

## PAPER IV

# MARY MACKILLOP'S VISITS TO QUEENSLAND

Sr Margaret McKenna RSG 2-4-96

### **The Australian people's saint.**

On the 16th January 1995, Pope John Paul II declared, '*An extraordinary event in the life of the church in this land (Australia) is being celebrated: the beatification of Mother Mary MacKillop, the first Australian formally declared among the Blessed in heaven.*'<sup>1</sup> After years of research into every aspect of her life, the writing of the Positio for the Canonisation of Mary of the Cross MacKillop, and rigorous investigation by the Congregation for the Causes of Saints, Rome has set its seal of approval on this woman. Australia has its first 'beata': the Australian daughter of migrants from the Scottish Highlands. Mary MacKillop was born in Brunswick Street Fitzroy, then known as New Town, near Melbourne Victoria, on 15 January 1842. She died in Sydney New South Wales, on 8 August 1909 aged sixty seven. Today she is hailed as 'the Australian people's saint.'

### **Sister Mary of the Cross comes to the diocese of Brisbane.**

Known as Sister Mary or Mother Mary of the Cross, Mary MacKillop visited Queensland on eight occasions between the years 1870 and 1890. The length of time she spent on each visit varied. From January 1870 until April 1871 she lived in South Brisbane. This was the longest of her visits. On most other occasions she stayed for two or three months. The last two visits seem to have been shorter. On each occasion Brisbane was her base. Letters preserved in the Mary MacKillop archives North Sydney are testimony to the friendships that she made with Queenslanders over that period.<sup>2</sup> These letters reveal a bond of loyalty between the writers and the usually calm, quietly spoken nun with the slight Scottish accent.<sup>3</sup>

### **A Controversial figure.**

At the time of her beatification the Australian press hailed Mary MacKillop as a '*saint, a celebrity and a cultural hero*'.<sup>4</sup> Our national parliament acknowledged that, '*The qualities she embodies - openness and tolerance, courage, persistence, faith and care for others - are qualities for individuals, communities and nations to live by.*'<sup>5</sup> During her lifetime, however, she was a controversial figure. Some

hailed her as a living saint, a kind good woman. Others saw her merely as a trouble maker in the Catholic church.

Archbishop Duhig, when he was Bishop of Rockhampton talked with Mary MacKillop. In his evidence at the Process of Beatification he recalled this meeting: *'I met Mother Mary of the Cross for the first and only time when I was in Sydney on my way to Rome for my ad limina visit in 1909. Mother Mary was in a wheel chair then...This meeting with Mother Mary made a great impression on me which remains vividly with me until today. She was a very wise and saintly woman with a great trust in the providence of God.'*<sup>6</sup>

Other bishops held a different view. Bishop James Quinn, the first bishop of Brisbane, called her *'an ambitious, obstinate woman, a disobedient nun, the daughter of a spoiled priest and a very troublesome woman.'*<sup>7</sup> He declared to his priests that she *'had bribed the authorities in Rome'*<sup>8</sup> to agree with her, and that she was a subversive influence in his diocese.<sup>9</sup> The bishop of Adelaide, Dr Reynolds, accused her of drunkenness and of embezzling diocesan funds.<sup>10</sup>

The assessment of Cardinal Moran was different. In 1884 the Roman authority responsible for the government of the church in Australia, the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, directed Patrick Moran the new archbishop of the diocese of Sydney to investigate Dr Reynold's accusation. Moran reported to Rome that the charges were false and that in his judgement, Mary MacKillop was *'a well-educated person with much ability'*.<sup>11</sup> His opinion of her did not change over the years. Five days before her death in 1909, on his last visit, Cardinal Moran said to the sisters, *'[Mother Mary's] death will bring many blessings not only on yourselves, and your congregation but on the whole Australian church.'*<sup>12</sup>

### **What was the truth of Mary MacKillop?**

The Congregation for the Causes of Saints had to sift through the evidence and come to a decision. The question posed to the members of the special commission of this Roman congregation was, *'How [do we] account for the remarkable life and prodigious labours of Mary MacKillop? Can we explain it simply as a self-willed woman who was obstinate and ambitious beyond measure? Or must we acknowledge in her person and in her tireless toil the presence and power of God sustaining a selfless servant totally dedicated to God's will?'*<sup>13</sup> After studying the evidence the commissioners declared for the latter. One stated *'It is my judgment that she was totally dedicated and faithful to the mission entrusted to her by God through the Holy See'*<sup>14</sup>

### **The dangerous, revolutionary, indecorous Josephites.<sup>15</sup>**

Bishop James Quinn the first bishop of Brisbane was keen to have the services of the Sisters of St Joseph in his diocese. His interest in this new Australian sisterhood had been aroused while he was at the meeting of bishops in Melbourne early in 1869. Bishop Shiel had described how this newly formed religious sisterhood promised to be an effective provider of Catholic education in the diocese of Adelaide because the sisters were willing to live in small communities in isolated townships. Quinn's curiosity was stirred. He realised that the flexibility and mobility suited the pattern of settlement and shifts of population in Queensland so he asked Woods, their founder, to send him a photograph of a sister in the habit.<sup>16</sup> This must have pleased the bishop of Brisbane because he decided to invite the Sisters of St Joseph to his diocese because as he wrote to a friend, '*They can go where other nuns cannot.*'<sup>17</sup>

The Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph, founded in South Australia by Fr. Julian Tenison Woods and Mary MacKillop, was four years old and numbered eighty-two members when Mary MacKillop made her first visit to Brisbane in December 1869.<sup>18</sup> She was Sister Guardian of this group of dedicated, enthusiastic young women. Their average age in 1871 was twenty-four years six months. The racial composition of the group reflected that of Catholic white Australia of the period. Thirty percent had been born in Australia, sixty percent in Ireland and of the remaining ten percent, five came from England, two from Scotland, one each from Germany and the East Indies. Unlike many of the European religious orders who drew their members from the upper and middle classes, the Sisters of St Joseph were mainly from working class families. The servant girl could join the Institute as easily as the more affluent and better educated woman because no dowry was required to enter.<sup>19</sup>

The Institute had distinctive features in its ethos and structure. Its nature was egalitarian. Neither education nor social standing were criteria for entry into the community, and all grades and distinctions within the group were frowned upon. It had a 'grassroots flavour'. Because over half of the members had been reared in the colonies, the distinctive characteristic of the members was their ordinariness.<sup>20</sup> In colonial Queensland as well as in other parts of Australia this was not always appreciated. To some Catholics this 'ordinariness' was an endearing quality. Others who associated religious women with the upper classes of society, found the lack of mystique among the Josephites a cause of scandal. Some believed that '*it brought discredit on the Catholics in the eyes of the Protestants.*'<sup>21</sup> The Josephites were to discover that some of the Brisbane clergy held this opinion. Mary wrote to Woods from Brisbane 4 August 1870 '*I have not yet met one priest here who is not more or less afraid of the world's opinion ... I think the priests would run us out of Queensland if they saw us begging. One day this week Sister Collette and I*

