I acknowledge the Wurundjeri People of the Kulin Nation who for tens of thousands of years walked this land, protecting and nurturing it; I pay my respect to their elders past and present. I remember that Mary MacKillop was born on this land, their land.

Mary knew Melbourne; knew it well. Her Melbourne story gives particular insight into her spirit; it spans the first and the last years of her life. She lived her childhood and young womanhood in Victoria, mostly close to Melbourne. God was drawing her to a distinctive way of living the gospel of Jesus. The gospel nourished her spirit; her response was a radical love of God and love of people. As a young woman Mary wrote, ‘God’s presence seems to follow me everywhere, and makes everything I do or wish to do a prayer.’ To understand this is to understand the decisions she made. Her consciousness of God was shaped and formed among the people who came into her life; she wept, laughed, rejoiced, and worried with them and found God there.

Mary finally returned to Victoria as a Josephite Sister in 1890 having established an Australian-style religious congregation, having been excommunicated, having defended this Australian way in Rome, having been exiled from South Australia, having been stood down as Congregational Leader. She knew the cost of the path she was taking: ‘costing not less than everything’. It was customary for the Sisters to take a title when they made vows. Mary of the Cross was the title she took.

Mary’s spirit had been refined in the challenges. Though she could never have thought it when she returned to Melbourne, she had only 19 years of her life left to live; she had just turned 48. This return, beginning in 1890, linked the first and the last stage of her life. Here, in the place of her childhood, Mary shaped and mentored new foundations; she was experienced and reflective. ‘Never see an evil without considering what you might do to remedy it’ was a justice statement not simply advice to act kindly. Mary was now free from the need to focus on administration or Church politics; though she cared deeply about the Church and affairs of the Congregation, she was free to express her spirit of mission directly among the people. She listened with her heart: courageous, creative, tender.

Think of Melbourne in 1890. This was a time of global depression and Melbourne, built on gold, was hit hard; some say the depression was deeper here than anywhere else in the world. The Vincent de Paul men had set up a children’s shelter a few years previously; firstly for just three orphaned brothers and sisters in a small house. In the circumstances of depression a bigger building and yet a bigger building was needed. Furthermore the additional children were more troubled than those first orphans. The Vincent de Paul records describe these ‘urchins’: ‘Although but mites, one may say that every sixth word was prefaced by either an adjective or an oath’. Thomas Carr, the Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, invited the Josephites to take over this children’s home. Mother Bernard, the leader of the Sisters of St Joseph at the time, first responded saying that she had no Sisters; the Archbishop wrote again saying that two would be enough. The invitation must have sounded urgent; the Josephite leadership in North Sydney sent two Sisters who were not very well; with Mary’s help they would hold the situation until healthier Sisters could be found. Mary wrote to North Sydney to say that these were indeed tough children and that for this work we need ‘Sisters... with a strong stomach’.

Mary’s spirit nurturing was hands-on, warm, practical. Her mother Flora, who bore eight children, was a survivor. By the time Mary turned twelve years old, Maggie, John, Annie, Lexie and Donald ranged in age from infancy to ten years. Little Alick had died before his first birthday. Peter was yet to be born. Annie described Mary as a ‘little mother’. A story of Mary dismissing a nurse who had been hired to care for a newborn baby, then taking over the care of the baby single handed, was told and retold in the MacKillop family; the nurse was drunk and Mary knew that she could manage the baby herself. When Flora returned she found young Mary dressing the baby and the nurse gone. Mary surely grew up knowing babies and nappies and toddlers and unruly children. Well might Michael McGirr write ‘patron saint of nappies.’
The Surrey Hills home was seriously crowded. At one time it was reported that some children had to sleep two or three in a bed. They ate standing; there were no dining room chairs. The Sisters ate in a tin shed in the back yard; they were overworked; they also inherited a one thousand two hundred pound mortgage on the property. Every week more and more families were coming to them needing temporary care for their children. Mary saw that the first task was to make friends with people of good heart, rich and poor, who might contribute some support. She was convinced that God acted in the hearts of women and men, acted in communities. She managed to get a free rail pass, and then set off around central and western Victoria, where she could connect with friends of friends. Her begging attracted support despite the depression. There were also families able to care for children who could never be reunited with their own parents. Mary visited these families and later visited children in foster care. She wrote notes in her diary each day, ‘Saw our boy. He is doing well.’

