

0001

1 Volume 1, Pages 196

2 Exhibits: 1 - 14

3 COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

4 Suffolk County Superior Court

5 -----

6 GREGORY FORD, et al.

7 Plaintiffs

8 Civil Action

9 vs. Docket No. 02-04551-T1

10 BERNARD CARDINAL LAW, et al.

11 Defendants

12 -----

13 DEPOSITION OF EDWIN CASSEM

14 Tuesday, May 20, 2003, 10:00 a.m.

15 Greenberg Traurig

16 One International Place

17 Boston, Massachusetts

18 -----Reporter: Kathleen L. Good, CSR, RPR-----

19 K. L. GOOD & ASSOCIATES

20 Post Office Box 6094

21

22 Boston, Massachusetts 02209

23

24 Tel: 781-598-6405 -- Fax: 781-598-0815

00032

1 A. I'm sure that I must have.

2 Q. Can you recall any such instances right now?

3 A. The one I recall is the one I wrote a letter to

4 Bishop Murphy.

5 Q. Do you remember the name of the priest?

6 A. I said the name and you said that's not correct.

7 Q. No.

8 A. I don't remember who it was then.

9 Q. Okay. With respect to the consultations with

10 the Archdiocese concerning particular priests,

11 apart from that one instance, do you have any

12 recollection of telling the Archdiocese that

13 they needed -- the Archdiocese needed to do

14 something with respect to helping the people who

15 had come forward to provide information about

16 priests who allegedly molested them?

17 A. I don't, sir.

18 Q. Now, do you remember consulting with -- we're

19 going to go over some documents in a moment --

20 but do you remember generally consulting with

21 Father McCormack concerning a Father Paul

22 Shanley?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. I'll show you the documents in a moment -- we're

00116

1 Q. When was the consultation with Our Lady's Hall
2 in Milton?

3 A. I never have been able to find Eileen
4 McNamara's, the date of her column, because it
5 was after that column that I went there. No,
6 actually, it was before that. It was before
7 that, I went there to meet with the group, the
8 men who were there, the six of them.

9 Q. I don't believe that Eileen McNamara was a
10 columnist -- I may be wrong -- in the 1980s.
11 I'd be happy --

12 A. Maybe it was someone else, but someone else
13 wrote about Milton.

14 Q. You believe that was in the mid '80s at some
15 point?

16 A. I do.

17 Q. All right. Okay.

18 If you could turn to Exhibit No. L,
19 please, Doctor.

20 This is in Exhibit No. 1.

21 We have a copy -- and we may not be able
22 to locate it right now, but we'll have one for
23 you after the break -- we do have a copy of the
24 letter from the doctor concerning Paul Shanley.

00131

1 A. I apologize for interrupting.

2 Q. Go ahead.

3 A. I learned most about Father Shanley in the
4 newspaper.

5 Q. Okay. All right.

6 In the newspaper, that would have been
7 in 2002; is that correct?

8 A. I don't remember.

9 Q. Was recently?

10 A. Well, maybe a little earlier.

11 Q. Right.

12 A. But roughly that seems reasonable to me, that
13 date.

14 Q. These were newspaper articles that appeared in
15 the Boston Globe; is that correct?

16 A. Globe, Herald.

17 Q. And you made a reference earlier to Paul Shanley
18 which you read in the newspaper about Paul
19 Shanley being involved with NAMBLA?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. You did not know that in 1991, 1994 until you
22 read it in the Boston Globe; is that correct?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. And you saw, when you read it in the newspaper,

00132

1 you saw that there were records in existence
2 within the Archdiocese about Paul Shanley's
3 alleged involvement with NAMBLA; is that
4 correct?

5 A. I read about that in the paper.

6 Q. And you also read, did you not, in the
7 newspaper -- I think you alluded to this --
8 about some of Paul Shanley's statements about
9 man-boy love which you also learned about
10 through the newspaper.

11 Did I mischaracterize that?

12 Apart from the presidency of NAMBLA, did
13 you learn of other statements that Paul Shanley
14 had made about the propriety of sex between boys
15 and men?

16 MR. REARDON: Objection.

17 A. Other than NAMBLA, he was -- he had said it's
18 the boys who seduce the adults, but I think that
19 was in regard to NAMBLA.

20 Q. It was the boys who had seduced the adults?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And you did not have that information in 1991;
23 is that correct?

24 A. No, sir.

00133

1 Q. You did not have that information in 1994; is

2 that correct?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. But you now understand from newspaper reports

5 that that information was within the files of

6 the Archdiocese of Boston, do you not?

7 MR. REARDON: Objection.

8 MR. AUSROTAS: Objection.

9 A. From the newspapers?

10 Q. Yes.

11 A. I don't remember that specifically. I have to

12 assume, but --

13 MR. REARDON: Let's not do that.

14 Q. We'll get the documents.

15 If you had had that information in 1994

16 or 1991, would it have altered your opinions in

17 any way that are reflected in Exhibit No. 6?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. In what way?

20 A. That he's, No. 1, he's so personally damaged

21 that he ought to be in jail.

22 Q. Okay. How else would it have affected your

23 opinions?

24 A. Can't do any kind of ministry. He ought to be

00134

1 laicized and jailed.

2 Q. Any other way it would have affected your

3 opinions in Exhibit No. 6?

4 A. Those are the main ones.

5 MR. MacLEISH: Let's mark this exhibit

6 so that we have this complete, Exhibit No. 7,

7 which is your letter.

8 (Marked, Exhibit No. 7, Letter

9 11/16/91.)