*were coming home from St Mary's and I was carrying our convent broom in my hand. The thought of the consternation of some of the priests at the idea, were they to meet us, made us both laugh. I mention this to let you see how we are led to think the priests regard our spirit.'*<sup>22</sup>

### **Brisbane- a mission fraught with ambivalence from its beginnings.**

The sisters' experiences were to show that Dr Quinn wanted their services but only on his terms. In his letter to Fr Woods asking him to send some sisters he wrote, 'owing to the heavy depression in Queensland, there are no funds to pay expenses.'<sup>23</sup> This meant that the sisters had to obtain their passage money as best they could by requests to strangers, generous benefactors or relatives. The fare was collected in stages, firstly in Adelaide then in Melbourne and finally in Sydney.<sup>24</sup> In Melbourne Mary was disappointed that the Vicar General refused her request to beg because she had once again to turn to her family, relatives and friends for help. Sydney received the travellers with kindness and the foundress of the Sisters of the Good Samaritan, Mother Gibbons, invited them to stay in their Pitt Street Convent,<sup>25</sup> but they were warned that all was not well in the diocese of Brisbane. The sisters sensed that '*all seemed to look upon the little band as rushing into troubles they little knew of.*'<sup>26</sup> Time was to prove that the Josephites would also discover themselves in trouble with the bishop. The issues of education and the manner of offering it to the children of the working class, the social class of the women wishing to join the sisterhood and the style of government adopted by the sisters were matters upon which the Bishop James Quinn held a viewpoint which differed from that of the sisters.

### **Catholic education for the working class.**

The sisters' apostolate was to serve the labouring class and the neglected by offering elementary education, especially in the poorer sections of the cities and in pockets of settlement in rural Australia even where there was no resident priest. They were dedicated to a 'low maintenance' type of apostolate in which three or four sisters would live among the people whose children they were teaching and accept whatever payment the parents could afford. Their philosophy of education differed from that of Bishop Quinn. The bishop viewed education in terms of social prestige through 'culture and accomplishment', whereas the Josephites saw it as offering a means of social mobility to the children of the working class. They sought to offer an education equal to, if not superior to that given in the state schools. The emphasis was on the integration of religion and secular so that the children experienced a religious atmosphere and grew in an understanding of their Catholic identity.

### **A centralised system of government.**

To sustain and preserve the unity of such a newly formed group so thinly spread over a number of dioceses, a centralised form of government under one superior based in Adelaide was adopted by the sisters and in 1874 approved by Rome. This did not please many of the bishops who were accustomed to having immediate jurisdiction over the internal administration of women religious in the diocese. Such was the case with Bishop James Quinn. While the bishop did not like the 'working class' image of the group and tried through the interference of Dr Cani to prevent servant girls from entering the sisterhood, it was the issue of central government and Quinn's inability to accept the sisters' right to choose the Rule they wished to follow, that prompted him to dismiss the sisters from his diocese in 1880.

### **Sister Mary the teacher.**

Mary MacKillop, with five companions arrived in the diocese of Brisbane, co-extensive with the state of Queensland, on Friday 31 December 1869. Mary, aged twenty seven was the eldest member of the community. She and Sr Clare Wright had made vows for life on the day they had left Adelaide for Queensland. Sisters Augustine Keogh and Francis de Sales O'Sullivan had taken vows for a period of five years. Sr Theresa Maginnis was a novice and Sr Gertrude Byrne, a postulant, had joined the sisters while they were in Sydney. All had been born in Australia with the exception of two who, as children, had come to Australia from Ireland. Dr John Cani the Vicar General of the diocese met them on behalf of Bishop James Quinn who was in Rome attending the first Vatican Council. His welcome was cordial. The Sisters of Mercy offered them hospitality at All Hallows Convent for two to three weeks until they rented a house in South Brisbane, the poorer part of the city. Sr Teresa Maginnis described this house situated in Tribune Street. It consisted of '*four small rooms, two upstairs and two on the ground floor, with a back verandah which served for the kitchen and refectory. Near this was a washhouse with one small window painted with the bluebag.*'<sup>27</sup> By the end of January they had moved to Montague Street. Here they rented what had been an old hotel.: '*[It] was larger and more convenient in every way and we had not far to go to Mass*',<sup>28</sup> wrote Josephine Carolin the first Queensland postulant.

The sisters took over the staffing of St. Mary's School in South Brisbane. This was the school that Bishop Quinn had referred to in a letter to Julian Tenison Woods, '*There is a portion of our city that sadly needs them [the sisters],*' he wrote, '*and there is a school already prepared for them*'.<sup>29</sup> This school, housed in St Mary's church, had been staffed by the Sisters of Mercy. These sisters had been forced to close it because it was too far from their Mother House and '*there were no means of getting to it except to walk.*'<sup>30</sup> With Mary MacKillop as the head

teacher, the school re-opened with an enrolment of seventy.<sup>31</sup> By the end of 1870 the Josephites had opened four schools in the diocese. Two more in Brisbane, St. Joseph's at 'One Mile Swamp', now Woolloongabba, and St. John the Baptist's, Petrie Terrace. Maryborough was their first school in the country.<sup>32</sup> Young women joined the group and it was in Maryborough that the first profession ceremony in Queensland of a Sister of St Joseph was held in January 1872 and by 1880 when the sisters left this town two of this first community, Sisters Augustine and Gertrude were buried in its cemetery.

Some stories have come down to us from these days. Mary MacKillop had the privilege of preparing the children for their first communion. She was a practical woman! The evening prior to the 'special day' she had the ceremony of 'the washing of the feet'.<sup>33</sup> This held its usual religious significance but on this occasion it had a practical purpose as well. The children did not wear shoes. This fact had surprised Mary when she noticed it on arrival in South Brisbane.<sup>34</sup> After this ceremony the feet of the children were washed clean, ready for Mass the next morning. There are stories of picnics and games. School was to be a happy experience. An innovative game that linked fun with pedagogy was named the 'Providence Bag.' This was a combination of 'Lucky Dip' and 'Blind man's bluff'. The aim of the game was for the blindfolded children to find and reach into a bag full of gifts and select one.

### **The Education debate.**

In 1869 when the sisters arrived, the policy of the Queensland Liberal government on education was in a stage of transition. The plan was to have one centralised authority in complete control of all schools. The struggle for the churches, especially the Anglican and Catholic, was to gain some funding from the government for their denominational schools. Over the next ten years the government gradually tightened its control of education by imposing regulations on and reducing funding of the non-government schools.