During Mary’s childhood her immediate family was surrounded by a warm and hospitable extended family of newly arrived Scottish immigrants. There was frequent Celtic hospitality between the MacDonald’s, the McNabs, the L’Estranges, the MacKillop’s and the Keoghs. When, as often happened, Mary’s parents fell on hard times there was someone to loan money, someone to care for the children for a time, someone to invite the family to share their home, someone to help find employment. Mary grew up believing that the family was not alone. There were friends out there: a community ready to help.

As the children’s home began to settle into routine the Archbishop told Mary that he knew families and children, homeless people and street girls living in the block between Spring, Exhibition, Latrobe and Bourke Streets with Little Lonsdale and its maze of lanes through the centre. Those who lived here were in dire need. This notorious part of the city had always been known for its deplorable conditions; the Argus newspaper had described it as a disgrace to the city and an even greater disgrace to the police. ‘No persons other than bawds and prostitutes attempt to reside in that locality.’ During the depression the population of this block peaked. The Archbishop simply wrote that while the need was overwhelming one would have to live in the area to do anything worthwhile. He wouldn’t ask the Sisters to live there. Predictably Mary replied, ‘Of course I have no objection to the locality, it is there that the real work lies’. She and Sister Gertrude moved into 43 and 45 Latrobe Street using these houses as a Providence; a name the Josephites coined when they had no idea where the money would come from. God would have to provide. Mary and Gertrude would beg once more for food and donations of money. The Benevolent Women’s Society helped. The Sisters offered accommodation for homeless out-of-work servant girls, a soup kitchen and clothes distribution in the back yard, and a night school for street children. Mary’s sister Annie MacKillop who stayed for a short time at the Latrobe Street Providence wrote, ‘It was a dreadfully noisy place—women screaming at night used to be so awful I thought it was murder’. Mary had already written, ‘Seek first the poorest and most neglected parts of God’s vineyard.’

Mary grew up knowing that life was dangerous for the poorest. She was confronted during her childhood with the reality of abandoned women and children left behind as men went off to the gold-fields in the hope of becoming rich. There was a time when Mary’s own father was away from the family for 17 months. When, aged seventeen, she lived in Richmond and walked to work at Sands and Kenny in the city she walked through fetid city slums. She knew the effects of alcohol and violence. She knew even more clearly the effects of emptiness and hopelessness. People needed food and shelter; they also hungered to be listened to from the heart; the inner life of the spirit needed nurturing too. She responded with tenderness. She knew that the remedy could never be narrow. Life is complex.

While working at the Providence in 1892 Mary collapsed with complications of bronchitis and came close to death. Convalescing she wrote, ‘Pray that I may make good use of the time left’. The Sisters’ General Chapter of 1889 had directed that the Josephites should undertake work with the Aboriginal people in the far north of Australia. Fr Duncan McNab had promoted the needs of Australia’s first peoples when visiting the Vatican; the Jesuits were asked to respond. Fr Duncan directed them to the Northern Territory. In 1889 the Jesuits invited the Josephites to come to Daly River: there was need for women’s presence. Mary believed that she could lead a carefully chosen group of Sisters to establish a community there; the Congregational Leader, Mother Bernard, would not give her permission to do so. Mary wrote, ‘I am sorry, sorrier far more than I can say that there should be such apathy about the Northern Territory mission’. The Sisters held the memory of this and have tried to stand with Aboriginal people in their struggle for justice. Mary had lifelong contact with individual Aboriginal friends.
Justice for the Aboriginal people was a theme throughout Mary’s life. On the day of her birth and for weeks afterwards, the Port Philip Gazette had featured opinion pieces about teaching Aboriginal people that white law was dominant in this settlement. There was anticipation of a public hanging of two Aboriginal men. The Port Philip Gazette reported, ‘About twenty of the aborigines [sic] were observed witnessing the execution from the branches of neighbouring trees...May the fate [of Bob and Jack] have a beneficial effect on the aborigines [sic] of the province’. Mary’s family was politically astute. Her father was twice a candidate in the colony’s elections; it was thought that bigotry against Catholics prevented him from being successful. The legacy of dangerous political decisions made in Melbourne during Mary’s childhood led to wholesale take-over of Aboriginal lands. The ‘Aboriginal question’ was constantly debated. Mary’s cousin, Duncan McNab, became an eloquent campaigner for the rights of Aboriginal people. Mary and Duncan were close friends; they exchanged letters, and whenever in the same part of Australia they met to talk. Fr Julian Tenison Woods, Mary’s early mentor and guide and the co-founder of the Sisters of St Joseph, was also an ardent advocate for justice for the First Peoples. Her brother Donald, a Jesuit priest, was missioned to Daly River.

