

Letter to the editor (11-17-16)  
*Response to Wendy Tibbetts*

Dear editor,

Having attended the Borough Council meetings on the proposed LGBTQ ordinance, I would like to respond to Wendy Tibbetts' opinion (*Sentinel 11/15/16*). She stated the proposed ordinance "does not challenge the rights of anyone to hold whatever beliefs they choose", even though it actually does. A "conscience" clause was suggested and accepted by members of the public but was shot down by the majority on council, stating it would lead to a "slippery slope". This ordinance leads to a slippery slope. Councilman Heath commented that a Christian businessman, if that clause is not added, would have to leave his religious convictions at the church building on Sunday before entering his place of business on Monday, in order to satisfy the demands of this ordinance.

It was suggested that if a printer, for instance, could not in conscience provide services, such as posters or other literature promoting the LGBTQ agenda, he could refer them to another printer who would. Even though not stated in the ordinance, the final draft and publication of which is yet to be seen, he would not be protected since his refusal would be considered a violation to the ordinance, and thus subject to "police authority". Even though the LGBTQ community know of businesses that support their cause, it is not uncommon for them to pursue legal actions against the noncompliant.

When asked for instances to justify this ordinance, quoting Tibbett's comment where she hopes it would cease "the harassment and bullying of the LGBT persons", none was specifically stated at the meeting. There was not the same turnout from Dickinson College, present for the prior meeting which was full of hyperbole, suggesting that this has always been a done deal.

Charles F. Yana II

[www.truthdiscovered.net](http://www.truthdiscovered.net)