The small community of Josephites arrived just as the government declared that all national (government) schools were 'free' and issued a regulation that no fees were to be charged in any school in the state.<sup>35</sup> Mary MacKillop and the Josephites had also stumbled into a scene where the Catholic laity was divided. Some were in support of a system of Catholic education completely separate from government interference. Others argued that the interests of both church and state would be better served by all children attending the same school, whereas a third group was happy with the situation where the Catholic schools received funding by being registered with the Board of Education and governed by the regulations imposed by this arm of the government. Bishop Quinn's policy was for all Catholic schools to

be registered with the Board despite its restrictive rulings. In 1869 the Board of Education had ruled that in registered schools no religious symbols were to be displayed and no prayers were to be said. The next step was to decree that any teacher who taught religion in a school would forfeit their government funded salary. The Sisters of Mercy had reluctantly registered their schools with the Board of Education and obeyed these regulations with great inconvenience.

Education was one of the primary initiatives of Dr Quinn in his diocese.<sup>36</sup> By 1869 he had increased the number of schools from the four on his arrival to twenty-eight.<sup>37</sup> When the grant was available only to those schools who were subject to the regulations of the Board of Education he directed firstly that the parish schools and then those of the Sisters of Mercy be registered. By 1866 all schools in the Brisbane diocese had been registered with the Board of Education. On ideological grounds Quinn had no problems with this decision, and there were important practical reasons that endorsed it. The salaries of teachers would be paid, inspection by an outside body would ensure standards were maintained, and the parents would be reassured because the curriculum was identical to that followed by the national (state) schools.

#### **The Josephite Position - Catholic education for the working class and poor.**

The Josephite system devised by Woods and MacKillop held to 'a purely Catholic principle'. By this they meant that everything pertaining to the school should be such that the children 'were constantly breathing the atmosphere of their religion'.<sup>38</sup> Woods and MacKillop argued that this was a necessity in their schools which were founded for the children of the working class. They knew that these children had little or no education and would not spend many years at school. Their parents were in many cases illiterate with little interest in, or knowledge of Catholic beliefs. It was important, then, for such children to gain a sense of identity as Catholics.

Woods and MacKillop believed that the Catholic church seemed to have lost the interest of the working class.<sup>39</sup> Most were migrants or the children of migrants. Often they were married to partners of a different religion. This fact in most cases made the practice of their faith difficult. Even when their adherence to the faith was strong the lack of opportunity to attend Mass and frequent the sacraments, together with the secular influence of the society tended to make them remiss in the attendance at church services even when these were available. They felt no obligation to attend to the religious education of their children.<sup>40</sup> Despite the urging of bishops to send their children to Catholic schools these parents chose the nearest school. If this experience was common among the poor in the cities, the situation was more pronounced in the smaller towns where there were no resident pastors,

and community pressures to accept the status quo were stronger.

The Josephites offered to the diocese of Brisbane an Australian insight into the manner and method of offering education to the children of the working class. This system had already proved to be practical and effective in South Australia.<sup>41</sup> The sisters saw their schools as avenues of Catholic influence, 'to be to the church in those places where [they were] established what the secular schools [were] to the various governments'.<sup>42</sup> This system was organised. A series of Catholic textbooks with an Australian background was being written by Woods with advice from MacKillop. The schooling offered was 'a sound English education ... equal to that given in the national schools of the colony'.<sup>43</sup> The emphasis was on the practical rather than the 'culture and accomplishment' of Catholic schools run by the orders of nuns who had come from Ireland and Europe. Unlike other Catholic schools there were no divisions based on status in Josephite schools. The sisters were so convinced of their system and method of education that Woods in the *Rule for the Institute of St Joseph* set it down in detail. It was then not a matter of choice for the sisters but an obligation. It was part of the Rule according to which they had made their vows.

With funding would also come government regulations. This, to them, would open the Catholic system to government control and to secular liberalism.<sup>44</sup> While the Woods/MacKillop scheme stressed independence for the system and integration of religion into the curriculum, they saw the policy in the Brisbane diocese as one of compromise. There was segregation rather than integration of the religious and secular subjects because Quinn made allowance for the large numbers of Protestant children attending the schools.<sup>45</sup> MacKillop agreed that this method may have been suitable for some children, but it was totally unsuitable for schools that were founded for the children of the working class.

The registration of their schools with the Board of Education was to the sisters more than a question of the suitability of an educational method, because it brought into question their obedience to their Rule. To support the sisters' call to service the needs of the poor, Fr Woods had compiled a set of rules which he believed made the vision practical. One directive forbade the sisters to receive salaries. To register their schools not only meant obeying government directives but also receiving wages as teachers. Bishop Shiel on 13 December 1868 had given official approval of the Rule and by so doing established the Sisters of St Joseph as a religious institute. According to church law the sisters had both rights and obligations. They were obliged to follow this Rule and the church directives concerning members of religious institutes. They also had a right to have their way of life respected by the church authorities. The sisters chose to obey their



Rule but found that their right to have their Rule respected was ignored by the church authority in the diocese of Brisbane.

### **An experience of deprivation.**

The Josephite position was clear. They would not register their schools with the Board of Education. Dr Cani, the vicar general of the diocese, set about a campaign to force them to do so. He warned Mary that she was not to ask for fees from the parents. She requested permission to beg for help from the public. Dr Cani refused. This meant that the sisters were without any means of financial support. Starvation is a hard task master. In 1900, Mary recalled these first days in South Brisbane: *'It was a hard struggle at first, in fact for some months. Many privations were quietly endured, no word of complaint either to the priest or people, hunger often felt, water used instead of tea, meat a rare luxury, but the work went on and the sisters were happy'*.<sup>46</sup> The people began to ask how the sisters supported themselves. They took the matter into their own hands and called a meeting, formed a committee and support of the sisters was arranged.<sup>47</sup>

Dr Cani, too, must have realised that hunger was not effective as a pressure, because he supported this action on the part of the parishioners as he said: *'[to] support the poor sisters'*.<sup>48</sup> At the same time he told Mary MacKillop that she was *'selfwilled and obstinately bent upon adhering to her own ways rather than to yield to the wishes of learned and enlightened superiors.'*<sup>49</sup> She reminded Cani that Woods had assured her that Bishop James Quinn had agreed to respect the sisters' Rule.<sup>50</sup> For that first year there was a distinct feeling by the sisters that if Dr Cani had the authority they would be forced to (in Mary MacKillop's words) *'to tramp it out of Queensland.'*<sup>51</sup>

### **Food for the spirit.**

Physical deprivation had been ineffective in forcing the Josephites to register their schools with the Board of Education so the vicar general turned his attention to spiritual deprivation. Dr Cani used the obligation placed on religious to confess only to the appointed confessor to punish the sisters for not registering their schools with the Board of Education. It would seem that he had been appointed by Dr Quinn to be their chaplain and spiritual director or he had chosen this role for himself. He neglected on several occasions to offer them the sacrament of penance and the ceremony of Benediction and he would not allow another priest to attend to these needs.<sup>52</sup> Spiritual sustenance was very important to these young women who had made a radical decision to follow, for the love of God and service to the needy, a very distinctive form of apostolic religious life. They had left family, friends and familiar surroundings to follow what they saw as a call from God. None had received formation in a regular novitiate. Father Woods had as 'Father

Director' offered that formation. Until she had come to Brisbane Mary MacKillop had benefited from his enthusiastic explanation of the Josephite vision, but none of this was offered in the diocese of Brisbane. It was the seeming neglect in this area of spiritual nourishment that the sisters found particularly difficult. In a church with a strong sacramental tradition this was punishment indeed.

