

**From:** shannon McKinney <mckinney.shannon@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 9, 2022 3:49 PM  
**To:** ZZ City Clerk External  
**Subject:** Opposition to ordinance Sec. 32-191

\*\*\* **CAUTION:** This email originated from an external sender. **DO NOT** click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. \*\*\*

Dear city La Crosse City Council members:

I am advising you to vote down this ban on what you call conversion therapy, Sec. 32-191 or file #22-0636.

The first reason for voting this down is it appears to be a blatant assault on our community's churches, religious schools, and religious counseling organizations and their first amendment right to the freedom of religion.

The second reason is that any time there is a perceived attack of a community's religious institutions, you as the city council have an obligation to allow more time for public debate, especially when the organizations to be affected have not had a reasonable time to explore the issue. For example when the park and rec department wanted to start charging for using the Hixon trails last year, they had at least two public meetings. There has been only one public meeting for this. Obviously this is a more important issue and should receive at least that much opportunity for public input, if not more.

The third reason for voting this down is that it clearly cancels a parent's right to provide their children counseling that is in line with their religious beliefs. Does the council really feel it's their place to place monetary fines on the pastor who tells their child that according to the Bible, God made a man a man, and he made a woman a woman? Isn't it the job of the city to fix the roads? How is interjecting into the private counseling sessions of a child and his pastor part of the purview of the city of La Crosse? How can you criminalize an ill- defined "conversion therapy" the same as you would an unlicensed dog?

The fourth reason is that the council member who authored this ordinance, Mac Kiel, isn't representing her constituency but advocating her own personal bias. When presented with other opinions at the committee meeting on Tuesday, May 31, she essentially said those opinions had no merit. Why? Because she said so. Does the council really want to be on the hook for what is clearly a new council member's rookie ordinance that falls suspiciously in line with a national, leftist trend to push these types of ordinances down the throats of religious organizations? Is this a city council representing all of La Crosse or as it was said last week simply following in line with what everyone else is doing? Clearly, many in La Crosse don't approve this. Why would you criminalize the duties of pastors, Christian counselors and school counselors to instruct a child according to the Bible?

The fifth reason to not vote for this is that those who do vote for this will be remembered for how they voted. You walk a fine line for being fired by the people when they finally do find out what you tried to quickly push through when they weren't watching. You have the public trust at heart and how dare you betray it by attacking the Biblical beliefs of what has been the bedrock of civil society for thousands of generations and trying to replace it with what amounts to a ten year experiment on our society's children. And shame on council member Neumeister for last week comparing conversion counseling to the physical abuse of a child. The definition of abuse would be what this ordinance intends to do to the entire city of La Crosse.

Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Shannon McKinney