



# The Corren Agreement

Sean Murphy  
Director, Western Canada  
Catholic Civil Rights League

## Introduction

Two homosexual activists, Peter and Murray Corren, began an action before the BC Human Rights Commission in January, 1999, to try to force the Ministry of Education to introduce pro-homosexual curriculum into the public school system. Over the next seven years the case was delayed for a number of reasons and had come to public attention by the summer of 2005,<sup>1</sup> but was finally scheduled for a hearing in July, 2006.<sup>2</sup>

On 28 April, 2006, the Ministry of Education and the Correns signed a private agreement to settle the case on terms acceptable to the Correns.<sup>3</sup> The agreement, which can ultimately be enforced by the Supreme Court, was signed secretly and, by common consent, kept secret for over a month after it was signed, probably because the parties believed that it would be controversial. Subsequent developments seem to have confirmed this. In the eight months from April to the end of November, 2006, the Ministry of Education accumulated about 8,500 pages of documents relating to the agreement, including 1,000 pages of petitions and about 5,000 pages of correspondence to and from individuals or groups.<sup>4</sup>

Not all aspects of the agreement are problematic. For example, a social justice course to be implemented as a result of the agreement will be optional. Students will have the opportunity to review the curriculum and consult with their parents before choosing to take it, and they will not be disadvantaged if they decline to do so.

However, the agreement also

- promises a curriculum revision to ensure “respect for diversity with respect to sexual orientation,” without defining that term;
- purports to suppress parental authority to withdraw their children from classes that they find morally objectionable or offensive;
- gives the Correns a privileged position as consultants and overseers of curriculum development and public policy;
- guarantees the continuing secrecy of written and verbal communications between Correns and the government in meetings and discussions pertaining to the agreement;
- can be revised with the consent of both parties without public knowledge due to the provision for continuing secrecy.

As a matter of principle, the League protests the privileged status given to two private individuals in what is supposed to be a public enterprise: the development of public education policy and

## The Corren Agreement

public school curriculum. Moreover, the secrecy surrounding the signing of the agreement and its implementation violates principles of transparency and accountability that ought to inform the conduct of responsible democratic government.

Most important - and of greater practical interest to parents - the League objects to the provisions of the agreement that would prevent parents from removing their children from classes or lessons that would subvert the religious, moral and cultural traditions of their families. In view of the widespread denunciation of the residential school system imposed by previous governments, it is remarkable that parents are again threatened with a policy of compulsory cultural and religious assimilation on the grounds that the state, its officials, 'experts' and activist contractors know better than they do what is in the best interest of their children.

Finally, the League is concerned that the agreement may be used to suppress the exercise of freedom of conscience and religion by teachers who do not share the Correns' views about homosexual conduct and relationships.

### **Part I: Suppression of parental authority**

“. . .citizens do not surrender freedom of conscience and religion as a condition of attending a public school, nor do parents surrender their authority to the state, to a union, to a profession or to special interest activists when they entrust their children to a public school system.” (CCRL letter to BC school districts)

The first part of the government's private agreement with the Correns originates in the their frustration that they have been unable to impose pro-homosexual curriculum over the objections of parents, who often remove their children from classes where homosexual conduct is promoted.<sup>5</sup> "There's no point in us making the curriculum more queer-positive," said Peter Corren, "if people can take their kids out."<sup>6</sup>

One such case arose in Surrey in 1997. A mother was aware at the beginning of the school year that her child's Grade One teacher identified himself as a homosexual. She was also a volunteer in his classroom. She was assured by the school principal that the teacher would use only materials approved by the school board or Ministry of Education, and would not use his position to promote his lifestyle with the students. The principal also directed teachers to advise parents before class discussion of sensitive topics, like sexuality. However, in the spring of 1997 the teacher, an activist associated with Gay and Lesbian Educators of BC (GALE BC) disclosed in a CBC interview that he discussed homosexuality with his classes (Kindergarten and Grade One). The mother and father, not having been notified of this by the teacher, removed their child from his class. They were supported by the principal and board of education.<sup>7</sup>

Determined to put an end to such parental 'interference,' the Correns demanded that parents not be allowed to remove their children from classes, except in the health sections of Health and Career Education (Kindergarten - Grade 7; Grades 8-9) and Planning 10.<sup>8</sup> To this end, the Ministry agreed to let the Correns supervise its revision of the policy on "opting out" of classroom instruction and "alternative delivery" of curriculum, and to review the draft of the

## The Corren Agreement

Ministry letter to school districts and other educational associations giving effect to the policy revision:

