

PATTERNS OF HARMONY AND DISSONANCE IN THE HISTORY OF ROSELIA FOUNDLING ASYLUM AND MATERNITY HOSPITAL

Rev. Joseph C. Scheib

Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital of the City of Pittsburgh was incorporated on April 9, 1892 – about ten months after it had begun its work. Roselia closed in 1971.¹ The first published article about this charity appeared in the August 6, 1891 edition of *The Pittsburgh Catholic*.² At that time the “asylum for foundlings” had no name.

This author examines the history of Roselia with an interest in understanding the functioning of a complex system that came into existence, developed in various ways, continuing for eighty years before it ceased. Roselia has left a legacy almost as complex as its living reality. What Roselia can tell us about a charity as a complex social system may be among its most valuable heirlooms. The author is interested in Roselia because it is typical of many other charitable enterprises both past and present. This interest in Roselia is not concerned to add to the praise that has rightfully accrued to the Sisters of Charity of Seton Hill and all of those who made Roselia what it was. Neither is this interest concerned to evaluate the claims

project involves the participation of many persons. Whether the charitable project is an emergency response to a temporary need or an institutional response to an endemic problem, many people are involved. Some are involved willingly; some are not so willing. Some are recognized for their efforts; some are unknown even in their own time. Recognition may mean praise or it may mean condemnation. High ideals motivate some people; others are motivated by self-aggrandizement or the advance of their own group at the expense of others. Robert H. Bremner quotes the Reverend William Greenleaf Eliot of St. Louis: “the great cause of social reform goes on, if at all, in spite of its advocates.”³ The complex reality of charity can scandalize. But those who prefer history to allegory can find in the history of charitable works a complexity both contradictory and complimentary that defies simple explanation.

If the point is accepted that any charitable work is a complex reality, the next task is to become acquainted with the elements that make this reality complex.

The Beneficiary

We can begin with the “defined beneficiary” or the “cause.” Although the word “charity” evokes warm feelings in many hearts, the inquiring mind wants to know “who is it for?” Defining a beneficiary is not always easy. Success in meeting the needs of the beneficiary may put a charity essentially “out of business.”

Sometimes a charity adopts a new mission; the new mission is accepted and the transformed charity goes on. An example is the March of Dimes which marched from polio to birth defects. However, charities are reluctant to redefine their beneficiaries and when they do so it is often done in subtle ways; sometimes those who do the redefining do not even realize how they have changed the mission. Those who were beneficiaries and are no longer defined as beneficiaries may look for new patrons when they become aware that their needs no longer command attention.

When we examine the history of Roselia it is important to remember that few of our sources were written with history in mind. Nearly everything that is published about a charity is written with an eye on how it will affect donations. This is not to say that the records cannot be trusted; however, it is a warning that the source must be considered. What is written may well be true but it is seldom the whole truth. The first article published about the foundling asylum gives a definition of the proposed beneficiaries: “Only infants under two years of age will be taken charge of.”⁴ Sister Electa Boyle says in her history of the Sisters of Charity that on the first day “a mother came seeking shelter for herself and her child.”⁵ Whether the mother was given shelter, we are not told; but the point is that from the beginning there was some pressure to broaden the definition of beneficiary.



Roselia Founding Asylum and Maternity Hospital (1910)

Source: *Catholic Year Book and Directory of Pittsburgh Diocese 1910*

that might be made about the high quality of the services of Roselia. Roselia was neither the first nor last charity to be established in the diocese of Pittsburgh.

However untypical the high quality of its work, Roselia displays many patterns typical of charities past and present. A charitable

The twenty-fifth anniversary book claimed that Roselia was the “only asylum here where children are accepted at birth and kept until they are five years of age.”⁶ The same booklet gave the primary purpose of Roselia as the prevention of infanticide and the secondary purpose as providing “professional attention and tender scientific care for married women...” then said that the mission of Roselia was “not two-fold but manifold.”⁷ Roselia had already broadened its mission to include services that could be related to the foundling. However, adoption services, which became very significant in the later years of Roselia Foundling Asylum, are not mentioned in an article published in 1939.⁸ Three programs are listed: (1) a private maternity hospital “entirely separate from the other divisions,” (2) “nurseries providing care for dependent, neglected illegitimate and foundling babies,” and (3) “a department devoted to the unmarried mother.”