The punitive measures were all pervasive. The sisters and their apostolate were ignored. In the first ten months as their director Cani had offered no spiritual input to the sisters nor had he visited their schools.<sup>53</sup> Further he dissuaded other priests from taking any interest in the schools run by the Sisters of St Joseph. Mary MacKillop wrote: *'It seems to us that the priests are not encouraged to come near us.'*<sup>54</sup>

### **Dr Cani - the bishop's man.**

The future of the community was threatened. In his role as Administrator of the diocese Cani alone had the right to receive young women into the novitiate of the Sisters of St Joseph and to receive their vows at their Profession. He delayed the reception of novices and refused to receive postulants or to allow novices to pronounce their vows.<sup>55</sup> He did not believe that women from the working class should be received as religious.

Dr Cani was a disappointment and puzzle to Mary MacKillop. She found him *'kind, but very silent and reserved -will listen, or has as yet listened, to anything I have wished to say, but never seems inclined to give an opinion. I cannot but think he means well, and that he is a most holy priest, but beyond that he is a puzzle to me.'*<sup>56</sup> *'He cannot understand our position. He seems frightened of the Bishop.'*<sup>57</sup> Where Cani really stood on the issue was difficult to know. The question could be asked, 'Was it fear of the bishop that drove Cani to put professional survival above the call for justice to the Sisters of St Joseph? Mary MacKillop seemed to think that fear was a factor, she wrote: *'I believe that Dr Cani ... acts against his better judgement. I think he would love to lean more upon God than to the outward world as he seems to do.'*<sup>58</sup> Fifteen years later, in 1885, Mary met with Cani in Sydney. He was then Bishop of Rockhampton. She describes this meeting to her mother, *'Poor Dr Cani made for us at once when he arrived on Sunday ... I went into his Mass at the Providence yesterday and had a quick chat with him over many things. He reminded me that I was 'Mary of The Cross' and asked need I wonder.'*<sup>59</sup>

The effect of this treatment on these young Sisters of St Joseph was one of disillusionment. Some began to doubt their calling.<sup>60</sup> Most remained dedicated

but said: *'We need not thank either him [the bishop or his representative] or those under him who should have guided and helped us.'*<sup>61</sup>

### **An unpopular bishop and an unhappy diocese.**

When Mary left Queensland in April 1871, the bishop had not returned from Europe. She took away with her a perception of both the diocese and James Quinn. She wrote: *'I think Dr Quinn must have a very determined will. All seem so afraid of crossing him'*.<sup>62</sup> Of the diocese she had this to say, *'This seems a very unhappy diocese ... The Bishop and his relations in general with the priests and people is sad-sad indeed. He is such a kind and generous-intentioned man, but no one relies on his promises, for in his warm and generous character he promises more than he can accomplish, and this unfortunately makes him unpopular'*.<sup>63</sup> Mary was to meet Bishop James Quinn in person on her next visit to Brisbane in 1875.

### **Mary MacKillop's second visit, April to September 1875.**

Mary was back in Brisbane in April 1875. In the four years since she had left, much had happened to Mary MacKillop, Woods and the small Josephite community both in South Australia and in the diocese of Brisbane. When Mary returned to Adelaide in April 1871, she found Woods overworked and ill. Factions had formed within the Adelaide diocesan Catholic community. Dr Shiel had returned to Adelaide from Europe on 2 February 1871 to find that the diocese was in financial difficulties and that opposing factions led by members of the clergy had gained supporters among the laity. Soon after the bishop's arrival the faction opposed to Woods presented a memorial to the bishop blaming the troubles within the diocese especially the debt on the Sisters of St Joseph. At first Shiel ignored this, but his health began to deteriorate and he became reliant on the advice of Fr Charles Horan, a Franciscan like himself. Shiel began to believe that Woods was responsible for the debt and that the Rule of the Josephites needed to be changed.

### **What's in a Rule?**

Mary MacKillop respected the bishop's right to make changes in the Rule because he had approved it. She also understood that he had no authority to force those who had taken vows according to one Rule to adopt another. Shiel had decided that the parish priest rather than the religious superior was to have complete authority over the sisters in his parish. Further the sisters were to be divided into choir sisters and lay sisters. This meant that those who were teachers were to be of a higher status than those who did the household tasks. This was communicated to Mary MacKillop. She wrote to Bishop Shiel expressing her concern at this sudden change of the Rule. She also indicated that if the changes were made she would be forced to seek a dispensation because the nature of the Institute in which she had made her vows would be changed.<sup>64</sup> This angered the bishop.

### **Excommunication but not suppression.**

Matters marched quickly. On 22 September 1871 Shiel, in an excitable state, excommunicated Mary MacKillop for disobedience and expelled forty-seven Josephites from the Institute. For a little over five months Mary remained under this sentence. It was lifted at the direction of the bishop some days before his death which occurred on 1 March 1872. On 19 March the new administrator of the diocese, Fr Reynolds, restored the sisters to their religious habits. It is important to note that while Shiel had excommunicated the foundress, and dismissed some sisters he did not take the final step of suppressing the Institute. Bishop James Quinn was to use the excommunication of Mary MacKillop and subsequent events to argue incorrectly that the Josephites in Queensland at this time severed all ties with their central government because the Institute in the diocese of Adelaide had been suppressed.

### **A new Father Director.**

Reports of these events in the diocese of Adelaide had reached the Congregation of Propaganda Fide. A commission consisting of Bishops Murphy (Hobart) and Matthew Quinn (Bathurst) was appointed to investigate these happenings. Mary and the Josephites were exonerated. Woods who had left the diocese before the excommunication of Mary MacKillop came under the censure of the investigators. Because Woods had been responsible for the growth of a false mysticism among the sisters, his role as father director was terminated. Josef Tappeiner, an Austrian Jesuit resident in Adelaide, was appointed to this role in his place.

