

From: Bill 10 Court Challenge Org [mailto:feedback@bill10courtchallenge.org]

Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2017 4:27 PM

To: 'Drayton ValleyDevon'

Cc: 'airdrie@assembly.ab.ca'; 'barrhead.morinville.westlock@assembly.ab.ca'; 'battleriver.wainwright@assembly.ab.ca'; 'bonnyville.coldlake@assembly.ab.ca'; 'calgary.fishcreek@assembly.ab.ca'; 'calgary.foothills@assembly.ab.ca'; 'calgary.greenway@assembly.ab.ca'; 'calgary.hays@assembly.ab.ca'; 'calgary.west@assembly.ab.ca'; 'cardston.taberwarner@assembly.ab.ca'; 'chestermere.rockyview@assembly.ab.ca'; 'cypress.medicinehat@assembly.ab.ca'; 'drumheller.stettler@assembly.ab.ca'; 'fortmcmurray.conklin@assembly.ab.ca'; 'fortmcmurray.woodbuffalo@assembly.ab.ca'; 'grandeprairie.smoky@assembly.ab.ca'; 'grandeprairie.wapiti@assembly.ab.ca'; 'highwood@assembly.ab.ca'; 'innisfail.sylvanlake@assembly.ab.ca'; 'laclabiche.stpaul.twohills@assembly.ab.ca'; 'lacombe.ponoka@assembly.ab.ca'; 'little.bow@assembly.ab.ca'; 'livingstone.macleod@assembly.ab.ca'; 'oldsdidsbury.threehills@assembly.ab.ca'; 'rimbey.rockymountainhouse.sundre@assembly.ab.ca'

Subject: RE: Alberta Bill 10 and Bill 24 Analysis

References: A. http://www.jasonkenney.ca/statement_on_bill_24, dated November 7, 2017.
B. My email "[Alberta Bill 10 and Bill 24 Analysis](#)," dated November 8, 2017.

Mr. Smith

Thank you very much for getting back to me. Again, it is a great relief to see a united right. Your response is very helpful, although I do wish to offer some further comments and request clarification on some additional information, if I may.

The attached is respectfully submitted and is not intended to be an admonition of the UCP's position on Bill 24 (and Bill 10) detailed at Reference A. There is a broad range of understanding and opinion on the collision of rights and freedoms surrounding Bill 10 and 24 legislation and Ministry of Education guidance for safe, caring and inclusive school environments. If the political task was easy, there wouldn't be so much controversy. Rather, the attached is a "plea" to the UCP to further consider a number of negative impacts from the bills that still deserve remedy on the behalf of Alberta "social" conservatives (religious or secular).

Clarification of the UCP position on a number of observations/questions would be most appreciated. The attached document addresses in greater depth four general areas of concern:

1 – Bill 10 law, including the resultant Ministry/ATA publications [Guidelines for Best Practices](#) and [GSAs and QSAs in Alberta Schools: A Guide for Teachers](#), should fall short of the [Oakes Constitutional Legal Test](#) for rationality, minimal impairment and proportional effects. The UCP position: "*We support the common-sense status quo, the same status quo the NDP has supported until this week*" effectively ignores this reality. The "status quo" is really not okay.

2 – Inserting the Alberta Teachers Association between parents and their children and empowering ATA teachers with the tasks of “human sexuality advisors” and “outing arbitrators” fails to recognize the historical/biased/activist roles the ATA has played in sponsoring and advocating the very Sexual Minority ideologies and political/social activism that aggravate most conservatives. Indeed, the 46,000 member ATA has [fully endorsed Bill 24](#). The politically left-leaning and religiously insensitive conduct by the ATA has been on-going long before the Alberta NDP came to power.

3 – GSAs are not anything like a school chess club or football team. All can agree on the goal of welcoming, caring, respectful and safe learning environments for Alberta students. However, the current “blank cheque” approach on GSAs, written in response to this goal, does not serve social conservative interests. Bill 24 – *An Act to Support GSAs* further restricts historical policy and oversight powers of school boards, while nothing is being done to clarify/constrain the potential for controversial and unconstitutional activism in our schools by GSA clubs. What is truly in the best interests of all Alberta youth and their parents is unambiguous legislated boundaries defining what these clubs can and most importantly cannot do.

4 – Bill 10 legislation added to the Alberta Bill of Rights *S.1 (g) the right of parents to make informed decisions respecting the education of their children*. Why was this done? Leader Kenny’s statement offers a powerful reason: “*to ensure the moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions, rights which were recently affirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada.*” The Alberta Family Law Act affirms his statement and the School Act S.50.1 empowers parents through mandatory notification of “implicit” teaching on human sexuality and permits student opt-out provisions for their children. So why would the UCP continue to overturn/reverse/nullify the proceeding rights by accepting the “*status quo*” – i.e. empowerment of the same sons/daughters (K-12) to usurp parental oversight/authority by self-identifying LGBTQ etc. at any age, by living a secret double life at school, by secretly joining a GSA/QSA, and by secretly connecting with the Alberta GSA Network, all without parental awareness or approval?

Sincerely,

Carman Bradley

Bill10CourtChallenge.Org