Sister Helen [known as Sister Miriam Teresa from 1931 to 1968] Hart, S.C., M.S.W., in her Master’s Thesis gives a summary of conditions, policies and services at Roselia through ten year intervals beginning with 1895. For the early years, Sister Helen relied on record books for 1895 and record books and interviews conducted in 1937⁹ with sisters who served at Roselia as far back as 1905 to study 1905 in comparing Roselia at ten year intervals.¹⁰

In 1919,¹¹ the policy of Roselia “was to aid the mother in securing a position where she might keep the child. If this was impossible an effort was made to have the child adopted or boarded by a relative or friend.”¹² It was also the policy of the institution that “unless the mother took the child with her,” she “could not leave the institution until the baby was at least three months old.”¹³ The detention of mothers for three months along with the elimination of wet nurses was credited with a great reduction in the infant mortality rate. At the turn of the century, infant mortality was at 11% in the general populace but rates of 30% or more in institutions including Roselia was not considered unusual. An article in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* reveals how beneficiaries once defined and redefined can be redefined again. A woman is quoted as saying the “hardest part is giving up the baby.”¹⁴ She indicates that by her choice she saw the baby only once. At this time, Roselia no longer was involved in child placement or adoption.

An article in the *Pittsburgh Catholic* indicated that the director saw an advantage in child placement being done by other agencies. Roselia “can concentrate its efforts on the mother.”¹⁵ By the time Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital closed its doors, it was no longer a hospital and its primary beneficiary was no longer the foundling. Throughout the history of Roselia there was an evolution in its understanding of who was to benefit by its services. Although there may have been potential conflicts, the public saw a charity which emphasized its continuity with a tradition of service.

Donors

Another element constitutive of a charity is the donor. In a sense, the donor is the otherwise mythical customer who is always right. Donors may function as a group or as individuals but without donors a charity ceases to exist. On the surface it would seem that in these first two elements we have said all there is to be said about

charity. Charity names needs and finds givers willing to meet those needs. However, even this simple description reveals charity as a systemic reality in which the elements mutually define each other in dynamic tension.

It is notable that the first articles about the founding asylum do not mention the Donnelly family, either Roselia or Charles. However, the twenty-fifth anniversary booklet gives Roselia Donnelly the primary credit for the establishment of the asylum. It was she who came to the diocese of Pittsburgh, which appealed to Mother Regina [Ann Regina Ennis] of the Sisters of Charity to undertake the proposed



CHARLES DONNELLY
PRESIDENT OF THE HUNTSVILLE MILLING
COMPANY.

work. Boyle gives a pre-history of Roselia that goes back to an incident in 1884. According to the story given there, it was the death of a foundling that the Sisters of Charity did not keep that determined for Mother Aloysia the need for a foundling asylum. Further, it was certain Sisters of Charity who interested Roselia Donnelly in the idea of a foundling asylum. The twenty-fifth anniversary book states that it was the donors who proposed an auction sale by which the choice of a name for the institution would fall to the highest bidder. By contrast,

Boyle writing thirty years later, implies that it was the sisters who arranged the naming by auction. Although no charity would be possible without donors, the differences in the way the donors are portrayed indicates a degree of dissonance about the role of donors in the history of Roselia.

