

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Held Feb. 13, 1967, at the offices of Most Rev. James Peter Davis, Archbishop of Santa Fe; present at the meeting:

Most Rev. James P. Davis, Archbishop

Rev. John Vincent, s.P.
Rev. Edwin Connolly, s.P.
Rev. John Feit, s.P.

Rev. Patrick Mulcahy, s.P.
Rev. Harry Kenney, s.P.
Dr. John Salazar, Ph.D.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING: To present to the Archbishop a plan whereby guest-priests under the care of the Servants of the Paraclete could enter into ministerial work in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe as a final step in a graduated program of rehabilitation begun at Via Coeli Monastery, and continued through the Paraclete houses in Albuquerque and Santa Fe.

(The meeting at 2:05 p.m., Monday, Feb. 13)

In answer to the Archbishop's question as to the purpose of the meeting, Dr. Salazar asked Fr. Feit to outline the matter to be discussed. Fr. Feit outlined the purpose of the meeting as stated above.

The Archbishop seemed immediately receptive to the idea, stating that the priests of the Archdiocese were well disposed to work with the Servants of the Paraclete in any well founded program for the rehabilitation of their brother priests. The Archbishop added his own personal interest in and concern for the work, then proposed the following parishes as suitable for such a plan:

In Albuquerque

Sacred Heart
St. Anne's
San Felipe
O. L. of Fatima
Queen of Heaven
Holy Ghost
O. L. of Assumption
St. Francis Xavier
St. Bernadette's

St. Therese
Annunciation
Immaculate Conception
St. Charles
Holy Family
St. Edwin's
Ascension
O. L. Guadalupe
Nativity SVM (Alameda)
St. Clement's (Los Lunas)

In Santa Fe

St. Anne's
Cristo Rey
St. John's
O. L. Guadalupe

The Archbishop pointed out that in these parishes there was room for another resident priest, and enough work to keep him active in the ministry, without placing an undue load on him in the initial stages of his return to duty.

The question then arose as to the mechanics of placing guest-priests in these parishes. The plan as presented by Fr. Mulcahy, Fr. Feit and Dr. Salazar was that when a man seemed ready for a long term parochial assignment (ready in the judgment of the Paracletes and the Doctor) he

should be interviewed by the Archbishop, said interview being arranged by the Paraclete superior with whom the man was resident. The Archbishop, after meeting with the man, would then decide which of the parishes and which pastor the man would have the best chance of success in his efforts to re-enter the active ministry, and would make the necessary arrangements for the transfer of the man from a Paraclete house to a parish rectory situation, if he found the man to be suitable for work in the Archdiocese. The man would then be invited to make a weeks retreat at Via Coeli, preparatory to taking his assignment, thus allowing himself time for a final preparation for his return to the ministry, and allowing the Superior of Via Coeli to make a final evaluation of the man prior to his being assigned. (This last step suggested by the fact that in the minds of the Ordinaries and Provincial Superiors it is still Via Coeli as such that is considered responsible for a man's rehabilitation.)

In placing men in the parishes, the Archbishop would use his judgment and discretion in informing the pastors only of what he thought they must absolutely know about the priest they were receiving, so that they might more effectively work with the man. No details or particulars of a clinical nature need be made known regarding the man's past history.

The point was then introduced that Villa Pius XII in Albuquerque was currently receiving guests from Via Coeli via two principal sources: first; those working with Dr. Salazar in a continuing therapeutic relationship, which relationship would be sustained during the man's parochial assignment; second; referrals from the existing AA program at Via Coeli who had demonstrated stability over a period of time, but who would be expected to continue in AA both while at Villa Pius XII and in their parochial assignments.

Villa Madre de Dios in Santa Fe, on the other hand, was better disposed to receive guests who were not receiving professional help (AA or psychiatric or psychological counselling) but who had shown stability over a period of time, and seemed ready to move on, first to week end supply, then possibly to parochial assignments in Santa Fe.

Archbishop Davis remarked that in placing men in Santa Fe parishes Monsignor Rodriguez would be of great help, as he was interested in the work of helping his brother priests.

Then the point was made that the program as so far stated might carry with it an inconvenience in terms of constant personnel changes in the parishes, the Archbishop remarked that there were enough parishes available to obviate that problem, and that the program must exist for the good of the men, and not the men for the program. He repeated that the priests of the archdiocese were ready and willing to help in this operation.

