## **SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES**

June 30, 2005 1:00 P.M. Hearing Room B Tapes 141 - 142

**Corrected 10/28/05** 

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Sen. Kate Brown, Chair Sen. Ted Ferrioli, Vice-Chair Sen. Jason Atkinson Sen. Charlie Ringo
	Sen. Frank Shields

# STAFF PRESENT:Tiffany Harris, Committee AdministratorLinda K. Gatto, Committee Assistant

#### **MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD:**

HB 2136A – Public Hearing and Work Session HB 2681A – Public Hearing and Work Session HB 2862A – Public Hearing and Work Session HB 2878 – Public Hearing and Work Session HCR 9A – Public Hearing and Work Session HJM 13A – Public Hearing and Work Session HJM 15 – Public Hearing and Work Session HJM 16 – Public Hearing and Work Session HJM 18A – Public Hearing and Work Session HJM 25A – Public Hearing and Work Session SJM 8 – Public Hearing and Work Session SJM 8 – Public Hearing and Work Session

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. <u>Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words.</u> For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE 141, A		
004	Chair Brown	Calls the meeting to order at 1:12 p.m. as a subcommittee and opens a public hearing on HB 2136A, HB 2681A, HB 2862A, HB 2878, HCR 9A, HJM 13A, HJM 15, HJM 16, HJM 18A,
		HJM 25A, and SJM 8.

# <u>HB 2136A, HB 2681A, HB 2862A, HB 2878, HCR 9A, HJM 13A, HJM 15, HJM 16, HJM 18A, HJM 25A and SJM 8 – PUBLIC HEARING</u>

018	Rep. Donna Nelson	House District 24. States these bills advocate for veterans, our
	1	military and their families. States that these are critical issues to restore the credibility of veterans.
078	Colonel Mike	States that HB 2862A codifies in to law what is a fairly common
	Caldwell	practice clarifying the policy of the state.
087	David McDonald	Director of Enrollment Services Oregon University System.
		Submits an issue brief on the Voyager Tuition Assistance
		Program and states support for HB 2862A (EXHIBIT A).
106	Chair Brown	Closes the public hearing on HB 2862A. Notes there is now a
		quorum and states for the record that Colonel Caldwell is here on
		HJM 13A, HJM 15, HJM 16, SJM 8, and HJM 25.
115	Colonel Mike	Deputy Director, Oregon Military Department. States that HB
	Caldwell	2136A updates the Oregon Code of Military Justice. Explains the

		three major provisions
154	Mike Sullivan	three major provisions. Lobbyist for the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers. Testifies in support of HJM 18A. States that this bill asks that
181	Kevin O'Reilly	Veterans Affairs be funded directly under mandated funds. Oregon Paralyzed Veterans of America. Reads a prepared statement about the cuts to medical equipment upgrades and comprehensive care in Veteran's Affairs.
246	Sen. Ringo	Asks if there is a distinction between veterans' health care needs that arise because of combat operations.
251	O'Reilly	Responds that the distinction is made between service connected and non-service connected. Explains there are eight categories of eligibility.
258	Sen. Ringo	Asks are the service connected given a higher priority.
259	O'Reilly	Answers yes.
261	Sullivan	Adds that currently there is no funding for category 8 priorities.
257	Fred Schafer	Oregon State Commander, National Association of Atomic
231	i ieu Senarei	Veterans. States HCR 9A requests July 16 as a special day in
		Oregon. Explains they were test sites participates and are
•	<b>D D</b> 11	considered not service connected.
299	Forest Bahler	Past Department Commander, Disabled American Veterans.
		States he is an atomic veteran. Describes his experience with
		atomic energy testing at sea. Explains that the first test was in
		New Mexico in 1945 and from there to Japan and the atomic
		bomb testing continued.
345	Bahler	States animals were used. Discusses the experience of the shock
		wave, the radiation exposure from atomic bombs from 1945 to
		1956 which has taken the lives of many veterans from cancer,
		leukemia and lymphoma.
366	Bahler	Describes medical issues experienced by his three daughters.
		States that passing this bill is one more step toward justice for
		atomic veterans.
414	William Milagan	States that he also served as an atomic veteran. States that he has
		a history of cancer related illnesses. Supports HCR 9A.
TAPE 142, A		
019	Sen. Ferrioli	Comments on the efforts expended during the cold war and the
		risks that were taken without explanation. States appreciation for
		bringing this issue to public consciousness.
056	Sen. Ferrioli	Adds they were not allowed to share their experiences with
		physicians or family.
058	Bahler	Adds there are veterans that have charges against them for
		talking.
084	Sen. Ringo	States that his father witnessed the first atomic blast in New
		Mexico and was told it was a fuel depot that exploded.
		Comments on veterans' exposure to risks where the effects are
		not disclosed. States appreciation for the testimony.
110	Jim Jones	Relays his experience in 1958 of the being in the submarine
		when the blast went off; in Vietnam with Agent Orange where it
		would run off them like water. States they are not looking for
		money; they are looking for a day of recognition for the veterans
		who were used Guinea pigs in the bomb tests.
131	Sen. Ferrioli	Observes that when these men were making these sacrifices
		members of the committee were children.
147	Jones	Relays what happened to when a shock wave hit the submarine.
		Discusses the secrecy requirements and deaths as a result of