The Variety Club has come to be closely associated with Roselia in the memory of Pittsburghers. However, it should be pointed out that the Variety Club only came into existence in 1927, thirty-six years after Roselia had begun.¹⁶ The first president of the Variety Club was John H. Harris. The Harris family had long been associated with Roselia. Mr. John P. Harris,¹⁷ the father of John H., had been a member of the board of trustees at least by 1916 and continuing to his death in 1926. Frank J. Harris seems to have taken his brother’s place not only as a State Senator but also as a member of Roselia’s board of trustees. Sister Mary Denis Harris, R.S.M., a daughter of Frank J. Harris, told this writer that when the Harris family lived on Cliff Street near Roselia a strong relationship was formed and continued after the family moved to Crafton. Mrs. John P. Harris (Eleanor Mae) had already been an avid donor to Roselia when a baby girl was found in a theater on Christmas Eve 1928. The theater was the Sheridan in the East Liberty section of Pittsburgh. Mr. John H. Harris was the owner of the theater and on the advice of his mother the baby was placed at Roselia. The Variety Club adopted the baby, Catherine Variety Sheridan,¹⁸ and from that time began to support Roselia. However, for a number of years, the financial support of the Club was limited and their primary contribution was good publicity.

After World War II, members of the Variety Club in Pittsburgh became more ambitious for Roselia. (The Variety Club had already become an international club with many “tents” by that time). The advent of television provided an opportunity; and, the Variety Club organized telethons to finance the construction of a new building. In November 1955 the cornerstone was laid. On January 14 and 15 of 1956, another telethon was staged by the Catherine Variety Fund. Although the Variety Club contributed greatly to the new building, their contributions fell short of the amount needed for construction, \$500,000. The Philip Murray Memorial Foundation contributed \$150,000. The new building was named the Philip Murray Building. Philip Murray had been president of both the CIO and the United Steelworkers of America.¹⁹ The newspaper accounts state that Bishop John F. Dearden allocated \$200,000 from the Diocesan Development Fund for the building.²⁰ Francis A. Devlin [d. April 15, 1995], who was a member of the Advisory Board for Roselia, told this writer that the diocese had not planned on contributing to the construction of a new building for Roselia but the failure of the Variety Club to raise the full amount was a potential embarrassment the bishop could not let happen.



Catherine Variety Sheridan as a Baby

Source: Rev. Joseph C. Scheib

Professional Services

Needs are not simple and those who meet those needs have needs of their own. A third element in any charity consists of the service professionals. This is a category that includes but is not limited to the usual traditional professions. The distinctive criterion is the commitment to a life of service. Service professionals all have needs, their own and those of their families. Among their needs, not the least, is the need for secure employment. The service professionals have a personal interest in continuing to find persons in need as well as givers able to support both the needy and the professionals. Service professionals also have professional needs. These vary from profession to profession. But all professions seek to some degree to be self-regulating. All professions need to establish some sphere of authority especially in defining their membership. The authority of a profession defines standards of correct behavior. Professional standards provide goals to be attained by candidates for the profession. The same standards can be used to judge questionable behavior of member professionals.

Tensions between communities of religious women engaged in the work of child care and social workers are well documented, but perhaps, they have been forgotten.

The School of Social Service on the Catholic University campus was established by Monsignor John O’Grady in 1934 because strained relations existed between the professional social worker and the untrained administrators of Catholic Institutions. In this first class Monsignor

gathered sisters and priests from all over the country. They were to be the future administrators of Catholic Institutions and Directors of Catholic Charities... This pioneering effort gave religious and priest directors equal status with the lay professional worker and a greater understanding and respect grew between them.²¹

“Greater respect and understanding” did not produce complete respect and understanding. There continued to be tensions between religious and lay professionals. These distinct groups of persons had little trust for each other; they worked together with great difficulty. When disagreements arose, each group was quick to charge the other with lack of commitment to the client. Religious communities were reluctant to have their members take professional training as social workers. Those few religious who did receive professional training found they were regarded with suspicion by both groups.

Roselia employed two divergent strategies in dealing with the needs of its clients for social work services. Dissatisfied with the level of service available through Catholic Charities, Roselia developed its own social service department. This department took over the task of gathering information from the pregnant woman and developing a plan with her and

for her future after Roselia. The social service department expanded the work of Roselia to include professional evaluation of parents wanting to adopt. Despite a program that seems to have been high in quality, Roselia eventually chose an alternative approach to social work. In 1953 the social service department was abolished. Social services were provided to clients through outside agencies.

