

**Testimony
Submitted by The Very Reverend William J. King, J.C.D.**

**To the Pennsylvania House of Representatives
Labor Relations Committee
Public Hearing on House Bill 2626**

August 18, 2008

My name is Father William J. King. I am a priest of the Diocese of Harrisburg and a canon lawyer. My area of specialization in doctoral research and in legal practice is ecclesiastical governance and corporate structure. Currently I serve full-time as Vicar General of the Diocese of Harrisburg (Pennsylvania), and also in a part-time capacity as Judicial Vicar of the Archdiocese of Atlanta (Georgia), as Promoter of Justice of the Maronite Diocese of Brooklyn (New York), and as Adjunct Instructor in the School of Canon Law of The Catholic University of America (District of Columbia). I was ordained a priest in 1983, received the Licentiate degree in Canon Law in 1989 from The Catholic University of America, and a Doctorate in Canon Law from the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, Italy in 2002. I have also attended the Widener University School of Law in Harrisburg. I was the Director of the Office of Mediation Services for the Diocese of Harrisburg, and supervised the Alternative Dispute Resolution process in the Archdiocese of Atlanta. In individual cases I have served or am currently serving as a judge in the ecclesiastical Tribunals of the Archdioceses of Chicago, Los Angeles, Atlanta, and Philadelphia, and the Dioceses of Greensburg (Pennsylvania) and Brownsville

(Texas). The case heard in the Tribunal of the Diocese of Brownsville specifically involved a contract question between a labor union and a Catholic parish. I have also published numerous articles on topics of canon law, principally concerning the interplay of ecclesiastical structures and state law in matters of church governance. My experience also includes work with several committees of the Canon Law Society of America, including service on the Board of Governors, chair of the Committee on the Protection of Rights in the Church, and currently as chair of the Task Force on the Marriage of Undocumented Residents.

As a native of Wilkes-Barre, where I began my own Catholic education in the Kindergarten of Saint Aloysius School, it is distressing to me to observe the heated controversy surrounding the decision of the Bishop of Scranton to reconfigure Church structures for the delivery of the ecclesiastical ministry of Catholic education.

Content of this Testimony: Summary

I come before this committee today in opposition to House Bill 2626. My rationale is rooted in the Canon Law of the Catholic Church, which is a small set of norms enacted in protection of the much larger set of values considered most important to the life and ministry of the Church. Many of the canons contained in the *Code of Canon Law* do no more than explicate important theological and spiritual values for all to hear, whether members of the Catholic Church or not. Some of the canons define structures and relationships within the Catholic household of faith. Still others are disciplinary in character, seeing to the good order of the Church

community. All of the structures of canon law, however, have one universal constant, and that is the ministry of the diocesan bishop as teacher, shepherd, and priest. In fact, the Church has come to call these three roles of the bishop the *tria munera*, or “three duties” of the bishop. The word “ministry” is derived etymologically from the word *munus*, denoting a task or a duty or an obligation.

In this testimony I will first offer commentary as to the position of Catholic schools within the *munus docendi* or “teaching duty” of the diocesan bishop.

Following this, I will note briefly the opportunities for dispute resolution, for relief and remedy, that are part of the *munus regendi* or “shepherding duty” of the bishop, and which allow for grievances to be considered and appealed within Church structures, in a manner in which does not oblige any agency of state government to inquire into the interpretation of theology, spirituality, ecclesiastical governance, custom or law, or for any state entity to substitute its own judgment for that of the Church in determining how the *munus docendi* or teaching duty of the bishop will be fulfilled.

The Teaching Duty of the Diocesan Bishop

The *Code of Canon Law* of the Catholic Church consists of seven “books” or major sections. Book III is entitled “*De ecclesiae munere docendi*,” or “On the Teaching Function of the Church.” It consists of canons 747 through 833, a relatively small number of the 1,752 canons in the entire Code. These canons paint in broad strokes and often in language deeply rooted in church history and theology. They deal with

the structures of handing on the Christian faith from one generation to the next, and the mechanisms for accomplishing this sacred duty. The canons on Catholic education and Catholic schools do not govern the content of education, but specify the purpose and role of Catholic education within the religious ministries of the Church.

The Catholic Church does not operate schools in order to provide an option to, or an alternate system than, public schools. The Catholic Church does not operate schools in order to compete with surrounding school districts or with private schools. Several centuries ago, the Church put into place the structure of schools for a very different reason, and the reason for a Catholic school's existence is pervasive in the daily operation of that school.