		radiation exposure.
200	Member of the audience	Discusses the "spooks" that came in after the testing.
236	John Gabrialson	Relays his personal experience on patrol and having to arrest people who spoke about what they witnessed.
256	Chair Brown	Closes the public hearing on HB 2136A, HB 2681A, HB 2878, HCR 9A, HJM 13A, HJM 15, HJM 16, HJM 18A, HJM 25A,
UD 2126A	WODK SESSION	and SJM 8 and opens a work session on HB 2136A.
<u>HB 2130A</u> 260	<u> – WORK SESSION</u> Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HB 2136A to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.
262		VOTE: 4-0-1
		EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. FERRIOLI will lead discussion on the floor.
	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HB 2136A and opens the work
IID 2/01 A	WODZ SESSION	session on HB 2681A.
<u>пв 2081А</u> 264	<u> – WORK SESSION</u> Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HB 2681A to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.
265		VOTE: 4-0-1
		EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. BROWN will lead discussion on the floor.
267	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HB 2681A and opens the work session HB 2862A.
	-WORK SESSION	
266	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HB 2862A to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.
267		VOTE: 4-0-1
	Chain Duann	EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
• • •	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. RINGO will lead discussion on the floor.
269	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HB 2862A and opens the work session on HB 2878.
	- WORK SESSION	
269	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HB 2878 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation.
269		VOTE: 4-0-1 EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. ATKINSON will lead discussion on the floor.
271	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HB 2878. Opens the work session on HCR 9A.
HCR 9A	- WORK SESSION	
283	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HCR 9A be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
283		VOTE: 4-0-1
	~ · · -	EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. FERRIOLI will lead discussion on the floor.
283	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HCR 9A and opens the work session on HJM 13.
<b>HJM 13A</b>	- WORK SESSION	

289	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HJM 13A be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
291		VOTE: 4-0-1
		EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. BROWN will lead discussion on the floor.
291	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HJM 13A and opens the work session on HJM 15.
HJM 15 -	WORK SESSION	
292	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HJM 15 be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
293		VOTE: 4-0-1
		EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. RINGO will lead discussion on the floor.
297	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HJM 15 and opens the work session on HJM 16.
<u>HJM 16 -</u>	WORK SESSION	
299	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HJM 16 be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
300		<b>VOTE: 4-0-1</b>
		EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. ATKINSON will lead discussion on the floor.
301	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HJM 16 and opens the work session on HJM 18A.
<u>HJM 18A</u>	- WORK SESSION	
302	Sen. Brown	MOTION: Moves HJM 18A be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
303		VOTE: 4-0-1
		EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. SHIELDS will lead discussion on the floor.
304	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HJM 18A and opens the work session on HJM 25A.
	– WORK SESSION	
306	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves HJM 25A be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
307		VOTE: 4-0-1 EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. FERRIOLI will lead discussion on the floor.
310	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on HJM 25A and opens the work session on SJM 8.
	WORK SESSION	
310	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves SJM 8 be sent to the floor with a BE ADOPTED recommendation.
311		VOTE: 4-0-1 EXCUSED: 1 – Shields *(see tape 141 B #266)
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED. SEN. BROWN will lead discussion on the floor.
313	Chair Brown	Closes the work session on SJM 8. Recesses the committee until