The [Ministry of Education] will provide the amended draft Policy and the draft Letter to the [Correns] for their review on or before July 15, 2006. The [Correns] will provide their comments on the amended draft Policy and the draft Letter on or before August 1, 2006. The [Ministry] will finalize the wording of the Policy and the Letter, and will implement the Policy and send out the Letter. . . on or before September 15, 2006.<sup>9</sup>

It is clear, from the text of the agreement and from this timetable, that the Ministry of Education deliberately excluded parents from decision-making about their role in the education of their own children. Moreover, the Ministry made it even more difficult for objecting parents to respond by keeping the agreement secret for over a month after it was signed.<sup>10</sup>

The Attorney General claims that the Corren-supervised policy revision<sup>11</sup> and instruction to the school districts was merely a clarification of policy dating from 2000.<sup>12</sup> The Minister of Education has made the same claim.<sup>13</sup> Such assertions are both inaccurate and disingenuous. Counsel for the Attorney General, representing the Ministry of Education in a 1998 submission to the British Columbia Human Rights Commission, stated that the Ministry had "**always** offered alternate delivery of education regarding sensitive topics."

As of **September, 1987**, schools throughout British Columbia began offering a program of instruction in Family Life Education for students at every grade level from 7 to 12 . . . Although. . . a prescribed part of the curriculum, the Ministry recognized that some parents or guardians wished to personally assume the entire responsibility for teaching their children about the topics covered in the program. Those parents could request that their children not participate in the school program . . . Family Life Education has developed over the years and is now incorporated in [Career and Personal Planning]. . . parents continue to have the option to have sensitive topics delivered . . . by alternative means.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, from at least 1987 - not 2000 - the Ministry of Education has formally acknowledged parental authority to withdraw their children from classroom instruction. But this authority was not granted by the Ministry. Quite the reverse: the authority of the Minister, teachers and administrators with respect to students is delegated to them by parents, a delegation reflected in the traditional statement that teachers act *in loco parentis*. And this introduces the fundamental issue.

It is true that the need to formally acknowledge parental authority with respect to morally controversial instruction first arose with the introduction of sex education, broadly construed as 'health' or 'family life' education. Ministry policy on "opting out"

It is now reasonable to anticipate serious parental objection arising if the coercive power of the state educational establishment, employed throughout the curriculum, is used to induce children to approve of homosexual conduct and relationships.

## The Corren Agreement

and "alternative delivery" focussed on these subjects not because parental authority was operative only within this context, but because it was mainly within these parts of the curriculum that one might reasonably anticipate serious parental objection.

That is no longer the case, courtesy the rulings of a handful of superior court judges, the passage of *The Civil Marriage Act* and the private agreement between the Ministry of Education and the Correns. It is now reasonable to anticipate serious parental objection arising if the coercive power of the state educational establishment, employed throughout the curriculum, is used to induce children to approve of homosexual conduct and relationships. The withdrawal of students from lessons or classes - formerly an issue in only one or two subjects - has become an issue in all.

Knowing this, and having a low opinion of the judgement and competence of parents who do not share their views, the Correns and the government have arrogated to themselves the moral guardianship of public school students, concealing the move behind the false pretence that parental authority to withdraw their children from morally controversial classes is limited to subjects directly related to health and sex. Archbishop Raymond Roussin of Vancouver warned parents about this threat:

[T]here is widespread anxiety that this agreement will not only see the introduction of material that is in conflict with Catholic teaching on marriage and human sexuality at the earliest grade levels, but could go so far as to restrict the abilities of parents to determine whether their children are exposed to this material.

This would be clearly contrary to the fundamental and non-negotiable right of parents to raise their family and educate their children. The right of parents to determine how their children receive instruction on matters of faith and morals is a primary consideration, and anything that puts it at risk should not go unchallenged . . .

[T]he government should be reminded that parents are the final decision makers when it comes to their children's education. This is particularly so when it comes to their moral upbringing. As stated by Pope Benedict, the right of married couples to determine how their children are educated is simply non-negotiable. They must have the right to remove their children from problematic course content.<sup>15</sup>

## **Part II: Curriculum revision**

“ . . . the possibility that an increasingly kaleidoscopic view of sexuality might be inculcated in children over the objections of their parents is profoundly disturbing.