In canon 747, the first canon of the section of the *Code of Canon Law* that treats of the teaching function or teaching duty of the Catholic Church, the Church definitively asserts her right to carry on this sacred duty:

Canon 747, §1 — The Church, to which Christ the Lord has entrusted the deposit of faith so that with the assistance of the Holy Spirit it might protect the revealed truth reverently, examine it more closely, and proclaim and expound it more faithfully, has the duty and innate right, independent of any human power whatsoever, to preach the gospel to all peoples, also using the means of social communication proper to it.

This forthright assertion is narrowly framed, claiming the right to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ by all proper means. This, in fact, is a command of Divine Revelation, coming as it does from the last directive of Jesus to the Apostles, namely to go into all the world for the purpose of teaching and sanctifying. The bishops, as successors of the Apostles, continue to carry on this Divine Imperative, and do so by all means appropriate or proper to this work.

It is a principle of interpreting canon law that the first canon of a section provides the context for the entire section which follows, and all subsequent canons in that section must be read and interpreted in light of the introductory canon. Following this principle, then, we must see all canons in Book III of the Code as deriving their meaning from canon 747.

A look at the other canons in this brief book of the Code demonstrates that they all do, in fact, derive from the content of canon 747. There are five "titles" within this book of the Code, all of which show how the teaching office or duty unfolds in practical ways:

- Title I. The Ministry of the Divine Word (preaching and catechetical instruction)
- Title II. The Missionary Action of the Church
- Title III. Catholic Education (schools, universities, and higher studies)
- Title IV. Instruments of Social Communication (books and media)
- Title V. The Profession of Faith (formal expression of the Creed of the Church)

The Catholic School as Constitutive of the Bishop's Preaching Ministry

Catholic schools exist in fulfillment of the Divine Imperative to protect, examine, proclaim, expound, and preach the content of faith known as the gospel. This is a matter of Divine Revelation, and the Church has no power or authority to modify or ignore this. A bishop is the successor of the apostles, and the Catholic Church for more than two millennia has consistently understood this core theological tenet to mean that the bishop is sent by God to continue the preaching of the gospel to the world, using all means proper for that sacred mission. Catholic

schools are one of the several means employed for the singular purpose of transmitting faith and proclaiming the gospel. As such, there is no part of a Catholic school's activities which can be considered apart from that overarching purpose. The closest dissection cannot, in the Church's self-understanding, uncover an activity or moment of the day which is not part of the preaching of the gospel in a Catholic school, whether by word, by conduct, by example, or by activity. Perhaps the constancy of presenting the gospel message was best stated by Saint Francis of Assisi, who said, "Preach the gospel always; when necessary, use words."

Were it possible to differentiate between the purely religious or spiritual elements of a Catholic school, and the exclusively secular elements untouched by the sacred, then it is more than likely that bishops would have found the faith-based school system an inadequate methodology for delivering the content of Divine Revelation, and would have closed Catholic schools some years ago. In an age in which costs are soaring to provide quality education, and in which pleas are heard from parents and pastors to halt continuous increases in tuition and in parish financial assessments for the operations of schools, bishops would have closed the schools if they were not vehicles for preaching the gospel, thoroughly imbued with religious and spiritual values.

Canon 794, §1, located in Title III, "Catholic Education," summarizes all of the above points and captures the theological values in juridical language:

Canon 794, §1 — The duty and right of educating belongs in a special way to the Church, to which has been divinely entrusted the mission of assisting persons so that they are able to reach the fullness of the Christian life.

The very purpose of a Catholic school is thus to assist persons “so that they are able to reach the fullness of the Christian life.” Every person who assists the work of a Catholic school, whether the Superintendent or other administrator, the pastor, the principal, a teacher of Math or History or Religion or Science, a cafeteria worker, a coach, a librarian or band director – every person who assists the work of a Catholic school has an essential primary clause in their canonical job description: to help every student in the school “to reach the fullness of the Christian life.” This language comes from the Second Vatican Council, in which the bishops of the Catholic Church reflected on the means by which they fulfill the Divine command to preach the gospel. Their Declaration on Education saw Catholic schools as an important means “of announcing the way of salvation to all men” (*Gravissimum educationis*, n.3). It is not so much the passing of tests and the development of job skills that gives a Catholic school its purpose: every facet of school life is directed toward preparing the student for their eternal destiny.