330	Chair Brown	2:10 p.m. Reconvenes the meeting. Clarifies the rules for minority reports when the Senate is under one hour notice. Opens the work session on SB 1000.
SB 1000 – WOF	RK SESSION	
361	Tiffany Harris	States there are -3, -6 and -7 amendments. Clarifies that the -6 tracks the -3 amendments and the -7 amendments track the original bill.
399	Doug McKean	Legislative Counsel. Reviews the -6 amendments (EXHIBIT B). Notes that the language "bona fide church or sectarian religious institution" is identical to language already in law.
452	Chair Brown	Asks how "bona fide church or sectarian religious institution" is defined in law.
457	McKean	Answers they are not defined terms and there are no court cases that describe what those terms mean. Current law in 659A.006 gives examples of a sectarian religious institution.
<b>TAPE 141, A</b>		
015	Chair Brown	Clarifies for the record this is current statutory law.
015	McKean	Continues to review the provisions of the -6 amendments.
<b>TAPE 141, B</b>		
036	Sen. Ben Westlund	Testifies that the -7 amendments clarify that marriage and civil
		unions are not the same. The -7 amendments delete the term "same" and insert "substantially equivalent to", the -6 amendments address specific issues/items/entities that could be impacted.
071	Sen. Westlund	Comments on the committee process and the work that was done on this bill.
082	Chair Brown	Asks if the -7 amendments clarify that SB 1000 is not the same as marriage.
084	Sen. Westlund	Responds affirmatively.
086	Chair Brown	Asks if it is his understanding that civil unions are not recognized by the federal law.
087	Sen. Westlund	Responds civil unions are prohibited from being recognized by federal law.
088	Chair Brown	Asks if they are transferable to other states.
089	Sen. Westlund	Responds unless a state recognizes civil unions, they are not transferable.
091	Chair Brown	Asks if the -7 amendments allow same sex couples to marry.
092	Sen. Westlund	Answers that federal law and the state of Oregon prohibits same sex couples to marry and this bill does not change that.
094	Chair Brown	Asks who participated in drafting the -6 amendments.
095	Sen. Westlund	Answers a group of legislators, legislative counsel, the ACLU, staff from Senators Bates, Westlund, Morse and Brown's offices.
100	Chair Brown	Asks if it is the intent of the -6 amendments to provide the maximum flexibility in hiring practices in regard to the issue of sexual orientation.
104	Sen. Westlund	Answers affirmatively.
106	Sen. Ferrioli	Asks who represented the religious organizations in the work group.
107	Sen. Westlund	Answers that he carried much of the will and intent.
111	Sen. Ferrioli	Perceives that there was not representation by bona fide religious organizations.

113	Chair Brown	Notes that Sen. Morse is a bona fide theologian.
126	Chair Brown	States there is not time to bring in all religious institutions in the state.
117	Sen. Ferrioli	States there was testimony from the Catholic church and other churches and asks which of them were consulted.
126	Sen. Westlund	States that the meeting was called to address their concerns.
120	Sen. Ferrioli	Comments on religious representation not being involved in the
152	Sen. Periton	negotiation process.
133	Chair Brown	Responds that the meeting was not a negotiation, it was a
155	Chall Blown	meeting of the sponsors of the bill to address the concerns raised
145	Sen. Ferrioli	by Mr. Castagna and Ms. Smith. Asks if there was an attempt to broaden the exception clause for
145	Sell. Perifoli	churches.
147	McKean	Responds the clause "or to its primary purpose" in the -2
14/	Wiekcall	amendments is not in the -6 amendments.
158	Sen. Ferrioli	Asks does this broaden the exemption or narrow it.
158	Sen. Westlund	Responds the specific purpose of the meeting was to broaden it in
100	Sell. Westlund	two areas; 1) the employee being exempted, and 2) to keep the
		core mission of a church or religious institution out of the courts.
189	Chair Brown	Refers to the listing of religious institutions.
189	Sen. Ferrioli	Notes that a "bona fide church" is not defined.
202	McKean	Responds that he has not done that research.
202	Chair Brown	Ask how long has the term been in Oregon statute.
212	Chair Brown	States the audience indicates since 1969.
213	Sen. Westlund	States there are court cases that have created a definition.
217	Sen. Ferrioli	
224	Chair Brown	Asks how religious activities are defined.
240	Chall Blowli	Closes the public hearing on SB 1000 and opens a work session for the purpose of allowing Senator Shields to vote on HB
		2136A, HB 2681A, HB 2862A, HB 2878, HCR 9A, HJM 13A, HJM 15, HJM 16, HJM 18A, HJM 25A and SJM 8.
HR 2136A	HR 2681A HR 2862A	HB 2878, HCR 9A, HJM 13A, HJM 15, HJM 16, HJM 18A, HJM
	SJM 8 – WORK SESSION	
264	Sen. Brown	MOTION: Requests unanimous consent that the rules be
204	Sen. Drown	SUSPENDED to allow SEN. SHIELDS to BE
		RECORDED as voting AYE on the "ADOPTION
		OF HB 2136A, HB 2681A, HB 2862A, HB 2878,
		HCR 9A, HJM 13A, HJM 15, HJM 16, HJM
		18A, HJM 25A and SJM 8".
266		VOTE: 5-0-0
	<b>Chair Brown</b>	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
268	Chair Brown	Re-opens the work session on SB 1000.
	WORK SESSION	Re opens the work session on 5D 1000.
272	McKean	Responds to Senator Ferrioli's question stating that the language
2,2		regarding religious activities in line 23 is not defined in the bill.
		Notes that it is a employment position that involves religious
		activities and those activities would be determined by the
		employer rather than the employee.
283	Chair Brown	Reiterates that the focus of the amendments is not about second
		guessing the employment decisions of religious institutions but
		rather to regulate the businesses engaged in commerce. The
		broadening of the language was to address the concerns raised by
		Mr. Castagna.
292	Sen. Ferrioli	States that there is a boundary in $7(c)$ that questions who would

