I think I told you that before you left for your short trip that I had information that Steve Church, one of the investigative reporters working on these stories about abusive priests, had gotten the name of Francis DeLuca. He dropped that name in the course of a conversation with Bob Krebs a couple of weeks ago. I presumed that he had secured that information from a victim or two. A couple of Fr. DeLuca’s victims I think are more than happy to speak now.

During the past week, I had a telephone call from Chris LaBarge, who told me that Steve Church, the investigative reporter, had called him asking for Doug Dempster’s telephone number. I asked Chris if there had been any further conversation between himself and the reporter and he indicated no. He went on to say that all he told the reporter was he did not have Father’s telephone number, it was private. He probably could get a message to Father if Father were in town.

I have a fairly good feeling as to which victim Steve Church is talking to in order to get Fr. Dempster’s name.

If in the next couple of days Fr. DeLuca’s and Fr. Dempster’s names come out in the paper, the only living priest who has been accused who will not have had some type of public disclosure about him would be Fr. Sarr. The other living priests (Dudzinski, Martin, McGovern, Rogers, Irwin, and Wiggins) have all had some disclosure in the newspaper – Dudzinski first in 1989 and then in 2002; Fr. Martin at the time of his arrest; Fathers Irwin, Rogers, and Wiggins at the time of their dismissal from ministry in 2003; Fr. McGovern with the disclosure of the grand jury report in Philadelphia.

Of the eleven deceased priests, I count three as having something in the newspaper about them in the last ten years – Lind, just recently; Mackiewicz and Carley probably around the time of their deaths (not so sure about Mackiewicz). That leaves no publicity about Fathers Clarahan, Gardiner, Power, Vignola, Cornely, Dreyer, Harney, etc.
I am supplying this information only to give you a kind of update as to where we are in terms of publicity of names and the expected publicity if in fact the newspaper discloses the two about whom reporters have been speaking with victims.

On another note: I called Harvey Rubenstein and went to dinner with him. (Harvey and I have been talking about going to dinner for quite some time.) The purpose of the dinner, of course, was to give Harvey an update on what happened at our early October Review Board Meeting and offer him an opportunity to ask whatever questions he had regarding Hermley and McGovern. Harvey, of course, feels very badly for the difficult situation created by the newspapers. He was very pleased with the updated statement, and also that the Oblates were willing to put a statement out in the public as well regarding Fr. Hermley. He recognizes that it was an oversight and that at worst it was reasonable to believe that the ministry at the Little Sisters could be provided.

I think I related to you that after a Public Policy Meeting last Friday (October 7), I met with Bill Kirk, a Board Member who was unable to attend the meeting earlier that week, and again offered him, as I did to Harvey, an opportunity to ask questions, seek clarification, etc. on discussions at the Review Board Meeting and any matter that was unclear regarding the Hermley and McGovern cases. He was grateful for the opportunity to ask questions and express his opinions. Aside from the two men mentioned above, I have not received any other inquiry from other Board Members who were not able to come to the October 4 meeting.