The 2004 *Directory for the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops*, promulgated by the Vatican’s “Congregation for Bishops,” notes in its section 133:

The Catholic school occupies an important place in the Church’s saving mission, since it offers a complete personal formation, educating students in the fullness of the faith and in a true Christian spirit. Insofar as it has received a mandate from the Hierarchy, the Catholic school should operate in complete harmony with the Pastors. It is the bishop’s right to establish norms for the general organization of Catholic schools in the diocese, including those run by religious institutes, and to visit the schools regularly, in person or through a representative, so that their apostolic spirit may grow and the work of teaching may take its proper place within the overall pastoral activity of the diocese.

This Vatican document, intended to guide a diocesan bishop in the fulfillment of his leadership of a diocese, continues:

The Catholic identity of the school leads to the promotion of the whole human person, because it is in Christ, the perfect man, that all human values find their fullest realization and therefore their unity. For this reason, the Catholic school should strive to achieve a synthesis between culture and faith, and between faith and life, by integrating the content of different areas of human knowledge in the light of the Gospel message, and by developing those virtues which characterize the honest citizen and the good Christian.

The Incompatibility of H.B. 2626 with Catholic Schools

It is not an exaggeration, but indeed a very true statement, that every employee and volunteer in a Catholic school is acting as an agent of the diocesan bishop in the conduct of preaching the gospel and in forming faith. No employee or volunteer can claim to stand apart from the preaching ministry – the *munus docendi* or teaching duty – of the bishop.

It is for this reason that I find the language of House Bill 2626, as well-intentioned as it may be, incompatible with the identity of a Catholic school and injurious to the ability of a bishop to fulfill his sacred duty of preaching and teaching through the instrumentality of a Catholic school. The Catholic school exists entirely in fulfillment of the bishop's duty, received by Divine Revelation and therefore not subject to our redefinition or adjustment, to teach and to sanctify. Every aspect of the Catholic school is in fulfillment of that ministry of the bishop. No part of a day, no element of a job description, no grand or menial task, can be divorced from the overarching participation of the Catholic school in the preaching and teaching ministry of the bishop.

All of those elements are included in the Catholic Church's vision of why we operate schools: not to preach and teach the gospel message in small blocks of time

and as a confined, solitary subject, but to form the entire human person through all the means available in a school. Every subject, every activity, every meal, every athletic competition, brings the opportunity for prayer, for inculcation of pervasive Christian values, for reanalysis of the order and aesthetic of life in a universe created and sustained by God, precisely in order to bring the student to a deeper and awe-struck awareness of God in all things and in all relationships.

If this commentary sounds a bit preachy, I apologize, but that is the point of this testimony: no part of a Catholic school can be distinguished from the preaching of the gospel under the direction of the diocesan bishop. The *Code of Canon Law* places this in less passionate language in canon 795:

Since true education must strive for complete formation of the human person that looks to his or her final end as well as to the common good of societies, children and youth are to be nurtured in such a way that they are able to develop their physical, moral, and intellectual talents harmoniously, acquire a more perfect sense of responsibility and right use of freedom, and are formed to participate actively in social life.

House Bill 2626 attempts to confine the state's ability, through the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board, to inquire into religious doctrine. It permits an inquiry into whether religious doctrine or a religious justification for a religious employer's action was merely a pretext for the action. What is dangerously lacking is the definition of what constitutes religious doctrine. Since no aspect of the school's mission or operation is entirely distinct from a religious purpose, the untenably vague notion in House Bill 2626 of what constitutes religious doctrine dangerously imperils the liberty of a diocesan bishop to fulfill his Divine mandate through the instrumentality of a Catholic school, and to fulfill the requirements of Canon Law through the internal ordering of Catholic Schools singly or as a system.

I am a canon lawyer and a judge in ecclesiastical Courts. The vagueness of the language of House Bill 2626 and the easily-foreseen evolution of a constricting, ever-narrower construction of the term "religious doctrine," allows me as a judge to cringe at the thought of the possibilities opened by this legislation. The effect on those who must actually apply religious teachings, values, and doctrines in our schools would be chilling: knowing that their protected area of religious freedom is thus constricted by narrowing secular governmental interpretation is incompatible with the breadth of their Divine directive.