The Ministry agreed to develop internal guidelines to be applied to curriculum standards ("Integrated Resource Packages" - "IRPs") to ensure that all curriculum standards reflect "inclusion and respect for

## The Corren Agreement

diversity with respect to sexual orientation, and an over-arching concern for social justice." The Correns were given the privileged position as consultants in the development of these guidelines, with the power to suggest what parts of the curriculum should be revised first. The government also agreed to solicit input about curriculum revisions from groups or organizations recommended by them as having "expertise in sexual orientation, homophobia and other issues of inclusion and diversity in the curriculum." The internal guidelines were to be implemented by 30 September, 2006. Again, the text of the agreement, the month's secrecy following its signing, and the timetable for implementation helped to ensure that parents would be shut out of this process.

Note that 'sexual orientation' is not defined, so the agreement is open-ended with respect to what forms of sexual 'diversity' the curriculum is to respect. It is a mistake to assume that 'sexual orientation' refers only to same-sex attraction, even though that is how it is commonly understood. In activist literature, it includes not only homosexual inclinations, but bisexual interests and those who desire sex change operations. The usual acronyms used to describe 'alternative orientation' are variations on "GLBT" - gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered.<sup>16</sup> Consistent with this open-ended understanding of 'sexual orientation,' the Correns are seeking the introduction of "non-heterosexual realities" into the curriculum from Kindergarten to Grade 12.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, Ministry instructions to curriculum reviewers, revised in light of the Corren agreement, instruct them to include "representation of individuals and groups *across the full range of gender identity and sexual orientation.*"<sup>18</sup>

What might "non-heterosexual realities" and "the full range of gender identify and sexual orientation" include? Might "non-heterosexual realities" or 'sexual orientation' be manifested in tranvestism, exhibitionism, voyeurism, and paedophilia? In 2003, two researchers suggested that these 'orientations' be removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, just as homosexuality had been removed thirty years earlier.<sup>19</sup> Judging from the entry in *Wikipedia*, the current tendency is toward greater 'diversity and inclusiveness' in defining 'sexual orientation': asexuality, monosexuality, autosexuality, pansexuality, homoflexibility, heteroflexibility, BDSM (various combinations of bondage, discipline, domination, submission and sado-masochism), fetishism, prostitution, polyamory, and zoophilia. Bearing in mind that the Correns mean to revise curriculum for all students beginning in Kindergarten, the possibility that an increasingly kaleidoscopic view of sexuality might be inculcated in children over the objections of their parents is profoundly disturbing.<sup>20</sup>

### **Part III: 'Social justice' elective**

As previously stated, the proposed 'social justice' elective is not of immediate practical concern, since no student will be compelled to enroll in the course. . However, the principled objection to the privileged and secretive role of private interests in the development of public school curriculum remains.

## The Corren Agreement

Moreover, Peter Corren demonstrated what the League considers "knee-jerk, anti-Catholic bigotry or appalling ignorance"<sup>21</sup> when he described the Catholic Church "an organization that has victimized our society through history" and called Archbishop Raymond Roussin's defence of parental authority (quoted above) a "homophobic diatribe against Canadian

"We wouldn't have worked for 10 years to sell out for something as minor as just a simple elective course," Murray Corren told the Vancouver Sun. He considered other curriculum changes and "tougher limits on parental rights to remove their children from classes teaching 'sensitive content'" far more important than the proposed elective.

society."<sup>22</sup> It is surprising that someone expressing such views should be specially consulted by the government as an expert in 'social justice.' However, the Correns continue to have the confidence of the government, and neither the Minister of Education nor the Attorney General have disclaimed or even distanced themselves from Peter Corren's statements.

Though the government has emphasized the social justice elective to try to draw attention away from the plan to suppress parental authority, the Correns don't consider the elective important. "We wouldn't have worked for 10 years to sell out for something as minor as just a simple elective course," Murray Corren told the Vancouver Sun. He considered other curriculum changes and "tougher limits on parental rights to remove their children from classes teaching 'sensitive content'" far more important than the proposed elective.<sup>23</sup>

## **Part IV: Guidelines for delivery**

The Ministry of Education agreed to implement new curriculum delivery guidelines by September, 2007, "to assist teachers . . . to enhance social justice, respect diversity, and achieve equality for all learners." In developing these guidelines the Ministry agreed to consult 'stakeholder groups' and unidentified 'experts,' all of whom will, apparently, be chosen by the government. While the agreement does not give the Correns more control over the guidelines than the government's chosen stakeholders and experts, it does make them the only citizens in the province guaranteed a place at the table.<sup>24</sup>

## **What others are doing**

Other groups known to be actively opposing the agreement include BC Parents and Teachers for Life, Concerned Parents of BC, Christian Coalition of BC, REAL Women, Vancouver Chinese Evangelical Ministerial Fellowship, the Christian Social Concerns Fellowship, Equipping Christians for the Marketplace (ECP), Focus on the Family (Canada), the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, the Christian & Missionary Alliance Church of Canada, and the Canadian Alliance for Social Justice and Family Values(CASJFV). Among other things, a number have written to the Ministry of Education and the Attorney General, and all have encouraged people to write to government officials.