Fairly soon the Providence was followed by a school for poor children, ‘street urchins’. Children were enrolled in a rented tenement in Little Lonsdale Street and later in a two roomed rented cottage in Cumberland Place around the corner from the Providence. The Sisters invited any children they found wandering around ‘Little Lons’ to come to school. The hungry ones were taken back to the convent to be fed. The Archbishop donated funds from his own pocket; it is said that he visited the school weekly for the rest of his life. He certainly listened to the children and, following Mary’s practice, carried a bag of boiled lollies in his pocket. Eventually the local community was collecting money for this school. The Cumberland Place free school gave hope for the future in this community of many nationalities and religious beliefs; it was a source of great pride that the next generation was educated. All children, not just Catholic children, were welcome. When the Providence at last had a permanent building in Albert Street the ex-pupils donated a stained glass window for the chapel in memory of their school.

Mary was always passionate about the right of all children to receive an education. She was already a teacher when she met Father Julian Tenison Woods; together they dreamed of a Congregation that could educate isolated or impoverished children as well as meeting other social needs. In 1894 Mary helped to establish the convent and school in Footscray, the first of many Josephite schools in the Melbourne Archdiocese.

In July 1900 Archbishop Carr floated the idea that he would like the Josephites to open a Foundling Home: in Melbourne at the time there was generally little compassion for illegitimate children or their mothers. A Commission in the early 1890s estimated that there were 500 cases of infanticide in Melbourne each year. There was clearly a justice issue where a judgemental society could provide no solution for desperate mothers. On the other hand Mary knew that responsibility for mothers and very young babies could not be taken lightly. She had mourned the tragic death of her baby brother Aleck. All life was precious; she could see the difficulties of this task and though others tried to convince her that there would be government funding for the work this did not persuade her. Mary took time in making a response. However by October, after long conversations with the Archbishop, Mary agreed that a home for mothers and babies was ‘St Joseph’s work’; she was realistic in judging that it would be ‘really uphill work’. A property at Broadmeadows was found and the home was opened a week before Federation. Mary handwrote objectives which made it clear that she envisaged the home primarily as ‘A sheltering home for unfortunate mothers and their young babes’. This contrasted with the European concept of Foundling Home as a shelter where babies could be abandoned anonymously. Mary set about contacting experienced people who might offer support and advice; the Women’s Hospital had developed well designed cots, and ‘one of the first doctors of Melbourne’ agreed to provide his services free. Though the first objective was for mothers and ‘their babes’, allowance was made for the chance that desperate mothers might abandon their babies. Sister Helena would organise a lantern search around the boundaries of the 30 acres each night lest ‘a newly born or infant’ needed care. Archbishop Carr fostered this spirit; he knew Mary’s capabilities, he challenged her to use all of her gifts of leadership for those in his Archdiocese who were most vulnerable.

