989.
- Forbes, E.R. and D. A. Muise (Eds.). *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Funk and Wagnall's New Standard Dictionary of the English Language*. A post 1921 edition, s.v. "tales".
- Girard, Philip. "Children, Church, Migration and Money: Three Tales of Child Custody in Nova Scotia." *Children's Voices in Atlantic Literature and Culture: Essays on Childhood*. Edited by Hilary Thompson. Guelph: Canadian Children's Press, 1997. 10-23.
- Girard, Philip. "Victorian Philanthropy and Child Rescue: The Career of Emma Stirling in Scotland and Nova Scotia, 1860-95." *Myth, Migration and the Making of Memory: Scotia and Nova Scotia c. 1700-1990*. Edited by Marjory Harper and Michael E. Vance. Halifax: The Gorsebrook Research Institute, 1999. 218-231.
- Hacker, Carlotta. *The Indomitable Lady Doctors*. Toronto: Goodread Biographies, 1984.
- Harper, Marjory. "Cossar's Colonists: Juvenile Migration to New Brunswick in the 1920s." *Acadiensis*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Autumn 1998): 47-65.

- Harrison, Phyllis. (Ed.). *The Home Children: Their Personal Stories*. Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer Publishing Limited, 1979.
- Kernaghan, Lois K. "'Someone wants the Doctor': Maria L. Angwin M.D. (1849-1898)." *Collections of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, Vol. 43 (1991): 33-48.
- Kohli, Marjorie. *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939*. Toronto: Natural Heritage Books, 2003.
- Kohli, Marjorie. "Young Immigrants in Nova Scotia." *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999): 11-21.
- Little, Jean. *Orphan at My Door: The Home Child Diary of Victoria Cope*. Markham, ON: Scholastic Canada, 2001.
- Mitchinson, Wendy. "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study in Nineteenth-Century Feminism." *A Not Unreasonable Claim*. Edited by Linda Kealey. Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1979. 151-167.
- Nova Scotia Newspapers: A Directory and Union List 1752-1988*. Compiled by Lynn Murphy. Catalogued by Brenda Hicks. With assistance from Anjali Vohra. Halifax: Dalhousie University School of Library and Information Studies, 1990.
- Parr, Joy. *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994 (1980).
- Parr, Joy. "'Transplanting from Dens of Iniquity': Theology and Child Emigration." *A Not Unreasonable Claim*. Edited by Linda Kealey. Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1979. 169-183.
- Prentice, Alison et al. *Canadian Women: A History*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988.
- Rand, Elizabeth. "Dempsey Corner." *Kings County Vignettes*. n.p.: Community History Kings Historical Society, 1989. 3-5.
- Rippey, Mary Louise and Leland Harvie. "Emma M. Stirling and Hillfoot Farm." *Nova Scotia Genealogist*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1999): 5-11.
- Rooke, Patricia T. and R. L. Schnell. *Discarding the Asylum: From Child Rescue to the Welfare State in English-Canada (1880-1950)*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1983.
- Rooke, Patricia T. and R. L. Schnell. *No Bleeding Heart: Charlotte Whitton, A Feminist on the Right*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.



*Some History of Aylesford.* Compiled and Written by: Greta Balsor. 1983-1984. Property of the Genealogical Committee of the Kings Historical Society. Kings County Museum, Kentville, Nova Scotia. Note: This is a compilation of articles and three of the articles briefly comment on Emma Stirling's years in Nova Scotia.

Staples, Michael Anthony. *Middlemore Memories: Tales of the British Home Children.* Fredericton, N.B.: Unipress Limited, 2003.

Strong-Boag, Veronica, "'Setting the Stage': National Organization and the Women's Movement in the Late 19<sup>th</sup> Century." *The Neglected Majority: Essay's In Canadian Women's History.* Edited by Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice. Toronto.: McClelland and Stewart, 1977. 87-103.

Sutherland, Neil. *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Veer, Joanne. "Feminist Forebears: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada's Maritime Provinces 1875-1900." Ph. D. Thesis, University of New Brunswick, 1994.

Wagner, Gillian. *Children of the Empire.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982.

Willigar, Marlene J. "The Maritime Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1875 – 1895 Labouring for a Temperate Society." M.A. Thesis, Saint Mary's University, 2001.

Wright, Mary Ellen. "Unnatural Mothers: Infanticide in Halifax, 1850-1875." *The Nova Scotia Historical Review*, vol. 7, no. 2 (1987): 13-27.

### **Secondary Sources (Internet sources)**

Bagnell, Kenneth. "Immigrant Children." *The Canadian Encyclopedia Online.* [www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com](http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com). (accessed on various dates 2007).

Girard, Philip. "Stirling, Emma Maitland". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* 2004 edition. Online. [www.oxforddnb.com](http://www.oxforddnb.com) (accessed on various dates 2007).

Gordon, Daniel Miner." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online.* [www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=42297&query=Gordon](http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=42297&query=Gordon). (accessed on various dates 2007).

"The People of Western Kings 1785-1901: references for: Sterling Emma." [www.rootsweb.com/~nskings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm](http://www.rootsweb.com/~nskings2/WKings/Refs-S2/SterlingEmma.htm). (accessed on various dates 2006-2007).

[www.automatedgenealogy.com](http://www.automatedgenealogy.com) (accessed on various dates 2006-2007). **Note:** This is a sight where one can search various databases such as the Canadian censuses for 1901 and 1911.

[www.collectionscanada.ca/archivianet/02011003\\_e.html](http://www.collectionscanada.ca/archivianet/02011003_e.html). (accessed on various dates 2006-2007). **Note:** This is an online database where one can type in the names of home children to try and find their immigration records.

[www.novascotiagenealogy.com](http://www.novascotiagenealogy.com). (accessed on various dates 2007). **Note:** This is an online database where one can search historical vital statistics records from Nova Scotia.