Woods found this loss of the directorship of the sisters very difficult to accept. Bishop Quinn knew this and used Woods' pique to his own advantage. Woods became an ally of Quinn in his scheme to gain control of the sisters in his diocese. Between 1872 and 1875 Woods with the approval of James Quinn, directed the sisters on their annual retreat. In giving Woods this approval, Quinn was acting beyond his authority because he was dismissing a directive of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide. Through this contact as spiritual director Woods built a relationship with the sisters in Queensland. With some sisters he continued to give spiritual direction through letters. To do this he had to enter into a deception and urged his correspondent to keep the letters secret because the ruling of Congregation of Propaganda Fide stated that all letters between Woods and the sisters had to pass through their superiors. With this type of relationship with the sisters and claiming that Mary MacKillop had been responsible for his removal from his role as spiritual director of the Institute, Woods set about forming a group who would agree to the bishop's proposal that they form a sisterhood under the Bishop's control.

Woods also claimed that Mary MacKillop was responsible for having the Rule changed. The outcome of the Adelaide experience with Dr Shiel was that Mary MacKillop was advised by Woods and others to seek the approval of Rome for the Institute so that the Rule would be secured from the tamperings of a local bishop. From May 1873 until October 1874 Mary was resident in Rome or travelling in Europe and the British Isles waiting for approval to be given to the Rule. The Congregation of Propaganda Fide directed that it be rewritten by a Dominican priest, Father R. Bianchi, and approval was given in 1874. The sisters were to live by this rewritten Rule and at a future date any changes that were needed would be considered by Rome. The concept of central government was endorsed but the ruling that the Institute could not own any property, was considered impractical. This change disappointed Woods. He considered the radicality of this idea of poverty to be essential to the spirit of the Congregation and claimed the Mary had gone to Rome without consulting him. Claiming that he had been overlooked, Woods attempted to alienate the sisters in Queensland from their Mother House and religious superior.

#### **A policy of denial.**

By 1875 the sisters had opened ten schools in the diocese of Brisbane. When Bishop Quinn returned from his visit to Europe and Ireland in May 1872, he found seven schools staffed by the Sisters of St Joseph. Besides the three schools in Brisbane and the one at Maryborough, Catholic schools had been opened at Mackay and Gympie in 1872. The sisters had spread to the northern centres of Townsville and Bowen by 1873 and west to the bustling but isolated mining settlement of Copperfield. By the time of Mary MacKillop's return in late April 1875 three more schools had been opened at Gladstone, Helidon and Redbank Plains. The bishop had indicated his satisfaction with the sisters' efforts in providing Catholic education in his diocese.

James Quinn, however, did not agree with the central government of the Sisters of St Joseph. This style of government allowed the sisters to control their own internal legislation and administration. In these matters the bishop of the diocese was bypassed. The overseeing authority was a Roman cardinal specially appointed to the task. Despite the fact that this form of government had been part of the original Rule, Quinn's objections had not prevented him from inviting the sisters to work in his diocese.

From 1875 the issue of government of the Sisters of St Joseph assumed major importance for the bishop of Queensland. In February 1875 Mary MacKillop informed Dr Quinn that the Congregation of Propaganda Fide had approved the Josephite rule including that of central government, and that a gathering (a general

chapter) of voted representatives of the sisters including those in Queensland was to meet to discuss and endorse this revised Rule. Quinn decided that now was the time to put into action his plans for a separate group of Josephites entirely under his control. Mary's letter advised him that Sr Clare Wright, the Provincial in Queensland, would attend the General Chapter to open on March 19 in Adelaide. Mary also reminded him that central government had always been a '*fixed point*' of the rule.<sup>65</sup> Quinn chose to ignore this point. He held that central government was introduced by Mary while in Rome, in fact that she had bribed the Roman authorities to get their agreement.

### **The bishop's coup d'état.**

Quinn took charge of the situation. He notified Sr Clare Wright that he was relieving her of her role as Provincial and was sending her to Adelaide. She was to vote at the sessions but was '*not to accept as binding on the sisters of this diocese [Brisbane] any decision that may be arrived at.*'<sup>66</sup> To reinforce this point of the separation of the Queensland sisters from their mother house in Adelaide, Quinn sent his best wishes for the chapter and congratulated the Sisters of St Joseph in Adelaide '*on the reorganisation of the congregation in that diocese.*'<sup>67</sup>

In April 1875 he made it clear that from his point of view Mary MacKillop's leadership of the sisters in his diocese was terminated. Quinn wrote: '*I hope that on the receipt of this letter you will cease to exercise any authority over the sisters in Queensland.*'<sup>68</sup> In order to implement this decision, he determined to sever all communication between the sisters in Adelaide and those in Queensland. He intercepted their mail and appointed Collette Carolan, a sister he had known before she had entered the Josephites, superior and directed her to send him any letters that came from Adelaide. He used the sisters' relationship with Fr Woods as bait to win them to his own scheme. According to Quinn the sisters in Adelaide had treated Woods badly. They had cast him off. Quinn promised to bring him to Queensland to be once again their Father Director.<sup>69</sup> This background against which Mary MacKillop and James Quinn met for the first time.

### **James Quinn and Mary MacKillop meet, May 1875.**

Mary could find no other way to resolve the issue but to come to Queensland. Her sole aim was to come to some terms with Bishop Quinn.<sup>70</sup> The interview was stormy. The bishop told Mary that she was obstinate and ambitious: that he would see that she would not be in authority twelve months hence. He threatened her with the police and forcible detention with the Sisters of Mercy. He told her plainly that he would not accept the constitutions. Mary responded by saying that it was her wish that they work with harmony but if it were not possible to come to some agreement then it would be necessary for her to withdraw the sisters.<sup>71</sup> Bishop

Quinn had met his match. In a letter to him after the interview she wrote: '*I do not ask you to accept the constitutions, if you wish not*'.<sup>72</sup> At the same time she reminded him that the sisters did accept the central government.

Bishop Quinn was not prepared to enter any negotiations with Mary Mackillop. His decision had been made. His goal now was to influence Rome to change the Rule in favour of the bishop's point of view. A month prior to Mary's visit he had written to Dr Cani then on a visit to Rome: '*Before I would allow any dependence of the sisters in this diocese on another Adelaide Mother General I would send back every one of the ... Adelaide Sisters in Queensland*'.<sup>73</sup> Cani now was instructed to inform cardinal heading the Congregation of Propaganda Fide: '*that the Adelaide Sisterhood is infected with fanaticism and insubordination to authority*', and that Mary MacKillop had come to the diocese of Brisbane '*to subvert the whole system*'.<sup>74</sup>

### **A sentimental young woman stands firm.**

Matters had reached a stalemate. During the next months Mary visited each of the convents. In a letter she comments on this travel. '*It takes so long going to the country convents here, they are so far apart, and the steamer communication interrupted ... I am one day in a rough mail coach, again in a steamer, in rain and storm*'. For these young sisters living in such isolation and at one time being blustered by the bishop and at another being cajoled by him, it was a joy to have a short visit from Mary MacKillop. Before returning to Adelaide, Mary, '*this sentimental young lady who is now only thirty-two years of age*',<sup>75</sup> as Quinn described her, met with him again. This time he agreed to accept the provincial Sr Josephine MacMullen whom Mary MacKillop had appointed. But only as Quinn expressed it: '*pending the decision of Rome*'.