The Archbishop took a personal interest in each of these foundations. Besides this there was every indication that he enjoyed Mary’s friendship. Though the topic of this paper is Mary MacKillop it is essential to note that well before the time that Mary was establishing these foundations the Catholic community of Port Philip had already developed a strong spirit of care. Fr Geoghegan had encouraged this from the early days of the Settlement; it was a spirit that Mary would have known from her childhood. It was of the spirit of the gospels: of courageous, creative tender nurturing; of involving many people of good heart; of education and development as a matter of justice. Before Archbishop Carr came to Melbourne, the Christian Brothers, the
Sisters of Mercy, the Good Shepherd Sisters and more were already engaged in social services. The men of the St Vincent de Paul Society had seen the need for further care for orphaned and neglected children. So too had a well known Catholic mother who had sheltered children and pregnant young women in her own home in Carlton and in premises she rented for the purpose. Mrs Goldspink was a member or a leader of almost every charitable women’s organisation in Melbourne. The Ladies Association for Charity had begun working in Little Lonsdale Street before the Sisters of St Joseph arrived there and were more than ready to keep supporting them. The St Vincent de Paul men from nearby working class suburbs began sorely needed fund raising for the Foundling Hospital as soon as it was established. They worked towards connecting electricity and running water; water was finally connected in 1922. Mrs Goldspink urged and worked towards a Reception Home at Carlton so that young pregnant women, otherwise without support, would be cared for close to the Women’s Hospital. The Sisters of St Joseph agreed to take it over. In the tradition of the Josephites the side wall of this site in Carlton had a servery hatch so the Sisters could offer hot drinks and sandwiches for homeless people. For generations it was fondly referred to as ‘The Hole in the Wall.’

In 1913 Dr Daniel Mannix became Coadjutor to the aging Archbishop Carr. Three years later he became Archbishop of Melbourne; he continued in this role until 1963 when the Vatican Council had already commenced. His relationship with Catholic Social Services was different from that of his predecessor. For those working with neglected or abandoned children these years of wars and depression, years of heavy Government and Charities Board restrictions, years of striving to find sufficient funding for overcrowded institutions were years of constant work and worry with never enough money to do all that they dreamed of doing for the children and their families. They tried to do much with little; this is a story that deserves thorough and separate telling. There were efforts to improve conditions for needy families, for children, for mothers, for newly arrived migrants, for prisoners. There were new partnerships with Aboriginal peoples. There was constant development of education, of tertiary education becoming accessible for daughters and sons of poor families. There was growing professionalism and the establishment of what is now CatholicCare.

The time after Vatican II became a time of looking again at the spirit of the social works: of hands-on, warm, creative nurturing; of the co-operation of many people of good heart; of education and development as a matter of justice.

While researching for this paper I opened the heavy archives boxes at the Congregational Archives at Mary MacKillop Place North Sydney, and Victorian Josephite files stored at MacKillop Family Services Heritage and Information Service. I remembered the mood of the late sixties and early seventies for returning to the original spirit. The files held more than I had remembered. The spirit of the foundational times was recalled in stories and in prayer; notes on dreams for the future are prolific. The foundational document of the Sisters of St Joseph, the Constitutions, refers to ‘The spirit passed on and enriched in succeeding generations’. Questions were being raised. What could be done for the families and children if there was the chance to start all over again in a new place, in a new way, with the same spirit? In the early seventies the issues became clearer and more urgent. I found papers recording hopes for change across the Homes in Surrey Hills, Broadmeadows, Kew and Carlton. The Sisters and staff were meeting together regularly. A number of oral histories were recorded. The Sisters were saying in various ways, ‘Do what is better for the children, for the families, for the mothers, for the babies’. During extended times of prayer they reflected on experience and questioned what might be really better for the mothers and babies; not the best of what was currently being done, but the best that could be imagined. I know that others in Catholic social service circles were asking similar questions. Coming from the perspective of the Gospel, the answers to these questions were radical.

Daunting practical problems were the first challenge. The only assets for re-founding these works were the buildings. The Josephite position was that these buildings had been paid for by donations to the Sisters for the children and for the mothers; as was custom in earlier times they were held in the name of the Roman Catholic Trust Fund. There were emotional considerations too. The buildings represented childhood memories for those who had grown up in them. They represented a lifetime of work and achievement for the Sisters. There were many dilemmas. To move would involve stepping away from programs with secure recurrent funding from government, however insufficient this still was, to something that might never be funded and that faithful donors might not understand.

There is a great deal of written material from this time. In looking at the Josephite situation I read the files describing the St Anthony’s decision to change its approach to meeting the needs of the children, and to
move from Kew to Footscray.\textsuperscript{xxi} The Sisters had listened to both the children and their parents; they knew the pain of separation from both sides. They wondered what could happen if families about to lose children to wardship were given close support in their parenting without the children leaving home.