The CASJFV held a protest rally in Vancouver on 28 August that was attended by about 800 people,<sup>25</sup> and the organization has collected over 17,000 signatures on a petition against the

## The Corren Agreement

agreement.<sup>26</sup> A spokesman for Concerned Parents of BC made a submission to the Richmond school district in the first week of September, and planned to make similar submissions in other districts.<sup>27</sup> By the end of September, a joint statement of principle had been drafted by eight groups.<sup>28</sup> Abbotsford school district received a presentation from the Executive Director for the Christian Coalition of BC at the beginning of October. He has since written to all public school districts in the province.

Readers are encouraged to contact these organizations directly for more information about their activities.

## **What the League is doing**

The Catholic Civil Rights League is working with other organizations opposed to the agreement. This has included correspondence with the government. The League was one of the signatories to the joint statement of principle drafted in Richmond in September.<sup>29</sup> We are also acting independently, though in consultation with other interested parties.

Curriculum content is not yet an issue. **The League's present intention is to assert and defend parental authority to direct the education of their children, regardless of religious affiliation.** To this end, a letter sent to almost all public school district trustees<sup>30</sup> in September, 2006, included the following reminder:

It is important that school trustees, administrators and teachers understand that citizens do not surrender freedom of conscience and religion as a condition of attending a public school, nor do parents surrender their authority to the state, to a union, to a profession or to special interest activists when they entrust their children to a public school system. Catholic teaching is that parents remain the primary educators of their children, and that this primacy is not primacy only in order of time and importance, but in order of authority, regardless of religious affiliation. The Catholic Church asserts that parental authority to closely supervise the moral education of their children is inalienable; it cannot be suppressed or revoked by a private agreement between the government and special interest activists, nor by fiat of the Ministry of Education.

The League observed that the Corren agreement would likely "place school districts and school administrators in an adversarial relationship with objecting parents," and that the associated consequences and costs would fall principally on the school districts. The trustees were advised that the League would assist parents in such circumstances, and call upon others to do the same. Finally, the trustees were asked to state their intentions with respect to the obligation to accommodate freedom of conscience and religion.

Specifically, we want to know if it intends to compel students to attend classes or lessons that their parents judge are contrary to the individual needs of their children, or that they find morally objectionable or subversive or offensive with respect to their religious, moral and cultural traditions. We also require your

## The Corren Agreement

school district's position on the exercise of freedom of conscience by teachers. Specifically, does your district intend to compel teachers to deliver curriculum materials to which they object for reasons of conscience? These questions have become relevant to the entire curriculum, not just the elective Grade 12 course, because of plans to introduce changes to numerous subjects.

Should your school district intend to adopt such policies, we would appreciate having your explanation of how they are consistent with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Included with the letter were references to Catholic teaching on parental authority in education, intended to assist trustees better appreciate the position of the League.<sup>31</sup>

A second letter was sent in November to school districts that had not responded to the first, and letters were sent to every District Parent Advisory Council, advising them of the correspondence with their district trustees. A third letter was sent to unresponsive districts at the end of December, 2006,<sup>32</sup> and correspondence is continuing with a number of districts that have replied.

The position of the League is that school districts are legally obliged to accommodate freedom of conscience and religion unless doing so would create undue hardship. No evidence has been advanced to support the view that opting out of classes or lessons or alternate delivery of curriculum, including that outside health and planning, would create undue hardship for the educational establishment.

Further: no direction or policy from the Ministry of Education can relieve school districts of their responsibility to accommodate freedom of conscience and religion. Were that the case, it would give the Ministry of Education the power to override the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, a power which has been granted only to parliament and provincial legislatures. Rather, the subsisting obligation of school districts to adhere to human rights law requires them to act independently when confronted by government demands that apparently conflict with that obligation. The League does not accept the argument that school boards can excuse themselves from their obligations with a defence of 'superior orders', especially since trustees are elected officials and not the employees or agents of the Minister of Education.

### **School district responses**

As of 29 January, 2007, responses had been received from half the school districts in the province, representing almost 70% of public school students.<sup>33</sup> (See Appendix "A" for the districts that have not yet responded). Of these, six school districts have provided assurance that students will not be compelled to attend classes over the objections of their parents.

