

Priest G

*Priest G* attended a college seminary prior to entering the seminary.<sup>40</sup> Before admission to the college, he was given a psychiatric evaluation. He was described by the examiner as, “immature and somewhat schizoid”, as well as a serious problem who needed attention and further evaluation. No such evaluation was forthcoming. (Grand Jury Exhibit 19F).

Altar servers were a favorite target of sexually abusive priests. Often, they were abused behind the altar, as they were either preparing or cleaning up from mass. *Priest G* began his sexual abuse of altar servers in his diaconate year and used the same method in each case. They would be completing tasks associated with their jobs, and he would come up behind them and rub his penis up and down on their backs. Sometimes, but not always, *Priest G* would have an erection. He often pushed the boy up against a counter in effect trapping him. Once, he brought a boy into the bathroom and put a dog collar around his neck. It wasn't until he was an adult that this victim realized this conduct was sexual for *Priest G*. *Priest G's* victims did not report that they were being sexually abused as children. As adults, the two independently reached out to the Diocese of Rockville Centre for help. In one case the victim wrote a letter to the Diocese. He was told that another priest who was involved in the handling of these matters would contact him. He never did.

The other told his mother about the sexual abuse after he graduated from college. She was concerned about his spiritual life and he thought it was a good time to explain the reasons

<sup>40</sup> A college preparatory seminary provides a college education in a seminary atmosphere. Graduation leads to an undergraduate degree as with any other college or university. The graduate then has the option to pursue post-graduate training at the major seminary. It is the major seminary that provides the theological training leading to sacramental ordination as a priest.

for some of his feelings. He did not tell his mother the details of the abuse or the name of the priest. His mother wanted him to address the issue at the time with the Diocese. He refused. As he later learned his mother took it upon herself to contact the Diocese by letter. (Grand Jury Exhibit 113). The letter confirms all of the events as described by her son and requests that he be contacted by someone to discuss the situation in an effort to bring, “closure to the issue”, for him.

Some time later, he received a call from an Auxiliary Bishop who asked the victim to detail his involvement with *Priest G*. The victim complied with this request because, as he wrote, “ My primary concern is that no other boys be endangered. What happened to me is real. I have no other motivations than to prevent fellow humans from being harmed.”(Grand Jury Exhibit 114). The Auxiliary Bishop confirmed that there had been other incidents of sexual abuse with *Priest G* and children. Upon learning this, the victim wrote again to articulate his feelings about the fact that others had been victimized:

Contacting you, reliving and writing about these experiences has been more traumatic than I ever would have imagined. Obviously effecting my job...but well worth it... I am saddened by the fact that someone else was victimized after I was. A victimization that could have been prevented had I had the wherewithal to report *Priest G* immediately. Now that you realize that his first reported offense was not an aberration, it is my hope that *Priest G* be separated from the priesthood and forever labeled the sex offender he is. Please keep me updated on the progress of the investigation...” (Grand Jury Exhibit 115).

He never heard from the Diocese again.

After his ordination, *Priest G* was assigned to a parish with an elementary school. The pastor at this assignment testified that he had no access to *Priest G*'s personnel file. Later, on a school trip overseas, an allegation was made that *Priest G* had sexually molested one of the

elementary school boys on the trip. A school official reported this to the pastor.<sup>41</sup> *Priest G* was removed from his duties and transferred to another parish with an elementary school. The pastor did not advise his colleague about the sexual molestation but admitted that he should have done so. He further admitted that he would want to know if a priest had a psychological problem. *Priest G's* new pastor likewise did not have access to personnel records concerning him and admitted that it would have been helpful to have them. He also agreed that he should have been advised of *Priest G's* past criminal conduct. During the course of his testimony, it came to light that this Pastor himself had abused several teenage boys during his time as an associate priest. He was recently relieved of his priestly faculties within the Diocese.

In the mid to late 1990's, *Priest G* was assigned again to a parish with an elementary school. His pastor there testified that he had spoken with *Priest G's* previous pastor and was advised that *Priest G* was a good worker. Approximately three months later, he spoke again to this pastor who advised that *Priest G* could be moody and difficult. Again, this new pastor did not have access to *Priest G's* personnel file and believed it to be the policy of the Diocese not to allow such access. He agreed that it would be beneficial to know the background of a priest before he was assigned to a parish. He was never advised of the letters to the Diocese alleging sexual abuse by *Priest G*, even though he was *Priest G's* pastor when the complaints were received. He was also unaware of psychological reports and evaluations conducted of *Priest G*

<sup>41</sup> Grand Jury Exhibit 19E is a memo sent to a high ranking Diocesan official from another Bishop describing the alleged sexual abuse perpetrated by Priest G during the school trip to Italy. The official admits the truth of the incident when noting that there is no criminal liability resulting from it in as much as the crime occurred in a foreign country. He states that the likelihood of civil liability and damages were relatively low. It also delineates the Diocesan investigation into the allegation of sexual abuse on the trip. This included interviews with two parish boys who stated they would not want to be alone in a car with Priest G. An interview with another boy's parents revealed that they overheard a telephone conversation between Priest G and their son. Based upon what they heard, they advised Priest G never to call the house again.

after the receipt of these letters. The pastor, this priest's immediate supervisor, was never told of the results of a psychological evaluation of *Priest G* done during the time he was assigned to him.<sup>42</sup>

Among other things, this report recommended that a "surveillance system" needed to be set up for *Priest G*. Specifically, the pastor and others with whom *Priest G* would have daily contact, were to observe him, fill out surveillance forms and send them to a professional for evaluation. Shockingly, Diocesan officials who were aware of those recommendations never advised *Priest G's* pastor. Ultimately, the pastor contacted Diocesan officials about his difficulties in the parish with *Priest G*. Despite his complaints, he was never advised of the previous allegations of sexual abuse and the results of *Priest G's* psychological evaluation. The pastor emphatically told the Grand Jury that he should have known these things, especially since they could affect the well being of his parish.

In a letter from the pastor to his superiors, he complains:

My complaint is with a system that allows Priests like (name omitted) to pass from one assignment to the next without correcting the problems he causes...I resent the fact that the trouble he has caused here – like the problems he created in almost every Parish he has been in during his 19 years as a Priest – are merely being transferred to another Parish. When is he going to be challenged and when is he going to be required to get the help he needs...by not challenging him and by allowing him to continue in his negative behavior...we are subjecting other Pastors, Priests and Parishes to the damage he can cause.<sup>43</sup> (Grand Jury Exhibit 125).

Despite this pastor's plea for change, the process of transferring priests in secrecy continued.

<sup>42</sup> Grand Jury Exhibit 19J.

<sup>43</sup> Grand Jury Exhibit 19J.