### **Incongruent behaviour.**

Quinn refused to acknowledge to Mary MacKillop or to the sisters that the Congregation of Propaganda Fide had made any decision regarding their Rule. Yet his letters to Cani and Kirby indicate that he was aware that Rome had acted. He instructed these two clerics, his agents, to argue for the sisters' Rule to be changed, and '*to hold [their own] with all the authority at Rome*'.<sup>76</sup> Mary left for Adelaide in September. Prior to her departure, she met with the bishop in a different situation. '*Dr James,*' she wrote: '*was extremely kind ... officiated at a profession ceremony signing vows that were according to the constitutions*'.<sup>77</sup>

### **The 1878 visits. March to July and December.**

Mary was back in Queensland in March 1878. She returned to Adelaide in July but returned again to Brisbane in December and remained until the end of the

month.<sup>78</sup> Two major issues concerned her. She was now aware that Dr Quinn was negotiating with Woods to form a breakaway branch of the Sisters of St Joseph completely under the bishop's control and there was friction between the priest and the sisters in Townsville.

Mary knew the reverence in which many of the sisters held Fr Woods, their father founder. She feared that this together with his ingratiating manner would fracture the sisters' loyalty. In her assessment of the situation, Mary was correct. Many sisters in Queensland felt torn between two loyalties. On the one hand was the institute under the leadership of Mary MacKillop and on the other the founder and former father director. While Mary believed that this was possible, she was unaware of the lengths to which Woods was prepared to go to achieve his own and the bishop's ends. For Mary the task in 1875 had been to maintain the right of the Queensland sisters to live according to the Rule they had chosen and that had been approved by Rome. That freedom to choose, and to act within church law was now threatened in a more dramatic manner.

In December 1878 Mary MacKillop arrived at the South Brisbane convent from Adelaide. She describes the situation: '*I found ... that I had taken some very much by surprise ... Sister Helena ... had a party formed in his [Woods'] favour.*' Fr Woods was there visiting the sisters but avoided meeting Mary until '*only at the last moment to say goodbye and seeming on thorns until he got away.*'<sup>79</sup> She found that he was preparing those who would follow the bishop, in Woods' words '*his true faithful children,*'<sup>80</sup> to form a separate diocesan group at Easter of the following year. MacKillop spoke to these sisters of their obligation to obey the Rule, according to which, they had made vows. She told them that they could seek a dispensation from their vows and when this was granted they were free to join in Fr Woods' plan. All decided to remain as Sisters of St Joseph.

### **Townsville: a place worth investigating.**

The other cause for concern was the treatment to which the sisters in Townsville were being subjected. At the request of the parish priest, Fr Connolly a small community of sisters had travelled to this remote northern port in February 1873. By 1878 they had a school of one hundred and thirty pupils. From the time of their arrival, the parish priest had treated them with neglect. No convent had been prepared for them and they were housed in the two back rooms of the presbytery. By 1878 they were living in a separate house, not '*lined or sealed or painted*'<sup>81</sup> Here they cared for nineteen children, orphans and others, whose parents were unable to care for them. The sisters had no water except what they could carry from the house of a friendly Jew. The priest had '*plenty of water*' at his house and



at the church. A visiting priest, friendly towards the sisters, had suggested to the provincial that she look into the treatment of the sisters, whom the parish priest referred to as 'servant girls.' This she did and left after what she believed to be an agreeable meeting with Fr Connolly.

Physical inconvenience could be coped with, but unjust public criticism needed to be rectified. Connolly waited for Josephine to leave Townsville. To the shock of the unsuspecting sisters he launched an attack on them and their provincial from the pulpit on each of the next four Sunday mornings. He branded the sisters as 'teachers of false doctrine' and claimed their school was not Catholic.<sup>82</sup> He would give no explanation, but wrote a letter backed up by a long leading article which was published in the local newspaper.<sup>83</sup> The criticism became a public scandal. Some believed that the sisters must have given cause for criticism. Others rushed to their defence.

### **Investigate the facts.**

Mary considered that the most prudent move was to recall the sisters to Brisbane. They were instructed to give no reasons for their departure apart from the fact that their superior had asked them to come.<sup>84</sup> In an endeavour to clear the sisters good name, Mary met with Bishop Quinn at the beginning of May and appealed to him to hold an investigation into the Townsville accusations. He promised one at the priests' synod to be held in June. No investigation was ever made. In a letter to Dr Grant in Rome, Mary wrote that the bishop admitted that Fr. Connolly was at fault in some things, but was very anxious to excuse him at the sisters' expense.<sup>85</sup>

### **Time to leave.**

The community did not return to Townsville. This was not the first occasion on which the sisters had to be withdrawn because of unreasonable pressure from uncaring priests. In 1877, the sisters had been withdrawn from Copperfield and Redbank Plains. Unfortunately, the behaviour of Connolly became the norm for the priests and also for the bishop. MacKillop described Quinn's action to Cardinal Simeoni as : *'the bishop carried out his policy of harassing us in every way'*<sup>86</sup>.

### **1879/ 1880-A long visit.**

Mary was back in Queensland from May 1879 until March 1880. The situation the Josephites found themselves in was a dilemma . The Bishop did not seem to want the sisters to leave but, on the other hand, was unwilling to respect their Rule. The sisters were dispirited and in some situations their presence, in light of the partisan attitude of priests, did more harm to the church than good. The story of the next few months was a kind of delaying action on the part of Mary MacKillop.

She did not want to take the sisters away, but as each convent came under intolerable pressure, or as the bishop told her to make way for other teachers, she removed the Josephite communities.

That Quinn might have wished to have a congregation of sisters whose government was diocesan, was understood and respected by Mary MacKillop. What she found quite puzzling was that he would try to entice members of an approved institute away from legitimate authority without requiring them to seek the required dispensation. His action was illegal according to church law. Further she discovered that he had tried to influence some of the leading Brisbane Catholics to '*believe strange things about my character,*' she wrote: '*I cannot understand the grounds for this hostility, nor why as a bishop he should try to injure us ... Poor bishop he looks so very ill, and it will be sad indeed if he will not act peaceably with us.*'<sup>87</sup>

To encourage the sisters, Mary MacKillop visited each convent. To her sorrow, she found that where Woods had visited the sisters he had sought to win sympathy by discrediting her. When she visited the sisters in Bowen, Woods had been there a short time previously. Mary heard the accusations he was making against her. In September she wrote to him: '*It is intense pain to write [to you] as I must*'. In this letter she refutes each of his accusations. She tells him: '*If you think you have a grievance against me tell it to myself.*'<sup>88</sup>

### **The 1885 visit.**

By 1885 when Mary MacKillop visited Brisbane again, all the Josephites had left Queensland. The last community of sisters to leave the diocese was from Bundaberg in July 1880. There was a new Archbishop, Dr Robert Dunne, a former vicar general of the diocese. Bishop James Quinn had died on 18 August 1881.