I know my limits and I would fail miserably in engaging in an interpretation or analysis of Federal and Pennsylvania labor law. It is not my area of competence, knowledge, or expertise. In the same vein, I truly fear the best-intentioned efforts of those who know Pennsylvania labor law but do not know where the religious aspects of a Catholic school begin and end, or fail to acknowledge that a seemingly "secular" activity or subject can, in the environment of a Catholic school, participate in the formation of the student to embrace, understand, and believe God's plan for the universe and for her spiritual life. I wonder if someone administering a labor law will see how the discipline unique to a Catholic school is part of the school's mission of forming a Christian community imbued with respect for human life and dignity, or will affirm that religious doctrine can form the context for actions and behaviors even outside of the walls of a church. In a zealous attempt to apply principles known to labor law, well-intentioned people will progressively narrow the state's acceptance of what is religious in a Catholic school, not out of malice but out of a lack of understanding of the uniqueness of Catholic education.

I trust that the courts will understand the peril of inserting the judgment of a state actor in the internal ordering of Church programs and institutions, because restriction by the legislature of the liberty of the Church can only lead to a constitutional confrontation as the meaning of “religious doctrine” becomes progressively narrower under governmental definitions. Where no bright line exists to delineate the secular from the religious in the teaching ministry of the Church, it’s best to stop at the threshold and not enter.

At the present time I am taking flying lessons, though at a slow pace. If I do eventually get my private pilot’s license, it will be because I heeded the advice of other pilots and learned from the lessons written down in the past. As I read the analysis of airplane accidents and crashes in order to learn some lessons about safe flying, it is amazing to me how many crashes are caused by pilots who get into difficult conditions and who ignore their training and the practical wisdom of older pilots. They fly where they should not go, and they crash. Their judgment was clouded at the moment and they went beyond their limits. The best of intentions in attempting to address a problematic situation should not cloud the wisdom that has come down to us from decades past: the Supreme Courts of the United States and of Pennsylvania gave unmistakably clear warnings about avoiding constitutional confrontations in their holdings in similar matters. We would be foolish not to heed those warnings.

If you will forgive another “folksy” illustration, we might speak of the pervasive character of religious values within a Catholic school by the analogy of a light bulb. The bulb itself is easily delineated by the physical space it occupies, but

the light it emits is far more extensive and less easily confined. The language of the bill anticipates that the task of discerning religious doctrinal motivations from purely secular motivations is easily accomplished, but as the Catholic Church understands and defines her own schools, that distinction is like defining where the influence of the light bulb begins and ends. It is not an easy task.

It is truly a shame that the mutual misunderstandings at play in this moment have brought us to consider whether the state should enter into an area it has rigorously refused to enter before. However, I truly fear that doing so through the mechanism of House Bill 2626 would generate more and greater misunderstandings, lengthy and contentious battles and constitutional arguments, and in the end not accomplish the good which its authors hope for.

The Responsibilities of a Diocesan Bishop Toward Catholic School Teachers

Because of the extreme importance of the Catholic School in the ministry of a bishop, the Church places upon the bishop great responsibilities toward the teacher in a Catholic School. The *Directory for the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops* notes in its paragraph 134 that the bishop cannot teach alone: "In order to accomplish the immense task of educating young people in the faith, the bishop will enlist the generous cooperation of suitably prepared members of the faithful..." The *Code of Canon Law*, placing upon the diocesan bishop the task of establishing "schools which offer an education imbued with the Christian spirit" (canon 802, §1), also charges him with oversight of Catholic schools so that "the instruction which is given in

them is at least as academically distinguished as that in the other schools of the area" (canon 806, §2).

The canon law of the Catholic Church places into legal enactment the more important social tenets of the Church as well. To this end, the Code in various places treats of the bishop's right to provide prior rule-making for, to receive reports on, and to correct malfeasance in such activities as fund-raising and tuition payments within parishes and schools; wages and benefits paid to employees; the qualifications of teachers and their continuing education; the quality of teaching in all subjects; the condition of the school building, facilities, and equipment; and the provision for a diocesan school board as well as other structures of school governance in keeping with the hierarchical constitution of the Church. Most of these functions are not carried out personally and directly by the diocesan bishop, but through staff who report to him and who are delegated by him for these tasks.

