

in the Diocese of Rockville Centre for the next four years. During this time he requested a transfer out of state on at least three occasions. Finally in 1989 he was transferred to an out of state Diocese as a priest in “good standing”. Officials in his new Diocese were told nothing of the credible accusations of sexual abuse. Later, when a new complaint surfaced in that Diocese the Diocese of Rockville Centre finally revealed what they knew about *Priest B*.

The first allegation against *Priest G* surfaced in the middle 1980’s and was the result of a complaint by a young boy that *Priest G* had forcibly pinned him up against a wall and kissed him on a trip out of the country. *Priest G* was sent to a psychologist on an outpatient basis for two years. He was transferred to another parish but they were not informed of the incident, or the subsequent investigation by the Diocese, that confirmed *Priest G*’s behaviors with young boys were abnormal. (Grand Jury Exhibit 19L) Again, there are no reports from the psychologist in *Priest G*’s personnel file including in his secret archive file with the exception of one short letter indicating that the “incident which drove him into treatment was an unfortunate event which could have happened to any priest as close to the community as *Priest G* was.” (Grand Jury Exhibit 19F) On this basis *Priest G* was permitted to continue to minister in a parish. When asked in the grand jury whether the Diocese was correct, in trusting a recommendation from a professional that seemed to defy common sense, since the conduct involved pinning a young boy against a wall and kissing him, a high ranking official indicated that it was a mistake to do so. Nevertheless, the Diocese clearly relied on this absurd conclusion. Subsequent to it, *Priest G* was transferred to two parishes with schools.

Even in situations where the unwritten policy of evaluation and therapy was followed, the members of the intervention team always put the interests of the priest and Diocese first. For example, *Priest T*, a Diocesan priest not heretofore mentioned, was accused of molesting a

number of young children in a parish assignment. After a period of therapy, it was recommended that he not be returned to ministry where he would be in unsupervised contact with young people. Thereafter, the intervention team recommended that he be offered the position of,

“Vicar for Senior Priests...This is a prestigious and responsible assignment which would not, in any way, be a disgrace for *Priest T* and would make use of his administrative and personal talents. Furthermore, in such an assignment it would be possible to inform him of and enforce the therapist’s recommendation that he have no unsupervised contact with young people without drawing special public attention to this limitation. At the same time, we would be able to assure (name omitted) that all of her concerns about her own children and other children were being addressed.” (Grand Jury Exhibit 184)

To the priest who brought the information about *Priest T* to the attention of the Diocese and assisted the victim’s mother in pursuing her complaints, the intervention team was not so kindly disposed. In a memo to another high-ranking Diocesan official it is suggested, “ that no serious consideration will be given to offering him another assignment in our Diocese” (Grand Jury Exhibit 184) In the Diocese of Rockville Centre, a priest who molests children should suffer no disgrace but one who advocates on their behalf risks banishment.