

CHRIST THE KING PARISH
43 SHELBURNE STREET
BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05401

April 20, 1978

Most Reverend John A. Marshall, D.D. Re: Rev. Edward O. Paquette

March 9, 1978 Mrs. [REDACTED] called for an appointment the next day - was urgent and had to do with Father Paquette.

March 10 - Mr. and [REDACTED] with Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED] So, Burlington [REDACTED] Burl. met at Christ the King Rectory with two major complaints: 1) stories and descriptions of Black Mass to Junior High pupils at Christ the King School introduced them to the occult and exorcism process in fairly minute detail e.g. "put sperm in cup to drink" Separated the boys from the girls to brief the boys in greater detail. 2) alleged molestation of children indicated fondling of privates of altar boys. [REDACTED] indicated one occurrence during altar boy practice of some 20 seconds duration. Didn't think it was wrong and quite well known among the boys. [REDACTED] was touched in a way he ought not to be last year and this year he was picked up around the legs and three times fondling in the area of the penis. The preceding Tuesday evening, March 7 [REDACTED] page 11 came down crying, having bad thoughts and the words were so bad that he alleged was told that he couldn't say them.

At insistence of these parents, Bishop, you were alerted that evening to what had developed.

March 12 - Father Paquette was informed by me of the accusations and referral to the Bishop. Initially he did not understand what I was saying or referring to. There would be no more teaching in the school relative to the black mass etc. No altar boy rehearsals until notified by pastor.

Some time after this, both families above called to see what had been done and would be done.

Bishop met with Father Paquette and outlined a 'plan of action' basically Father was to approach a local priest for direction and resume counselling with Father Kane in Shrewsbury etc. This Father did - meeting with Father Purtill, SSE who would be back from Alabama in a month and contacting Father Kane. Father was to remain at Christ the King with the consent and support of the pastor.

March 22 - Both Father Paquette and Monsignor Fradet met with you, Bishop and the entire matter reviewed together with guidelines to be followed and restrictions imposed. Father was not to train altar servers and avoid any action that could be mis-interpreted in regard to association with young people especially boys.

This was Holy Week and the following week Father had time off to visit his home.

Several calls were received from the [redacted] and one or two from the [redacted]. Both did not feel that much was being done even though they had or would approach the Bishop, again. To avoid the two boys involved from having to receive communion from Father Paquette, Monsignor was to arrange that another offer the school Mass on the days these classes were to attend Mass.

Father was away the weekend of April 7-8-9 to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of marriage of a cousin.

April 11 - [redacted] called for an urgent appointment which I scheduled after the 9:00 a.m. Mass. She had become aware of a similar situation with her son, [redacted] age 11. She was very distraught and showed the signs of lack of sleep etc. She had cried and prayed most of the night - torn because Father Paquette had been received as a personal friend of the family and had been there for dinner the week before; and the effect the association and alleged fondling might have had on her son. She had contacted her son's pediatrician, [redacted] who referred her to her pastor. She, too, felt too little was being done.

April 15 - The preceding day, Bishop, you called me for an interview but I was just leaving for Springfield, VT and you indicated an early Monday morning meeting would be scheduled. Also, on Friday, [redacted] called and I was to call him.

The phone conversation with [redacted] indicated that his son was also involved, [redacted] age 11, [redacted] felt that the Bishop did not realize the trauma caused parents of young boys. As a pediatrician he felt there was no way to determine later effects of all this - public school teachers would be dropped on the spot. [redacted] His 'read out' of parents aware of the problem was that we were dealing with an 'exposive situation.' Several indicated they would not go near the Church while Father Paquette was around. Feelings were high. [redacted] felt we were treading on 'very thin ice - he was aware of six other parents. One had called a fellow pediatrician when [redacted] phone was busy and he referred them back to [redacted] [redacted] felt only solution was removal of Father Paquette to obtain help. This was given more in sorrow than anger.

On April 11 or 12, the parish secretary, Mrs. [redacted] received a call from someone alledging to be ~~the~~ new in the area that was aware of why Father had been transferred from his previous assignment and felt parents of young boys should be told to watch out.

April 16 - Mrs. [redacted] asked to see me real soon to consider a 'very serious matter.' Since Sunday was a very tight schedule and Monday required my presence at both morning and afternoon sessions at St. Mark's - a.m. budget hearings and p.m. Administrative Board meeting, I set up an appointment for Tuesday.

Later that afternoon, I felt that Mrs. [REDACTED] urgency might have something to do with Father Paquette and would be helpful for the Monday meeting with you, Bishop. I called asking what the nature of Tuesday's appointment might be and she said it was Father Paquette.

I met [REDACTED] with both Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED]. Their son, [REDACTED] while aware of what the boys felt, had not himself been approached in any way. The [REDACTED] felt this might be because Father might have felt they knew something. This they did but had not directly or indirectly mentioned it to any other person until their visit with me the evening of April 16. In substance, [REDACTED] sister, [REDACTED] had informed them of potential problem because of her assignment with Father Paquette in Montpelier. She felt they should know since her nephew would possibly be affected. Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED] decided they would not mention this unless something did, indeed, happen. When they learned that the problem had surfaced at Christ the King they felt it time to let me know of their knowledge and they felt something had to be done. They [REDACTED] both felt their pastor and their Bishop had known all along of the Montpelier situation and [REDACTED] could not understand why Father Paquette was put in charge of altar boys and had assignments with young people.

April 17 - meeting of Father Paquette and Monsignor Fradet with the Bishop. No longer could keep lid on things at Christ the King. [REDACTED] had talked to Father McSweeney. Father Paquette relieved of his assignment at Christ the King effective immediately and to return to his home Diocese. Continued counseling advised etc.