Administration Management and Leadership

The first three elements functioning in a charity are mutually exclusive and mutually defining. The next three elements – administration, management and leadership – are not so easily distinguished in an operating charity. In part this is due to a certain fluidity in the definition of the words. But a greater difficulty in distinguishing these elements stems from their common function in ensuring a unity of effect in the work of the charity.

Administration may be described as providing the service professionals with the stable environment necessary for their work. It can be as simple as paying bills or arranging schedules. When the administration of a charity does its job, no one notices but when the administration of a charity is poor, everyone notices.



Roselia Foundling and Maternity Hospital ca. 1950s

Source: Archives of the Sisters of Charity of Seton Hill

Management also ensures a unified effect in the work of a charity by motivating the service professionals and administrative support to keep the defined beneficiary at the center of the work. By engaging the personal commitment of the persons who work in the charitable project, management combats self-interest, personal rivalries, turf battles, etc. which threaten to displace the “cause.”

Leadership speaks on behalf of the beneficiaries and also on behalf of the persons who meet their needs through professional or administrative services. Leadership speaks to society at large, to donors and to potential donors. In speaking to society at large, leadership engages the cooperation or at least the noninterference of government and other powers in society. The functioning of leadership is necessary if donors are to continue to give. Where leadership does not function well, donors may find other ways to express their generosity. Effective leadership assures service professionals that their efforts are valued. In the absence of effective leadership service professionals may seek employment with other agencies or go into private practice. Lack of effective leadership may result in management and administrative elements working at cross purposes in an attempt to compensate for lack of leadership. Since the compensation does not replace the missing element, working harder often means less rather than greater effectiveness.

Although the history of Roselia could not have continued for as long as it did without successful administration, management and leadership, that does not mean that it was ever easy. A fundamental conflict to be managed was the question of whether Roselia was primarily a health care institution as implied by the title “Maternity Hospital” or a child caring institution as implied by the title “Foundling Asylum.” Boyle indicates an essential difficulty in the management of Roselia was the tension between secrecy and publicity. Roselia was committed to guarding the privacy of the persons who benefited. At the same time Roselia needed publicity in order to raise funds.

Ownership

Effective leadership gives to everyone who participates in the charitable enterprise a “sense of ownership.” “Stakeholders” is a term used to evoke this kind of ownership. Participation is a kind of ownership but it must be distinguished from legal ownership. In some ways a charity can never be possessed. The legal owner of a charity is never allowed to use the assets of a charity in a way that contradicts the mission of the charity. In a sense, the beneficiary of a charity is the owner, in the way that stockholders are the owners of a corporation. The legal owner cannot have absolute disposition of the assets of the charity without reference to its defined beneficiaries and the intentions of the donors.

The specific obligations of ownership are determined in many respects by the legal basis of a charity. Charities may be personal or corporate. They may be private or public. They may be church-related, or not church-related. Charities can be incorporated through the courts, chartered by the legislature, or commissioned by an executive branch of government. They may be independent or related in a complementary or subsidiary manner with one or more charities. Charitable institutions often endure long after their founders.

The legal and social context may change in ways the founders could never have foreseen. When the legal basis on which the charity is established changes, ownership is affected. But whatever the changes that may take place, the owner of a charity is the one ultimately responsible for the actions of the charity as an entity. When things go wrong, it is the owner who takes the blame.

Most of what can be said about the ownership of Roselia and much more that will not be repeated here is dependent on the research of Reverend James W. Garvey, M.Div., former Director of Saint Joseph House of Hospitality. Garvey carefully detailed the real estate transactions of Roselia in a manuscript history.²² According to Boyle citing the *Council Book* of the Sisters of Charity, it was on June 23, 1891 that Father Stephen Wall [d. 1894], Vicar General of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, committed the diocese to be responsible for finding a place for the proposed Asylum and paying rent for a year “on condition that the Sisters should assume full responsibility thereafter.”²³ This condition was never fulfilled. In the following year, Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital was incorporated as a nonsectarian institution with a lay Board of Trustees. It was this Board of Trustees which exercised the functions of ownership. The Board held title to the buildings and property.