However, no aspect of ecclesiastical governance is untouched by the values of the gospel. This is why structures which are put into place for the administration of schools, as with parishes, charitable and healthcare institutions, cemeteries, and the like, must respect both the hierarchic organization of the Church as well as the communion of faith and life that is the Church herself. Such things as the preparation of employment contracts are noted within the *Code of Canon Law* as necessarily affected by the social teaching of the Church (*cf.* canon 1286, §1).

Elements of the "job description" of a diocesan bishop are outlined in heavily-theological language in canons 381 through 402. The immensity of the task is evident in the broad sweep of areas within a bishop's responsibility. Among the canons

which express in far-reaching language the obligations of a diocesan bishop is canon 392:

§1 — Since he must protect the unity of the universal Church, a bishop is bound to promote the common discipline of the whole Church and therefore to urge the observance of all ecclesiastical laws.

§2 — He is to exercise vigilance so that abuses do not creep into ecclesiastical discipline, especially regarding the ministry of the word, the celebration of the sacraments and sacramentals, the worship of God and the veneration of the saints, and the administration of goods.

The bishop must apply these broad criteria of oversight and vigilance in every area of ecclesiastical ministry and discipline. It is an appropriate exercise of his ministry to discern and define criteria by which any group or organization will be recognized within the diocese. This is true for a group which might seek to form a soup kitchen, for a group wishing to collect monies for an overseas mission project, and also for a group seeking to represent the interests of teachers in one or more Catholic schools.

The duty of vigilance by a bishop over the entire scope of a Catholic school's program springs from the core of his pastoral mission. It is not limited to ensuring the quality of the school's curriculum and program in light of ecclesiastical doctrine, but the duty is also expressed in canon law as protecting the right of Church members to a Christian education. Canon 217 provides:

Since they are called by baptism to lead a life in keeping with the teaching of the gospel, the Christian faithful have the right to a Christian education by which they are to be instructed properly to strive for the maturity of the human person and at the same time to know and live the mystery of salvation.

The twin goals of Catholic education expressed in this canon are expressed as an ecclesiastical right to instruction in broad strokes, teaching one how properly to "strive for the maturity of the human person," and "to know and live the mystery of

salvation.” The protection of this canonical right of necessity interweaves faith, religion, worship, prayer, dogma and doctrine into the entire curriculum and the entire life of the school’s faith community. The Catholic understanding of the “maturity of the human person” and of knowing and living the mystery of salvation refuses a diminishment to one subject or one set of activities. In protecting the right of persons to this type of education in Catholic schools, a diocesan bishop must know that the thread of faith and doctrine can be seamlessly woven throughout the fabric of a Catholic school’s ministry. One commentator on this canon explains this in these words:

The duty of vigilance to insure that the Catholic schools in his territory maintain and promote their own Catholic identity is also linked to the bishop’s pastoral mission. Otherwise, not only would grave harm be caused to the Church, but the right of the faithful who attend these schools to obtain a Christian education (c. 217) would also be seriously violated.

The area in which this function is to be understood, in addition to the area set forth in §2 [*i.e., the quality of education and curriculum*], encompasses everything that could reasonably cause harm to the Catholic character of the educational institution. This then includes not only education and religious instruction, but also the guiding principles that inspire the school’s environment, as well as the teachers’ doctrinal and moral qualities. [Davide Cito, *Exegetical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law* (2004), III:239-240.]

The Pursuit of Remedies Within the Church

No employee should be without the opportunity for relief from unjust actions, or from pursuing recourse against unjust decisions. This is precisely why the *Code of Canon Law* provides for four options for relief and remedy. Two are judicial processes or court actions, and two are administrative. No disgruntled person is left without a means of seeking repair of injuries or restitution.

The Catholic Church has operated a system of Tribunals or courts of law for well over a millennium, and a substantive body of jurisprudence has developed in many areas of law. Within the judicial system of the Catholic Church, there are Courts of First Instance as well as Appellate-Level Courts, and there are two broad categories of Tribunals – the Administrative Tribunal, and the ordinary Tribunal. Their jurisdiction is distinguished by subject matter.

Canon 1400 provides:

§1 — The object of a trial is: 1° the pursuit or vindication of the rights of physical or juridic persons, or the declaration of juridic facts; 2° the imposition or declaration of a penalty for delicts.

§2 — Nevertheless, controversies arising from an act of administrative power can be brought only before the superior or an administrative tribunal.