In response to the issue whether the district intends to "compel students to attend classes or lessons that their parents judge are contrary to the individual needs of their children, or that they find morally objectionable or subversive with respect to their religious, moral and cultural traditions" [i]t is our belief that these concerns



## The Corren Agreement

can best be addressed on a case by case basis . . . [offers four possible alternatives, including opting out and alternative delivery]. . . if a situation of "conscience" did arise, our district would make a sincere attempt to accommodate the teacher where reasonably possible. (District 22: Vernon. Letter dated 13 December, 2006)

. . . the Quesnel School District does not intend to compel students to attend classes or lessons that their parents/guardians judge are contrary to the individual needs of children or that they find morally objectionable or subversive or offensive with respect to their religious, moral, and cultural traditions. We also respect and accommodate on teachers exercising their freedom of conscience. (District 28: Quesnel. Letter dated 1 December, 2006)

In accordance with the Human Rights Code and Charter of Rights the Vancouver School District will honour our legal duty to accommodate concerns based on religious beliefs . . . we will deal with issues on a case-by-case basis and will make decisions accordingly and to the extent possible in our system. (District 39: Vancouver. Letter dated 20 November, 2006) . . . the Vancouver School District will honour our legal duty to accommodate students with issues arising from concerns about any curriculum on a case by case basis. We will make decisions accordingly and to the extent possible within the School Act. (District 39: Vancouver. Letter dated 20 December, 2006)<sup>34</sup>

School District No. 46 does not force our students to participate in any activity or class which they or their parents find objectionable. We abide by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. (District 46: Sunshine Coast. Letter dated 20 November, 2006)

We respect parents' decisions to have their children opt out of classroom discussions specific to controversial subject matter. We also believe that our teachers' rights are respected regarding the assignment of teaching duties. . . (District 91: Nechako Lakes. Letter dated 24 November, 2006)

The chairman of District 36 has made the following public statement:

I have every confidence the parent's voice will be heard, as it always has in the past . . . **If their student doesn't wish to participate their wishes will be followed.**<sup>35</sup>

Districts 36 and 39 are the two largest school districts in the province. Together, these six districts account for about one quarter of the province's public school student population.<sup>36</sup>

### **What you can do**

1. If you live in Districts 22, 28, 36, 39, 46, and 91 thank your trustees for their support for parents and students.

## The Corren Agreement

2. If you are a CCRL member with an e-mail address, please send it to [ccrl-west@shaw.ca](mailto:ccrl-west@shaw.ca) so that we can keep you abreast of developments. Encourage others to join the League and do the same.
3. Let others know about the Corren agreement, regardless of their religious affiliation. Give them the address for the League's web page about it (<http://www.ccrl.ca/index.php?id=435>). Download documents for people who do not have internet access. Use your contacts in service clubs, the community and parish groups to spread the word and distribute information.
4. Welcome and encourage non-Catholic Christians and persons of other faiths as partners in asserting and defending parental authority in the education of our children.
5. Write to or call your school district trustees or school board office and ask them to provide you with copies of the League's correspondence and their response to it. These ought to be matters of public record.
6. All citizens support the public school system, whether or not they have children enrolled. All are entitled to answers from their elected representatives. Ask them the questions asked by the League, and politely insist upon having answers. Let them know
  - that you expect that parental authority to withdraw their children from objectionable classes or lessons will be respected;
  - that you expect freedom of conscience and religion to be accommodated.

It may be more effective if several people do this, or if parents act collectively to elicit a response. You might consider making the following points in your communications with trustees:

- The issues are the defence of parental authority in the education of their children and the accommodation of freedom of religion and conscience.
- Parents delegate (not surrender) some of their authority to the school system. They do not need permission to withdraw their children from classes or otherwise intervene in the best interests of their children.
- Parents and students do not give up freedom of conscience and religion as a condition of enrolment in public schools.
- Accommodation of freedom of conscience and religion is not optional. It is a legal obligation.
- Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that should be given their children. From *Article 26 - United Nations, 'Universal Declaration on Human Rights' – 1948*
- The best interests of the child shall be the guiding principle of those responsible for his education and guidance; that responsibility lies in the first place with his parents. From

## The Corren Agreement

*the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child, Principle 7*

7. Parents whose children are enrolled in the public school system are automatically members of the Parent Advisory Committee of their school. Parent Advisory Committees and the District Parent Advisory Committees represent parents. School administrators, district officials and trustees have no jurisdiction to give direction to PACs or DPACs about what issues they may bring forward. They are entitled to take a position on these issues and communicate their positions to school administrators, district officials and trustees.