One of the advantages the Board possessed was wealth, but even more important was their political influence. By the following year they had succeeded in gaining a state appropriation for Roselia.

*The state was appealed to for an annual appropriation and in 1893 the institution was given five thousand dollars. Roselia, it will be noted, was incorporated as a Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital but it received state aid on a hospital basis and was subject to the supervision of the Bureau of Assistance, which section of the state government inspects hospitals. Thus, from the beginning, emphasis was laid on the medical functions of the institution.*²⁴

In the early 1920s the appropriation averaged fifteen thousand dollars.²⁵ The rapid growth of Roselia in its early years was due to the increasing annual appropriation which allowed the funds of donors to be used for capital improvements. The state appropriation continued unchallenged for nearly thirty years. At that time the state auditor informed the board that the grant to Roselia had been challenged on the basis that Roselia was not in fact non-sectarian. William Brennen [Chairman of the Democratic County Committee 1901-1919], president of the board, was able to meet this challenge and maintain funding for some time. But it seems that shortly after his death on April 15, 1924, Roselia’s defense collapsed. Boyle attributes the challenge to Roselia’s appropriation to anti-Catholic sentiment. But whatever the motives, the decision in the end was not based on prejudice. The facts in evidence²⁶ were that the Sisters of Charity and not the Board of Trustees controlled Roselia. With the decision that Roselia was a sectarian institution, the legal basis of Roselia was changed.

Although this seemed to be a disaster at the time, in many ways the best years for Roselia lay ahead. In 1930 Roselia was admitted to the Community Fund, a precursor of the United Way. At the same time the sisters and many volunteers increased their fund raising

efforts. In 1952 the Board of Trustees reconstituted itself. From that point all of the members of the board would be Sisters of Charity. However, the Sisters of Charity did not own the property of Roselia directly until Roselia closed. At that time, Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital sold the property to the Sisters of Charity of Seton Hill in Greensburg, Pennsylvania for one dollar. Boyle, writing in 1946, stated that the sisters were “liable for the payment of all debts contracted in the maintenance of the institution, yet they never owned the buildings in which it is housed.”²⁷ However, this was not strictly true. The sisters could have walked away from Roselia at any time; that they chose not to do so is to their credit, but it was within their power. The fact that Roselia was operated without reference to financial limitations imposed by the Board of Trustees is evidence that the board was ineffective in functioning as owner. It is not surprising that the sisters should have compensated for what they perceived as a lack of support.

Authority

New charities more than well-established charities are required to prove themselves. But all charities must continue to show that they

what authority it makes its claim for support. Answering this question reveals a personal authority, or author. When the charity is new, the author may also be known as founder. The founder may work within the framework of historic traditions. Old but ever present needs call forth a new commitment. In making this commitment the founder claims to follow worthy and inspiring precedents. Since the donors may know the precedents already, the founder’s invocation of the revered past may allow the founder to gain the support of donors more readily.

The question of authority is related to the elements of leadership and ownership. All three elements can claim control of a charity. The author claims control based on the articulation of the insight defining the mission of the charity. Leadership claims control based on the ongoing task of unifying donors, defined needs and service professionals for effective service. Ownership makes its claim to control based on the risks it has undertaken in accepting ultimate responsibility.

No charity can exist without a pattern of cooperation. But the existence of patterns of cooperation does not exclude conflict. In this context, conflict is not seen as the absence of cooperation. The absence of cooperation in any system as complex as a charity would not result in conflict except as a transition to the nonexistence of the charity. Conflict can be seen as a potential transition to a new pattern of cooperation.

From the first article about the asylum in *The Pittsburgh Catholic* the charity is presented as a work of the Sisters of Charity, “true to their gentle mission, and following in the footsteps of their illustrious founder, St. Vincent De Paul.”²⁸ The authority for Roselia was grounded from its beginning in religious tradition. Authority is first of all a matter of persuasion. The sisters found responses to their persuasion in Roselia Donnelly, the diocese of Pittsburgh’s vicar general, a long series of donors, professionals, and the general public. In doing the work, the sisters elicited far more cooperation than conflict; but they made use of both. Although Boyle’s tracing of the history of Roselia back to Paris in 1638 may seem a bit fanciful,²⁹ it is the stuff of which authority is made. In a number of critical moments already mentioned, the authority of the sisters was tested.