Ecclesiastical Tribunals exist in nearly every diocese in the United States. In the very few dioceses in which there is no local Tribunal, a nearby Tribunal has jurisdiction to hear cases. The canon lawyers who serve in these Tribunals are trained and have passed a licensing examination to demonstrate competency in advocacy and in judging cases of all sorts. In my own experience as an ecclesiastical judge in various disputes, I have found that local Tribunals will ordinarily recruit a panel of three judges from outside the diocese to travel to the diocese to hear and judge the case, to avoid any prejudice or bias which might exist when using local judges. The local Tribunal will also ordinarily permit the parties to hire a canon lawyer skilled in the pertinent area of law, to serve as their Advocate or attorney during the trial. I have personally been involved in ecclesiastical trials alleging wrongful termination from employment, abuse of office by an employer, seeking

compensation for personal injury, for restitution of monetary losses, and seeking specific performance of a contract.

As an alternative to a judicial process or trial, the *Code of Canon Law* provides for two administrative methods when an employee or other person feels aggrieved by an action or decision.

The first of these is termed "hierarchical recourse," and is governed by canons 1734 through 1739. It is a request for review and reconsideration of administrative decisions at progressively-higher levels hierarchically.

The second is an Alternative Dispute Resolution process. Provision for this is found in canon 1733, which states:

§1 — Whenever a person considers himself or herself aggrieved by a decree, it is particularly desirable that the person and the author of the decree avoid any contention and take care to seek an equitable solution by common counsel, possibly using the mediation and effort of wise persons to avoid or settle the controversy in a suitable way.

§2 — The conference of bishops can determine that each diocese establish in a stable manner an office or council whose function is to seek and suggest equitable solutions according to the norms determined by the conference. If the conference has not ordered this, however, the bishop can establish a council or office of this kind.

Many dioceses in the United States of America have established an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) office or process. Those which have not done so in a stable manner handle requests on an *ad hoc* basis. The Canon Law Society of America has produced several resources to assist dioceses in the implementation and operation of an ADR process. Local diocesan offices employ various names, such as the "Office of Due Process," the "Office of Mediation Services," the "Office of Informal Procedures," and often utilize the services of registered neutral parties

or certified mediators or arbitrators. Many such offices operate under the current rules and procedures of the American Arbitration Association.

I have been involved professionally on both sides of processes for redress of grievances within the Church – through hierarchic recourse, in ecclesiastical trials, and in an administrative tribunal. Likewise, I have taught ADR and hierarchic recourse to student canon lawyers at The Catholic University of America and through continuing legal education offered by the Canon Law Society of America. My experience is that the procedures are taken seriously and operate efficiently. It is the ecclesiastical alternative to State inquiry into the actions of a church employer. It is also an application of the centuries-old civil law doctrine of deference, in which state courts refused to intrude into the internal affairs of a religious body when that body had a functioning tribunal system of its own, which could be used to seek relief or correct wrongs.

If any bishop should act against the doctrines or teachings, or violate the laws of the Catholic Church, or fail to protect the rights of persons with respect to the treatment of teachers or the recognition of teacher organizations, a remedy can be pursued within the Church's processes, through ADR or especially through administrative or judicial review of the disputed action.

Conclusion

In sum, I have grave reservations about both the language and the effects of House Bill 2626. My opposition is not about the concept or benefit of labor unions,

which enjoy a privileged position in Catholic social doctrine. My concerns are specifically about the unique relationship of a diocesan bishop to a Catholic school, which no state agency is competent to inquire into or alter without running headlong into theological or spiritual considerations. This proposed legislation will needlessly bring state agents into the realm of interpreting religious doctrine and religious motivations. It will seriously impair the ability of a diocesan bishop and those who assist him in the delivery of Catholic education to govern Catholic schools in fulfillment of the Divine mandate to teach and to sanctify. It will remove the interpretation of the intrinsic and pervasive religious dimension of a Catholic school from those who are charged with oversight of religious values, and place it in the hands of those whose skills are oriented otherwise. Ultimately it will require the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to interpret what it means for a Catholic school to be truly Catholic, or to remove from the fabric of a Catholic school's fundamental identity one thread at a time. The Church herself operates her schools with the understanding that the fabric is seamless, and that all elements of the education and development of the student participate in the formation of the total human person in relationship with God. To place the Commonwealth in the position of redefining Catholic education is unnecessary, especially since the Church herself provides multiple means for seeking redress of wrongs and remedy for injustice, within the same fabric of the Church's doctrine on justice as we seek to teach in our schools.