- While PACs and DPACs can be convenient and important channels of communication, individual parents remain free to communicate directly with trustees and administrators and to form other associations or groups for that purpose.

8. Write to the Attorney General, the Minister of Education, and your MLA. Tell them what you think, and ask them

- why they continue to have confidence in the Correns as experts in social justice in view of Peter Corren's comments about the Catholic Church and Archbishop Roussin's statement;
- if they believe that children should be forced attend classes or lessons that their parents judge are contrary to the individual needs of their children, or that they find morally objectionable or subversive or offensive with respect to their religious, moral and cultural traditions;
- if they believe that teachers should not be permitted to exercise freedom of conscience and religion in the workplace.

**The Corren Agreement**

**Appendix “A”**

**School Districts Not Responding  
(as of 29 January, 2007)**

<b>District</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Name</b>
6	Rocky Mountain	63	Saanich
8	Kootenay Lake	64	Gulf Islands
10	Arrow Lakes	67	Okanagan-Skaha
19	Revelstoke	70	Alberni
23	Central Okanagan	72	Campbell River
35	Langley	73	Kamloops/Thompson
40	New Westminster	74	Gold Trail
49	Central Coast	75	Mission
50	Haida Gwaii/Queen Charlotte	79	Cowichan Valley
52	Prince Rupert	81	Fort Nelson
53	Okanagan-Similkameen	82	Coast Mountains
54	Bulkley Valley	85	Vancouver Island North
57	Prince George	87	Stikine
59	Peace River South	92	Nisga'a
61	Greater Victoria	93	Francophone

Contact BC School Districts [<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/apps/imcl/imclWeb/DistrictOffice.do>]

## The Corren Agreement

### Notes

1. Badelt, Brad, “Gay activists want sexual orientation added to curriculum.” *Vancouver Sun*, 11 July, 2005
2. The focus of the original complaint was alleged discrimination against “non-heterosexual students and their parents” due to their sexual ‘orientation’. An amended complaint was introduced in September of that year and referred to the BC Human Rights Tribunal as Complaint No. 75. Over the next couple of years the case was delayed by procedural issues. In January, 2003, the Correns indicated that they would be filing a new complaint that would introduce broader issues. A year later they lodged Complaint No. 941, this one including the alleged ground of discrimination to marital and family status. An application for intervenor status by a parent opposed to the complaint was denied in April, 2005. Disputes between the Ministry and the Correns about the scope of the complaint presented continuing difficulties and had to be resolved by two rulings from the Tribunal, the last in February, 2006. The history of the complaint can be followed in three rulings from the Tribunal.  
See *Corren and Corren v. B.C. (Ministry of Education)*, 2005 BCHRT 167, 15 April, 2005. ([http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2005/pdf/Corren\\_and\\_Corren\\_v\\_BC\\_\(Ministry\\_of\\_Education\)\\_2005\\_BCHRT\\_167.pdf](http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2005/pdf/Corren_and_Corren_v_BC_(Ministry_of_Education)_2005_BCHRT_167.pdf)) Accessed 2007-01-26;  
*Corren and Corren v. B.C. (Ministry of Education) (No. 2)*, 2005 BCHRT 497, 2 November, 2005. ([http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2005/pdf/Corren\\_and\\_Corren\\_v\\_BC\\_\(Ministry\\_of\\_Education\)\\_No\\_2\\_2005\\_BCHRT\\_497.pdf](http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2005/pdf/Corren_and_Corren_v_BC_(Ministry_of_Education)_No_2_2005_BCHRT_497.pdf)) Accessed 2007-01-26;  
*Corren and Corren v. B.C. (Ministry of Education) (No. 3)*, 2006 BCHRT 55, 1 February, 2006 ([http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2006/pdf/feb/55\\_Corren\\_and\\_Corren\\_v\\_BC\\_\(Ministry\\_of\\_Education\)\\_No\\_3\\_2006\\_BCHRT\\_55.pdf](http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2006/pdf/feb/55_Corren_and_Corren_v_BC_(Ministry_of_Education)_No_3_2006_BCHRT_55.pdf)) Accessed 2007-01-27
3. *Settlement Agreement between Murray Corren and Peter Corren (Complainants) and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia, as Represented by the Ministry of Education (Respondent)*, 28 April, 2006. (Hereinafter “*The Agreement*”). (<http://www.ccrl.ca/Documents/2006-04-28CorrenAgreement.pdf>) The agreement is to be reviewed jointly by the Correns and Deputy Minister of Education every six months to satisfy the Correns that the Ministry is complying with its terms. A mediator appointed through the BC Human Rights Tribunal will attempt to resolve disagreements before they are taken to the Supreme Court for adjudication.
4. Letter to the CCRL from Ministry of Education, Privacy & Records Management Branch, dated 19 January, 2007
5. “Ultimately, the most frequent reason for parents to opt their children out of classes had to do with any discussion of sexual orientation and gender identity and same-sex parents,” Murray Corren said. “We felt it was extremely important for the ministry to delineate exactly where this

## The Corren Agreement

policy applies and where it doesn't." Smith, Charlie, "Correns unfazed by right-wing backlash." *Georgia Straight*, 9 November, 2006.