For every institution that has closed its doors, there remains the question of whether the decision to close was the right one. For Roselia there was no easy answer at the time. The closing was blamed at the time on changed social mores which made unmarried pregnancy less of a social stigma.³⁰ However, social stigma was only one of the injuries dealt with by Roselia right up to the time it closed. In the end, the decision to close seems to have hinged on the physical legacy, that is, a hospital building far too large for the kind and number of services demanded. However, a decreased demand is not the same as no demand. Albert Phaneuf, executive director of Catholic Services of Allegheny County, stated that “Only the facility – the physical plant – is closing at Roselia.”³¹ The services continued at Roselia Manor (1971-1985) which became Roselia Center (1985-2012). Catholic Social Services of Allegheny County became Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, which continues the mission with “Roselia Program and Support Services.”³²



Shown above is Roselia Manor, a new “group” home capable of accommodating 14 unmarried mothers. Located at 624 Clyde St., Oakland, the Manor is one of several attempts by the Catholic Social Service to continue and expand the programs of the recently-closed Roselia Maternity Hospital. Plans are also underway for a series of foster home residences for the unmarried mothers.

Roselia Manor, 624 Clyde Street, Oakland (Pittsburgh)

Source: *Pittsburgh Catholic* (October 10, 1971), 1

are needed. Philosophy, ethics, religion, science or any combination of these make the case for the new charity. New needs or a new answer to an age old problem can be presented as evidence in favor of a new enterprise while tried and true solutions can bolster the claims of a well-established charity. The question the charity answers is one of authority. The public demands that the charity show on

The long rich history of Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital provides many concrete examples of the functioning of the elements in a “typical” charity. Conflicts and tensions can only co-exist where there is an underlying unity stronger than any conflict. Harmony and dissonance can exist together where there is a unifying theme. It can only be helpful to understand the patterns in relationships which make charity possible.

Suggested Readings:

Sr. Francis de Sales Joyce (ed.), *The Sisters of Charity of Seton Hill – Volume Two: 1945-2002* (Greensburg, PA: Sisters of Charity of Seton Hill, 2005).

Ralph L. Little, *An Evaluation. Study of Roselia Foundling and Maternity Hospital* (Pittsburgh: Little & Associates, 1971).

Rev. Joseph Scheib, “Rosealia [sic],” *Gathered Fragments* Vol. 4, No. 1 (Fall-Winter 1992), 2.

Michael P. Webster, *Don’t Call Me Boss: David L. Lawrence, Pittsburgh’s Renaissance Mayor* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988).

Endnotes:

¹ This article will not deal with Roselia’s successors, Roselia Manor (which opened in 1971 on Clyde Street in the Oakland section of Pittsburgh) and Roselia Center (the name, as of 1985).

² See “Foundling’s Home Opened: Sisters of Charity Establish the Home for Foundlings in Oakland,” *The Pittsburgh Catholic* (August 6, 1891), 5.

³ Robert H. Bremner, *The Public Good: Philanthropy and Welfare in the Civil War Era* (New York: Knopf, 1980), 33.

⁴ “Foundling’s Home Opened: Sisters of Charity Establish the Home for Foundlings in Oakland,” loc. cit.

⁵ Sister Mary Electa Boyle, *Mother Seton’s Sisters of Charity in Western Pennsylvania* (Greensburg, PA: Sisters of Charity, 1946), 137.

⁶ “The Babe on the Doorstep – Being a Brief Recital of a Quarter Century of Roselia 1891 – 1916.” Silver anniversary booklet from the Archives of the Sisters of Charity of Seton Hill.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Sister Mary Clarence, “Roselia Home, Hospital Has Three-Fold Program,” *The Register* (October 22, 1939).