It was agreed among all present that it should be the task of the Archbishop, after interviewing a man put forward by the Paraclete team, to himself select the pastor and parish best suited to the man's needs. It was further agreed that the parochial assignment was to be of an indefinite nature, lasting so long as was necessary for the man to give evident signs that he had readjusted well to the ministry and was

now deserving of a full time assignment either in his home diocese, his religious community, or in whatever opportune situation he might be placed. It was agreed that should a man fail to measure up in his parochial assignment he should be returned to a Paraclete house, preferably in the Canyon, where efforts at his priestly renewal might begin anew.

In answer to Dr. Salazar's question regarding the availability of teaching assignments within the archdiocese, the Archbishop replied that this was not feasible at the moment, with one possible exception at St. Vincent's academy.

Fr. Mulcahy introduced the need of extending the facilities at Villa Pius XII by adding four more private rooms to meet the expected influx of guests there, once the new program got under way. He went into some detail explaining how he hoped to get the job done at minimal costs, then concluded by saying that the matter would have to be referred to the Board of Directors of the Paraclete New Mexico corporation, since he figured the costs at about \$10,000.

The Archbishop then led the discussion along lines centering on many aspects of the Paraclete work; he spoke of the Apostolic Delegate's interest in Via Coeli, and his concern for an ongoing program there, both evidenced in his recent visit to the archdiocese; he spoke of misunderstandings in the past, which he hoped were now settled so that the work might indeed progress for the good of all; he spoke of his admiration for the professional services being extended to the Paracletes by Dr. Frank Rowe and Dr. John Salazar, and urged that the recommendations of these men be weighed carefully in our operational procedures; he warned of the danger of being over-crowded and understaffed in our efforts at helping priests, and seemed relieved to find out that one house in the Canyon (St. Joseph's) was not operational precisely because of Fr. Moylan's decision to rather close a house than not have it adequately staffed; he cautioned that we not allow a large number of specifically ill-adjusted emotional cases to accumulate in one place.

At this point Dr. Salazar interjected the comment that he was well pleased with the progress that had been made at Via Coeli during his tenure on the staff, although he kindly gave the credit to the efforts of the Paracletes. He pointed to the increased recreational and medical facilities, and to the fine working relationship now existing between Via Coeli and Villa Pius XII. So far as treating the seriously disturbed (in the psycho-sexual sphere) he indicated that two things must be kept in perspective: first, no good is gained from segregating these individuals from men with dissimilar problems; this only serves to accentuate their feelings of being cut off from society. Second, in most cases a solid therapeutic relationship can be established, although the individual must be brought along slowly and with the utmost prudence.

Fr. Connelly then reminded the group that an integral part of the Paraclete apostolate was and always would be the care of those who, either by personal decision or obvious signs, would NOT return to the active ministry. He pointed out the benefits to community life some of these "retired" priests were able to make.

The Archbishop was in agreement that Via Coeli existed to help priests in whatever capacity possible or necessary.

The question of having adequate quarters for the guest-priests was introduced by the Archbishop. He pointed out there is an area of reasonableness to be hoped for between luxury and poverty, and that a pleasant and liveable kind of living quarters was a factor in a man's readjustment and rehabilitation.

It was agreed that some of the rooms at Via Coeli needed reworking, but that the hope of opening the new infirmary in the not too distant future kept us from this project, since the plan was to do away with the out-dated rooms entirely when infirmary space was available. Recent improvements in the physical plants at Regina Mundi and the provisional infirmary were cited as efforts at updating.

At this point Fr. Kenney asked to speak on the AA program currently in effect at Villa Pius XII. He read from a letter he had recently sent to Fr. David Temple, OFM, religious assistant to the Paracletes, which letter was in the way of a progress report on the program.

The Archbishop expressed his approval that a well-regulated and well thought out program including the services of AA was now in effect. He moved to close the meeting with this final thought: namely, that although financial problems were difficult to live with, the charity shown in receiving guests without support at Via Coeli would turn out to be a great blessing for the work in the long run.

The meeting came to a close at approximately 4:10 p.m. All present expressed appreciation to the Archbishop for this generous use of his time and his proffered assistance.

minutes submitted by
Fr. John Feit, S.F.
2/15/67