There was no funding for such a service except for a six-month Commonwealth Grant for a pilot study. In 1975 four Sisters volunteered to be involved in a pilot study. Footscray was chosen as the location; it had long association with the Josephites.\textsuperscript{xxii} It was relatively easy to connect with families in the area who had children in imminent risk of being taken into State care. I read the notes made at the time, ‘\textit{We give kindness and we receive kindness and in the good times there is laughter and tenderness and play among the children and adults too. Relationships are built in many simple and homely ways. When broken promises and love withheld have been the main experience of life, a person learns to trust only very slowly.’} And, ‘\textit{Because of the life and death seriousness of this situation we have taken seriously our responsibility to understand it better}’. In 1976 St Anthony’s of Kew, became St Anthony’s, Commercial Road Footscray.

St Anthony’s way of working was to form a supportive team around each family according to the particular goals that the parent/s and social worker had agreed. A ‘family worker’ was the daily companion to the mother; a ‘child development worker’ would be involved to work individually on the child’s needs and would involve the parent with the child; an ‘education worker’ would be concerned with the school and with remedial lessons with the children or adults if necessary. The social worker kept the focus on the specific goals the parents had been assisted to shape. The Commercial Road centre was homely and the mothers and family workers cooked meals and snacks in a kitchen/bungalow in the back yard. Sister Dorothy who had worked with children and mothers in the institutions was now a family worker. In an oral history interview she reflected: ‘\textit{One mother had this baby about 12 months old she’d bring down to St Anthony’s... [she had asked me] to show her how to cook something for him. I used to take her down to the butcher and get the very fine mince beef and some vegetables and go back to this little one room place...[where she lived]...she had a stove... and get it cooked and my goodness how he used to eat. I was trying to say, ‘...“don’t wait until it’s tea time if he didn’t have any dinner”.’}’

From making the family and family functioning the focus much was learned.\textsuperscript{xxiii} The family was central even if the children needed to be taken into residential care.

Catholic Social Services Victoria pledges ‘to stand with the poor, disadvantaged and marginalised and work for a just equitable and compassionate society’. Its members seek soundly researched ways to confront complex problems. The echoes go back the first Port Philip settlement, to the expressions of care that continue to resonate. It is still a question of the gospel spirit: of courageous, creative tender nurturing; of involving many people of good heart; of education and development as a matter of justice.

In this present time we are moving together in vision. A profound re-founding is possible we encourage one another to dream beyond what is to what could be. Fourteen years ago MacKillop Family Services brought together three traditions claiming, ‘\textit{There is, today, a rediscovery of the power of story—the voice of one’s lived experience reaches to the core of our humanity in a way that analysis and conclusion does not ...we are challenged to listen more carefully to the stories of our founding agencies}’.\textsuperscript{xxiv} Leaders of the three Congregations ready to merge to form MacKillop Family Services noted that their founders ‘were creative people, committed to the marginalised in society, and they were not fearful of letting go and bringing about change.’ Four hundred guests watched the symbolic weaving of a ‘tapestry of goodness’; the bringing together of these traditions.

There is a spirit among us in Melbourne that is responsive to each new time.

Last month MacKillop Family Services residential houses staged a ‘My Kitchen Rules’ competition. The young people in these residential houses are living apart from their own families; this competition was important for them; a commercial kitchen was hired for the evening of the finals. Three judges volunteered their time; one was a judge that the young people had seen on the TV version of ‘Conviction Kitchen’. The winner made a speech thanking the organisers and the judges then added, ‘I want to thank my Dad who has come to watch.’ Somebody in the back row shouted, ‘Daddy’s girl.’ The winner spun around, ‘Yes I am and I’m proud of it.’ The Dad rushed up and hugged her.\textsuperscript{xxv} I expect that many layers of leadership were involved in making this occasion possible.
This Conference links past with future; we each carry the responsibility of leadership for the future. Some will, like Sister Dorothy, be showing the spirit in action day to day: in grounded, tender listening and relating. Our stance for justice is earthed when we hear what they hear. May there always be those with ‘the stomach for it’. They transform lives. Others will lead at a broader level, managing programs, developing the knowledge that is necessary for good service, weaving that ‘tapestry of goodness’. May they listen with their hearts and touch reverently the threads of justice, courage, potential, connectedness, and soul. Others carry the heavy responsibility of leading the agencies, or serving on boards. These are indeed difficult times for balancing budgets and meeting multiple requirements. Nevertheless may these leaders and directors have the freedom to focus on the larger truth of the complex needs of children, families, communities and those who live at the margins. May they protest against narrow projects that stifle their vision; may they find support as they carry the burden of balancing the ideal with the possible. As for Church leaders and Congregational leaders may they remain conscious of the precious tradition that they hold; the Gospel is radical. May they, like Thomas Carr, keep close to the hopes and sorrows of those whose struggles are the greatest; may they trust in the providence of God and have courage and discernment to recognise when the next re-founding is need. They may also need a bag of boiled lollies from time to time.