10 Q. Just to complete this, Doctor, that was your

11 response to Father McCormack -- when I say

12 "that," I'm referring to Exhibit No. 7 -- was

13 your response to Exhibit No. 5?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Do you see that now?

16 A. I see it.

17 Q. Let's go back to 1991. Okay? You, at that

18 point, were not provided with any information

19 about allegations either of sexual misconduct by

20 Paul Shanley or statements that he may have made

21 about the propriety of man-boy love; is that

22 correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. All you had in front of you, as I understand it,

00190

1 at Massachusetts General Hospital starting when?

2 Was that 19 --

3 A. '88.

4 Q. Up through?

5 A. 2000.

6 Q. And you were -- I mean, needless to say, that's

7 a position of some distinction. We can all, I

8 don't want you to say I agree, but -- let me

9 withdraw the question.

10 Do you think, Dr. Cassem, as you sit

11 here today, that you were in some way, your

12 opinions were in some way being used by the

13 Archdiocese inappropriately?

14 MS. QUILL: Objection.

15 MR. AUSROTAS: Objection.

16 MR. RAVITZ: Objection.

17 MR. ROGERS: Objection.

18 A. I have no way to know that.

19 Q. Can you think of any reason why you were not

20 provided with all the details concerning Father

21 Shanley and Father Picardi?

22 MR. ROGERS: Objection.

23 MS. QUILL: Objection.

24 A. For Father Shanley, I'm stupefied that I was not

00191

1 provided with the information.

2 Father Picardi, I don't understand if
3 there was an evaluation why I don't have it in.

4 My files. So I don't believe I ever saw
5 any evaluation from either St. Luke's Institute
6 or the Institute of Living.

7 Q. And you certainly don't recall being informed
8 that this man had admitted to raping someone, do
9 you?

10 A. No, sir.

11 Q. Now, your colleagues at the Massachusetts
12 General Hospital, Dr. Sanders and Dr. Murray and
13 the other people that you've listed, do they
14 continue to do work for the Archdiocese of
15 Boston, do you know?

16 A. I don't know.

17 MR. MacLEISH: This is a useful breaking
18 point for us. It's now four o'clock. I don't
19 have probably more than half a day at most
20 tomorrow. But I would suggest that we stop for
21 the day and reconvene tomorrow. And I would
22 like to -- one of the reasons I ask we stop is
23 because I would like to look at that file.

24 MR. AUSROTAS: And if we could get

00001

1 Volume 2, Pages 1 - 174

2 Exhibits: 15-44 and 1A

3 COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

4 Suffolk County Superior Court

5 -----

6 GREGORY FORD, et al.

7 Plaintiffs

8 Civil Action

9 vs. Docket No. 02-04551-T1

10 BERNARD CARDINAL LAW, et al.

11 Defendants

12 -----

13

14 DEPOSITION OF EDWIN CASSEM

15 Wednesday, May 21, 2003, 10:10 a.m.

16 Greenberg Traurig

17 One International Place

18 Boston, Massachusetts

19 -----Reporter: Kathleen L. Good, CSR, RPR-----

20 K. L. GOOD & ASSOCIATES

21 Post Office Box 6094

22 Boston, Massachusetts 02209

23

24 Tel: 781-598-6405 -- Fax: 781-598-0815

00140

1 allegations of sexual abuse concerning Paul
2 Shanley?

3 MR. REARDON: Objection.

4 A. Well, feeling like I'm manipulated by you the
5 way I've been manipulated by Father McCormack,
6 I'd have to say, yeah, you're pulling a fast one
7 on me.

8 Q. Doctor, please forgive me. I'm not trying to
9 pull a fast one on you; I'm not trying to
10 manipulate you. I'm just trying to take you
11 through some of records as Mr. MacLeish did.

12 A. That's good, but I don't trust you, Mr. Rogers.

13 Q. I appreciate that, Doctor, but my point is I
14 need to take you through these records so I
15 represent my clients' interests.

16 A. What was the question?

17 Q. The question is:

18 Is it possible that in 1994, given these
19 records now before you, that you were aware of
20 the allegations of sexual abuse concerning Paul
21 Shanley from Father McCormack?

22 MR. REARDON: Objection.

23 A. Possible.

24 Q. It is possible, Doctor. Thank you.

00169

1 primary concerns.

2 If you were aware of allegations of
3 abuse, you would be focused upon how do we
4 protect others from him?

5 MR. REARDON: Objection.

6 Q. Is that fair?

7 MR. MacLEISH: Objection.

8 A. I'd put him in jail right now, I said.

9 Q. Isn't that fair? That would be one of your
10 primary concerns, how do you protect others from
11 him if there were allegations of abuse that he
12 had admitted?

13 A. Not when I can't see them, sir.

14 Q. Doctor, Father McCormack represents in this
15 memorandum, does he not, that this was one of
16 your observations in August of 1994, the
17 question "How do we protect others from him,"
18 does he not?

19 MR. MacLEISH: Objection.
20 Argumentative.

21 MR. REARDON: Objection.

22 A. Father McCormack is a liar.

23 Q. So you're saying that Father McCormack was lying
24 when he sent this memorandum out in August of

00170

1 1994?

2 A. Yes, I am. Yes, I am.

3 MR. ROGERS: I have nothing further,

4 Doctor. Thank you.

5 MR. REARDON: All right. Thanks.

6 MR. MacLEISH: Thank you very much.

7 (3:22 p.m., proceedings adjourned.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24