


POOR
ORIGINAL

Archdiocese of Seattle

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: File
From: Fr. Espen 
Subject: "Unassignables"

Date: 8 April 1987

Some reflections pursuant to our meeting of 26 March 1987.

1. Is there any kind of insurance available for this sort of casualty? --something similar to disability insurance? As a matter of fact, why aren't these people "disabled"? They are actually canonically impeded from exercising their Orders, either temporarily or permanently. Such insurance could help pay not only for their treatment, but also their support while they are unable to work.
2. I have already sent Fr. Ryan a memo regarding "salary," which I attach for your information.
3. For a place to live while disabled, maybe we need a (Regional?) "half-way house," or some place where room and board is provided, as well as perhaps an in-house counselor. I should think that, over the Northwest, we could find quite a few "residents." This would remove the onus we put on individual parishes, and also take care of those who cannot really be placed in a parish setting.
4. As regards priests we have incardinated, should we review our incardination policies? E.g., to me, it may no longer be worth the risk to buy into the "simply a personality conflict with my previous bishop" theory. As regards our own men, is there communication between the Priests' Personnel Office and the Office of Seminarians, in such a way that the experiences learned by the former can be applied to the testing performed by the latter?
5. This brings up the question again of the permanent diaconate, where we could find ourselves in the same boat, particularly for those actually employed by the Church. The same questions then arise regarding incardination or acceptance for ordination.
6. Could the Archbishop share with us how other diocesan bishops are dealing with these matters?

PPB000993

POOR
ORIGINAL

File Memo
Fr. Espen
Page 2

7. The present Priests' Personnel Office seems to me grossly understaffed for what is expected of them. It seems so tied up with these errancies (which MUST be dealt with) that it is restricted in the time and energy available for more positively focused activities on behalf of those priests who are still healthy.

8. I presume we support Mike Cody; that's an example of a permanent disability. I was wondering what technique we used with him? I think we called it a "medical retirement."

9. I distinguish two categories of "disabled": first, those for whom nothing can be done to ever permit their return to active ministry; and second, those who have reasonable hope of return. There will be a difference in handling the two. Some thoughts on how we might (and/or must) deal with these folks I will have to address in a separate memo.

Thank you.

cc.: Archbishop Hunthausen
Father Ryan
Sr. Carol Ann McMullan
Father Walmsley

PPB000994