On the day of the Canonisation of Saint Mary of the Cross MacKillop a battery of TV cameras filmed the procession from Mary’s birthplace in Brunswick Street. In the lead there was an Aboriginal Message Stick. Surging behind were parish groups with banners, little children waving balloons and flowers, ethnic groups in traditional dress, and bands blaring a cacophony of music. They formed a packed mass of humanity surging to the Exhibition Centre where Aboriginal Elders, the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister and religious leaders waited, crammed together on an outdoor platform in the threatening rain. Some days later I watched a long segment of unedited footage from those TV cameras. I saw people walking, pushing, marching and even dancing along Gertrude Street. There they came; close to Charcoal Lane, the urban Aboriginal meeting place, past buildings that almost dated back to the time of Mary’s birth. Sometimes the camera focussed just on the feet: moccasins, runners, working boots, high heels, thongs, silver slippers; the feet of tiny children too.

Into focus came a large, bearded, weathered man who seemed to have been sleeping rough for many a night. ‘What do you think about Mary?’ He seemed pleased that the journalist had asked him. ‘She cared about the poor and disabled.’ He paused, gazed belligerently at the camera and added emphatically, ‘She was a saint before she died.’

Mary, Saint as she is, still connects with Melbourne!
conduct would be the same. I should say also that it was a consequence of grief and terror combined. It is no small misfortune to a little child, black or white, to be suddenly torn from its home and from all that it loves, by those who may be ghosts or wild beasts for all it know.

Julian writing from Queensland (Source being researched): Some adequate provision, which would put them out of reach of hunger must be made. It is objected that the expense of this would be too great, but we are bound by every interest of justice and humanity to make even great sacrifices for the purpose. We have no right to leave these people to starvation and death, when we have taken their country. If ten times the amount be spent upon the blacks, it would be no more than simple justice. It is abundantly evident that something can be done, and something should be done, unless Queensland means to have her conduct to the natives as an everlasting stain upon her history.


xvii Mary MacKillop to Sr Patricia, May 29 1901 Mount Street Archives.

xviii When Mary collapsed with complications of bronchitis Thomas Carr visited her almost daily.

xix For example when the Broadmeadows Home became overcrowded he encouraged the Sisters to locate a Home for Small Children in Kew where Catholics were better able to notice the needs of the children and to donate. The Home, which he opened before a great crowd, was close to Xavier and Gennaro.

xx *Constitutions of the Sisters of St Joseph of the Sacred Heart*.


xxii Mary’s name is on the title deeds. It is now used as the Footscray Office for CatholicCare.

xxiii *Towards Understanding and Good Service* Second Paper, October, 1983 Documents from the first seven years at Footscray record families and children beginning to thrive, no longer needing support from St Anthony’s: they had natural supports in the local neighbourhoods. A new way of understanding the difficult problem of child neglect was being mapped; the families and the workers were learning together. The 1983 progress report noted: ‘Over and again we have demonstrated in action our intention to provide family for the children and to develop whole families...We observed family correlates of child neglect and gradually shaped a description of the dimensions of the problem. We believed that we consistently identified difficulties in the parents’ ability to assume many of the leadership aspects of the adult parent role, in the family’s ability to identify its membership and ritualise this, in the primary and secondary network of support surrounding the family.’

xxiv Paul Linossier and Joan Healy: Preface to *Holding on to Hope* op cit

xxv Story related by Mary Davis RSJ