(<http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:zHpZI5ha74sJ:www.straight.com/node/49292+%22Corren+s+unfazed+by+right-wing+backlash%22&hl=en&gl=ca&ct=clnk&cd=1>) Accessed 2007-01-29.

6. Luymes, Glenda, "Hooky touted for anti-gay parents: Trustee claims Education Ministry policy on opting out takes away 'freedom'". *The Province*, 12 September 12, 2006

7. The teacher filed a grievance against the board. The arbitrator, without consulting the parents, ruled in the teacher's favour. "One for the Mad Hatter." *BC Report*, 14 December, 1998.

8. There is reference to this in the later Tribunal rulings.

"If, as the complainants allege, students are removed from the class when a sensitive topic is discussed, and that sensitive topic relates to issues of sexual orientation and same-sex families, then that student may not learn about gay and/or lesbian issues. This allegedly has an adverse effect on both heterosexual and non-heterosexual families." Paragraph 58, *Corren and Corren v. B.C. (Ministry of Education) (No. 2)*, 2005 BCHRT 497, 2 November, 2005.

([http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2005/pdf/Corren\\_and\\_Corren\\_v\\_BC\\_\(Ministry\\_of\\_Education\)\\_\\_\(No\\_2\)\\_2005\\_BCHRT\\_497.pdf](http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2005/pdf/Corren_and_Corren_v_BC_(Ministry_of_Education)__(No_2)_2005_BCHRT_497.pdf)) Accessed 2007-01-26. The same issue is noted in Paragraph 25 of *Corren and Corren v. B.C. (Ministry of Education) (No. 3)*, 2006 BCHRT 55, 1 February, 2006

([http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2006/pdf/feb/55\\_Corren\\_and\\_Corren\\_v\\_BC\\_\(Ministry\\_of\\_Education\)\\_\\_\(No\\_3\)\\_2006\\_BCHRT\\_55.pdf](http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/decisions/2006/pdf/feb/55_Corren_and_Corren_v_BC_(Ministry_of_Education)__(No_3)_2006_BCHRT_55.pdf)) Accessed 2007-01-27

9. *The Agreement* (<http://www.ccrl.ca/Documents/2006-04-28CorrenAgreement.pdf>)

10. "The parties will attempt to negotiate a mutually agreeable public statement about the terms of resolution of the complaints. If such agreement cannot be reached on or before May 31, 2006, the parties may issue their own respective public statements. The parties further agree that they will not publicly discuss the settlement of the complaint, including the terms of settlement, prior to May 31, 2006." *The Agreement*

(<http://www.ccrl.ca/Documents/2006-04-28CorrenAgreement.pdf>)

11. BC Ministry of Education: *Alternate Delivery - Health and Career Education Curriculum*. ([http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/policy/policies/alt\\_delivery.htm](http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/policy/policies/alt_delivery.htm)) Accessed 2006-10-02.

12. "This is not a change to the current circumstance, but a clarification to school boards, administrators, and teachers who may have a view that the Alternative Delivery Policy has broader application." Letter dated 5 October, 2006, from Attorney General Wally Oppal, to a school trustee. Copy in possession of the author.

13. Bond, Shirley, "Alternative delivery policy offered by curriculum." Letter to the *Vancouver Sun*, 11 January, 2007. For the League's response, see CCRL Letter to the *Vancouver Sun*, 13

## The Corren Agreement

January, 2007.(<http://www.ccrl.ca/Documents/2007-01-13VanSun.pdf>)

14. Letter from Ministry of the Attorney General, Legal Services Branch, dated 20 February, 1998 to the British Columbia Human Rights Commission, p. 7-8 (emphasis added).

15. Roussin, Archbishop Raymond, "Parents the final decision makers on education." *BC Catholic*, 4 September, 2006. (<http://bcc.rcav.org/06-09-04/editorial.htm>) Accessed 2006-12-19

16. For example, "Peer counselling programs need to include training in glbt issues and support strategies." Creating a Safe School- A Model For Ending Homophobia In Your School (Handout at Gay and Lesbian Educators of BC workshop, 10 December, 1996, Powell River, B.C.)