Why did Mary MacKillop return to Brisbane in 1885? In Mary MacKillop's own correspondence there is no reference to this visit. We know, however, that she did come to Brisbane through letters of sisters who refer to her having been there.<sup>89</sup> Each writer refers to Mary MacKillop's health and expresses the hope that it has improved. She had returned to Sydney by 16 October 1885.

A clue to the purpose of this visit lies in a letter from the Archbishop of Adelaide Dr Reynolds to his fellow countryman and agent in Rome, Dr Kirby. In the context of informing Kirby that Cardinal Moran had arrived back in Australia, Reynolds expressed his surprise that Rome was still supportive of the central government of the Sisters of St Joseph. This fact would have disturbed Dr Reynolds because during Easter of 1885 when the sisters were gathered for their retreat, he had

issued them with an ultimatum: acknowledge him as their only superior or leave the institute. He had prefaced his remarks with this statement: '*I, as bishop of Adelaide, received letters from Rome during Passion week which empowered me to act, and it has been decided that the Institute of St Joseph is to be divided into diocesan communities, and the bishop in each case to be superior in his own diocese.*'<sup>90</sup> To enforce his point he had added as a threat that no bishop in Australia would have the sisters.<sup>91</sup> Reynolds informed Kirby that: '*She [Mary MacKillop] went to Brisbane in the beginning of October to try and induce Dunne to accept her party, he knew her well and would have nothing to say to her. All was arranged to withdraw 39 of her sisters from Adelaide.*'<sup>92</sup>

Dr Dunne did not take up this offer by Mary MacKillop. The reason for his reluctance may be found in the memoirs of Mother Brigid Lehane, an Ursuline nun. She recalled how Archbishop Dunne, a friend of her father, had asked him if he should invite the sisters back to Queensland. Mr Lehane, a strong supporter of the Sisters of St Joseph and brother of one of the sisters told the bishop that the sisters were well accepted in the archdiocese of Sydney.<sup>93</sup> This was a fact because Cardinal Moran indicated that he was willing to receive any sisters from South Australia.

### **The 1890 visit.**

On the 15 September Mary wrote a circular letter to the Sisters from Boundary St, Brisbane. The purpose for this visit may lie in a telegram and subsequent letter that Dr Cani, now the bishop of Rockhampton, had addressed to Mother Bernard the then Superior General of the sisters. In this correspondence he requested Sisters of St Joseph for his diocese. He nominated North Rockhampton, Clermont and Gladstone as suitable centers and added that he hoped to have the sisters by Christmas. It may be that Mary MacKillop was sent to discuss this proposal with him. In his letter written on 22 August 1890, he makes it clear that he supports the central government of the institute. He added the following: '*The sisters will only visit such locality wherever they reside, as the bishop may approve in writing.*'<sup>94</sup> It may have reminded Mary that when Dr Cani was vicar general in Brisbane he would not allow her to visit the sisters in Maryborough even though she was the superior of the whole Institute. She may have wished to clarify his views on this point. Whether this was the reason for her visit we are not sure. What we do know is that the sisters did not go to the Rockhampton diocese, [Clermont] until 1900 after Dr Cani's death.

### **Conclusion.**

Mary MacKillop's visits to the diocese of Brisbane span a significant portion of the history of the Sisters of St Joseph and also of the Catholic church in

Queensland. She came to this state when the diocese of Brisbane was the state of Queensland. She knew the pioneer bishops, Quinn and Dunne of Brisbane. She had much to do with Dr Cani the first bishop of Rockhampton. Her sisters pioneered schools in the more remote centres of the state and in the poorer sections of Brisbane. The Queensland story of the Sisters of St Joseph points to the dedication and pastoral zeal of both the men and the women who shared in its development. It also points to the heroism of those young women, the first Sisters of St Joseph, in the face of misunderstanding and injustice from those members of the church whose support they had most expected.

#### Endnotes.

- AAA. Adelaide Archdiocesan Archives.  
BAA. Brisbane Archdiocesan Archives.  
CASSJ. Congregation Archives Sisters of St Joseph, North Sydney.  
MMA. Mary MacKillop Archives, North Sydney.  
ICRA. Irish College Rome Archives.  
SMA. Sisters of Mercy Archives, Bardonia.

<sup>1</sup> John Paul II, *Papal Address at the Beatification of Mary MacKillop & Holy Mass*.

<sup>2</sup> Letters from T. Lehane, James Carmichael, D. O'Donovan, Annie O'Donovan, Patrick Ahern, K. Farrell, Jane McLillis, Susan Flood, Anne O'Neill, Jane Ellis, and William O'Donnell all residents of Brisbane. MMA, N Sydney.

<sup>3</sup> Bridget Conlon, 'unpublished diary', entry 20 February 1871. SMA, Bardonia.

<sup>4</sup> Barbara Posten-Anderson, 'Mary MacKillop: Saint, Celebrity and Cultural Hero', (unpublished paper using content analysis to demonstrate ways in which the press constructed Mary MacKillop's image. University of Technology, Sydney, 1994), p.1.

<sup>5</sup> Paul Keating (Blaxland—Prime Minister), *Beatification of Mary MacKillop* (Hansard 2 February 1995, p. 357).

<sup>6</sup> Paul Gardiner, 'Positio for the Canonisation of Mary of the Cross MacKillop' (unpublished manuscript presented to the congregation for the canonisation of saints, Rome 1989), p. 206.

<sup>7</sup> MacKillop to Franchi, 20 May 1875, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>8</sup> Teresa Maginnis to Mary MacKillop, 9 December 1879, Q Sisters Letterbook,

MMA, North Sydney. Quinn to Kirby, 18 April 1876, Quinn Letterbook, BAA. Cani to Franchi, 20 April 1875, Cani Letterbook, BAA.

<sup>9</sup> Quinn to Cani, 19 May 1875, Quinn Letterbook, BAA.

<sup>10</sup> Reynolds to Simeoni, 4 November 1884, original held in the Archives of Propaganda Fide, copy folio 1884, vol.4, no. 1A, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>11</sup> Moran to Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda Fide, 7 March 1885, folio 85, vol. 1, no. 2, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>12</sup> Account of Cardinal Moran's last visit to Mother Mary 4 August 1909' (unpublished manuscript) folio 1909, vol.1, no. 2. MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>13</sup> Vote 6, *Voti del Congresso Speciale*, p. 76.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> C. Horan, Sermon given at Kapunda, SA., 30 March 1872, AAA.