⁹ Sister Helen Hart, S.C., “Recollections of Roselia,” unpublished document collected for the centenary of Roselia in 1991. Sister Helen served at Roselia from 1937 to 1952 as a social worker and as administrator from 1968 to 1971.

¹⁰ See Sister Miriam Teresa Hart, *A History of Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital Based on an Analysis of the Social Records at Ten Year Intervals* (M.S.S.W. Thesis, Catholic University of America, 1936), 20, 22.

¹¹ Sister Helen based this summary on the Roselia section of Pittsburgh Social Studies: National Catholic War Council, Pittsburgh Social Studies 1919, [Box 32, Folders 1-4], Records of the National Catholic War Council at The American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. Note: when searching the website, the term “Rosella” rather than “Roselia” is found in the index; this must have been a typo or scanning error. See: <http://archives.lib.cua.edu/findingaid/NCWarCouncil.cfm>.

¹² Hart, *A History of Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital Based on an Analysis of the Social Records at Ten Year Intervals*, op. cit., 33.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ “Giving Up the Baby Proves Hardest for Roselia Girls,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* (May 5, 1971), 15.

¹⁵ Renee Snyder, “Roselia: Alternative to Abortion,” *Pittsburgh Catholic* (February 26, 1971), 6.

¹⁶ As to the history of the Variety Club, see (1) “Variety, the Children’s Charity” at the website https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variety,_the_Children%27s_Charity and (2) the group’s website at <http://www.varietypittsburgh.org>.

¹⁷ The story of John P. Harris and other members of the Harris family is told in Lynne Conner, *Pittsburgh in Stages: Two Hundred Years of Theater* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007).

¹⁸ The story of baby Catherine appears at the website of Variety: <http://www.varietypittsburgh.org/History>.

¹⁹ Philip Murray (1886-1952) was born in Scotland, immigrated to the United States in 1902, and settled in Pittsburgh where he became a steelworker and an American labor leader. He served as the first president of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, first president of the United Steelworkers of America (USWA) 1942-1952, and the longest-serving president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) 1940-1952. He is buried in St. Anne Cemetery in Castle Shannon (Allegheny County), Pennsylvania, and is memorialized in the great bell tower of St. Anne’s Church.

²⁰ “Million Dollar Hospital Highlights 65 Years,” *Pittsburgh Catholic* (September 13, 1956,) 3.

²¹ Hart, “Recollections of Roselia,” op. cit., 1.

²² The “Roselia Center” manuscript is located in the “Rev. James Garvey Collection 1989-1996” at the Senator John Heinz History Center, Pittsburgh, PA. The manuscript was revised in February 1992.

²³ Boyle, *Mother Seton’s Sisters of Charity in Western Pennsylvania*, loc. cit.

²⁴ Hart, *A History of Roselia Foundling Asylum and Maternity Hospital Based on an Analysis of the Social Records at Ten Year Intervals*, op. cit., 7.

²⁵ Ibid., 58.

²⁶ Ibid., 57-58. The listing of Roselia in the *Official Catholic Directory* (P.J. Kenedy & Sons) was decisive.

²⁷ Boyle, *Mother Seton’s Sisters of Charity in Western Pennsylvania*, op. cit., 139.

²⁸ “Foundling’s Home Opened: Sisters of Charity Establish the Home for Foundlings in Oakland,” loc. cit.

²⁹ Boyle began the story of Roselia by recounting the fact that St. Vincent de Paul entrusted the care of abandoned infants in Paris to the Sisters of Charity in 1638. Boyle, *Mother Seton’s Sisters of Charity in Western Pennsylvania*, op. cit., 136.

³⁰ “Foundling Hospital is Victim of Change,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* (September 25, 1971).

³¹ “Roselia closes, but services will go on,” *Pittsburgh Catholic* (October. 1, 1971), 1-2.

³² See the website of Catholic Charities, Diocese of Pittsburgh at: <http://www.ccpgh.org/pages/services/pregnancy-and-parenting-details>.