17. Steffenhagen, Janet, "Schools Go Queer: Gay guarantee for provincial curriculum. Contract assures same-sex couple will have unprecedented influence over B.C. curriculum." *Vancouver Sun*, 16 June, 2006  
(<http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=223d5fea-2e50-4b1d-9678-f37850ca50cb&k=69470?id=6>) Accessed 2006-12-21

18. BC Ministry of Education, *Curriculum Development and Revision: Guidelines for Internal Ministry Review of Draft Curriculum* (Revised 22 November, 2006).  
([http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/irp\\_internal\\_review.pdf](http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/irp_internal_review.pdf)) Accessed 2007-01-26. Emphasis added.

19. Charles Moser & Peggy Kleinplatz, *DSM-IV-TR and the Paraphilias: An Argument for Removal*. Presented at the American Psychiatric Association convention, 19 May, 2003, in San Francisco. Quoted in Lawrence Morahan, "Psychiatric Association Debates Reclassifying Pedophilia". CNSNews.com, 11 June, 2003. (<http://www.cnsnews.com/ViewCulture.asp>) Accessed 2006-12-19. That paedophilia can be understood as a form of sexual orientation had already been suggested by others. See, for example, Berlin, Fred, "Treatments to Change Sexual Orientation," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol 157:838, May 2000.  
(<http://www.ajp.psychiatryonline.org/cgi/content/full/157/5/838> ) Accessed 2006-12-19. Berlin argues against acting upon 'sexual orientation' towards children.

20. "Sexual Orientation." *Wikipedia*. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual\\_orientation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_orientation)) Accessed 2006-12-19

21. "Anti-Catholic bigotry or appalling ignorance behind BC diatribe, says League." *CCRL News Release*, 7 September, 2006. (<http://www.ccrl.ca/index.php?id=363>)

22. Steffenhagen, Janet, "Gay school material a threat: Archbishop." *Vancouver Sun*, 6 September, 2006

23. Steffenhagen, Janet, "Schools Go Queer: Gay guarantee for provincial curriculum. Contract assures same-sex couple will have unprecedented influence over B.C. curriculum." *Vancouver*

## The Corren Agreement

*Sun*, 16 June, 2006

(<http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=223d5fea-2e50-4b1d-9678-f37850ca50cb&k=69470?id=6>) Accessed 2006-12-21

24. Article 4, *The Agreement*

25. “Protesters rally against gay and lesbian issues course.” *CBC*, 28 August, 2006.

(<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2006/08/28/bc-same-sex.html>) Accessed 7 September, 2006

26. CASJFVA Newsletter No. 67, September-October, 2006, p. 3

27. “Parents step up campaign against B.C. same-sex course.” *CBC*, September 6, 2006.

(<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2006/09/06/bc-parents.html>) Accessed 2006-09-07

28. *A Statement of Principles of Fairness for Students and Parents*. Richmond, BC, 23 September, 2006. (<http://www.ccrl.ca/doc/A%20Joint%20Statement.pdf>)

29. See note 28.

30. School District 5 (Southeast Kootenay) was inadvertently overlooked. The first letter to the district was sent in late January, 2007.

31. CCRL Letter to BC School Districts dated 27 September, 2006

(<http://www.ccrl.ca/doc/New%20link.pdf>)

32. CCRL Letter to BC School Districts dated 29 December, 2006

33. Ministry of Education, Enrolment Report Collection (January, 2006).

(<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/reporting/enrol/collections.php>) Accessed 2007-01-23

34. In a somewhat grudging confirmation that accommodation would be available, the Chair of the Board later commented, “We’re sensitive to these matters. We won’t bolt them to their desks.” Steffenhagen, Janet, “Boards warned on ‘values’: Catholic civil rights group seeks guarantee that parents can pull children over ‘objectionable’ material.” *Vancouver Sun*, 8 January, 2008

(<http://www.canada.com/vancouvernews/news/story.html?id=7a44d5f3-0c8d-4208-90e7-dcbaff8dd085>) Accessed 2007-01-29

35. Reynolds, Sheila, “No support for Stilwell.” *Surrey Leader*, 15 October, 2006. Emphasis added.



## **The Corren Agreement**

36. Ministry of Education, Enrolment Report Collection (January, 2006).  
<http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/reporting/enrol/collections.php> (Accessed 2007-01-23)