<sup>16</sup> Woods to MacKillop, August 1869, Woods Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>17</sup> Quinn to Mary Therese O'Meara, 7 July 1870.

<sup>18</sup> Marie Therese Foale, *The Josephite Story*, (Sydney: St Joseph's Generalate, 1989) p. 234.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35. (England-5, Scotland-2, Germany-1, East Indies-1).

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

<sup>21</sup> C. Horan, 'Sermon at Kapunda'.

<sup>22</sup> MacKillop to Woods, 4 August 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>23</sup> Mary MacKillop, 'Life of Rev. J.E.T.Woods, p.92

<sup>24</sup> Mary MacKillop, 'Origin and Works of the Institute 1866-1900', (unpublished manuscript, folio 1900, vol. 1, no.10, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>25</sup> Teresa Maginnis, 'Memoirs'.

<sup>26</sup> Mary MacKillop, 'Origin and Works of the Institute'.

<sup>27</sup> Teresa Maginnis, 'Memoirs of South Brisbane', (unpublished manuscript), folio 87, vol 1, no. 1, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>28</sup> Josephine Carolan, 'Memoirs', (unpublished manuscript), folio 1880. vol. 2, no. 15. MMA, North Sydney, p. 2.

<sup>29</sup> Quinn to Woods, 18 October 1869, folio 69, vol. 2, no.3, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>30</sup> Josephine Carolan, 'Memoirs', p. 1.

<sup>31</sup> MacKillop to Woods, 21 February 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>33</sup> Teresa Maginnis, 'Memoirs'.

<sup>34</sup> George O'Neill, *Life of Mother Mary of the Cross (MacKillop)*, (Sydney: Pellegrini, 1931) p. 57.

<sup>35</sup> Mary MacKillop, 'Origin and Works of the Institute 1866-1900.'

<sup>36</sup> Denis W. Martin, *The Foundation of the Catholic Church in Queensland*, (Toowoomba: Church Archivists' Society, 1988) p. 155.

<sup>37</sup>Yvonne M. MacLay, *James Quinn: First Bishop of Brisbane* (Armadale: Graphic Books, 1979), p. 47.

<sup>38</sup>Julian Tenison Woods, *Directory*, 1870, pp. 84-86.

<sup>39</sup>Patrick O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community in Australia* (Melbourne: Thomas Nelson, 1977) p. 146.

<sup>40</sup>Mary MacKillop, 'The Necessity for the Institute' (unpublished manuscript, London, 1873) folio 1873, vol. 5. no. 8, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup>Mary MacKillop, 'General Notion of the Institute,' Kirby File, ICRA.

<sup>43</sup>Josephine Carolin, 'A Brief Sketch of the Institute', (unpublished manuscript) folio 85, vol. 3, no. 4, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>44</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 28 March 1870. MacKillop Letterbook, MMA. North Sydney.

<sup>45</sup>Ronald Fogarty, *Catholic Education in Australia 1860-1950*, (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 1959), p. 195.

<sup>46</sup>Mary MacKillop, 'Origin and Works of the Institute 1866-1900,' (unpublished manuscript) folio 1900, vol. 1, no. 10, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 16 March 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>49</sup>MacKillop to Sisters, 28 March 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>50</sup>Woods to MacKillop, 15 July 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>51</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 6 August 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>52</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 28 October 1870, 4 November 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>53</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 17 October 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>54</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 5 March 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>55</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 1 August 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>56</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 31 February 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>57</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 17 October 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>58</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 28 March 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>59</sup>MacKillop to her mother, 12 February 1885. MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

- <sup>60</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 2 August 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>61</sup>Collette Carolin to MacKillop, 7 December 1878, Queensland sisters Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>62</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 8 February 1870. MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>63</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 16 March 1870, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>64</sup>MacKillop to Shiel, 10 September 1871. MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>65</sup>MacKillop to James Quinn, 10 February 1875, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>66</sup>James Quinn to Clare Wright, 1 March 1875, Quinn Letterbook, BAA.
- <sup>67</sup>James Quinn to Mary MacKillop, 8 March 1875, Quinn Letterbook, BAA.
- <sup>68</sup>James Quinn to Mary MacKillop, 13 April 1875, Quinn Letterbook, BAA.
- <sup>69</sup>MacKillop to Franchi 20 May 1875, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>70</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>71</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>72</sup>MacKillop to Quinn, 20 May 1875, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>73</sup>Quinn to Cani, 2 March 1875. MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>74</sup>Quinn to Cani, 19 May, 1875, Quinn Letterbook, BAA.
- <sup>75</sup>Quinn to Cani, 18 March 1875, Quinn Letterbook, BAA.
- <sup>76</sup>Quinn to Cani, 21 March 1875, Quinn Letterbook, BAA.
- <sup>77</sup>MacKillop to Kirby, 4 August 1875, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>78</sup>Mary MacKillop was present in Adelaide at the council meeting held on the 8 January 1879. Minutes Book of General Council Meetings 1879, folio 79, vol. 1, no. 1, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>79</sup>MacKillop to Bonaventure Mahoney, 13 December 1878, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>80</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>81</sup>Annie Walker to Mary MacKillop, 17 March 1878, Townsville Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>82</sup>MacKillop to Grant, 19 April 1878, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>83</sup>*The Queenslander*, March 1878.
- <sup>84</sup>MacKillop to Baptista Molloy, 19 February 1878, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>85</sup>MacKillop to Grant, 19 April 1878, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.
- <sup>86</sup>MacKillop to Simeoni, 7 March 1880, Mary MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>87</sup>MacKillop to Josephine MacMullen, Mary MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>88</sup>MacKillop to Woods, 12 September 1879, MacKillop Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>89</sup>Monica to Mary MacKillop, 16 October 1885. Laurentia Cosgrove to Mary MacKillop, 25 October, 1885. South Australian Sisters Letterbook, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>90</sup>Monica Phillips, Report on Easter Week events 1885, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>91</sup>Reynolds to Murray, 7 June 1884, folio 1884, vol 2, no.8, MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>92</sup>Reynolds to Kirby, 2 January 1886, ICRA(copy held in MMA, North Sydney.)

<sup>93</sup>Bridget Lehane, 'Memoirs' (unpublished document), MMA, North Sydney.

<sup>94</sup>Cani to Mother Bernard, 22 August 1890, Queensland File, MMA, North Sydney.

Sr Margaret McKenna is a Sister of St Joseph of the Sacred Heart. She has a keen interest in education and has taught in Catholic Schools in Queensland. She is currently writing a socio-cultural history of the Congregation of the Sisters of St Joseph of the Sacred Heart in Queensland 1870-1970. Her studies have been at the University of Queensland and Loyola University, USA.