313McKcanmake the decision about whether the exemption is sufficient.314Chair BrownAdds that courts may have to define an employment position that is not connected to a connectional or basiness activity.324Chair BrownNotes that United States Supreme Court requires certain connections between the institution and the activity.328McKeanResponds the Oregon courts have talked about the issue but is not sure if has been determined in the context of this statute.335Sen, FerrioliClarifies for the record that if the boundary cvisst, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Industrics. Bciteves the appropriate approach would be to not include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.372Sen, FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industrics.370Chair BrownStates that utimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.371Sen, FerrioliReterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen, ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.427Sen, FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean. 018018McKcanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that cerating practical equivalency to mariage in law is a constitutional violation. <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>			
324       Chair Brown       Adds that courts may have to define an employment position that is not connected to a commercial or business activity.         328       McKean       Responds the Oregon courts have talked about the issue this not sare if has been determined in the context of this statute.         335       Sen. Ferrioli       Clarifies for the record that if the boundary exists, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Industries. Believes the appropriate approach would be to not include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.         363       Chair Brown       Comments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.         372       Sen. Ferrioli       States his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.         370       Chair Brown       States this ultimation is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.         417       Sen. Ferrioli       Reiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ingrid.         427       Sen. Shields       States his perspective as a clergyperson.         7414       Sen. Ferrioli       Asks what does "substantially could acts on ling and point leads to ling atom.         018       McK can       Responds that "equivalent" mean.         018       Sen. Ferrioli       Asks what does "substantially could acto ling and nualue or volume and 'substantial			make the decision about whether the exemption is sufficient.
324Chair Brownis not connected to a commercial or business activity.323McKeanResponds the Oregon courts have talked about the issue but is not sure if has been determined in the context of this statute.335Sen. FerrioliClarifies for the record that if the boundary exists, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Industries. Believes the appropriate approach would be to not include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between ethurch and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.370Chair BrownStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between ethurch and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.371Sen. FerrioliStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that that not been thought of.417Sen. Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalent, is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalent, is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalent, is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that <td>313</td> <td>McKean</td> <td></td>	313	McKean	
324Chair BrownNotes that United States Supreme Court requires certain connections between the institution and the activity.328McKeanResponds the Oregon courts have talked about the issue but is not sure if has been determined in the context of this statute.335Sen. FerrioliClariffes for the record that if the boundary exists, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and 			
328McKeanconnections between the institution and the activity.335Sen. FerrioliResponds the Oregon courts have talked about the issue but is not sure if has been determined in the context of this statute.335Sen. FerrioliClarifies for the record that if the boundary exists, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between ehurch and state will be resolved at the Bureau of I abor and Industries.352Sen. RingoDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially" means in the same degree.040McKeanAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency is adecident than Vermont, Masachuzetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provides. Answers no.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the wo			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
328McKeanResponds the Oregon courts have talked about the issue but is not sure if has been determined in the context of this statute.335Sen, FerrioliClarifies for the record that if the boundary exists, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Industries. Believes the appropriate appropriate appropriate appropriate states his concern is the approach, that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach, that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary leads to litigation.427Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creatifual equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and 'substantially' could be considered a qualifier. States that creatifual equivalent is a host of federal benefits that oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same exc couples the exact same rights, responsibilities	324	Chair Brown	· · ·
335Sen. Ferriolisure if has been difermined in the context of this statute. Clarifies for the record that if the boundary exists, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Industries. Believes the approach would be to not include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659. States his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.352Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.370Chair BrownStates this concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.417Sen. FerrioliStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is refering to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.418McKeanResponds that "equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" mean in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, r			•
335Sen. FerrioliClarifies for the record that if the boundary exists, the administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Industries. Believes the appropriate approach would be to not include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.370Chair BrownStates this concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" output is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks des SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Orego	328	McKean	· ·
administrative remedies will end up in Bureau of Labor and Include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.352Sen. RingoDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates thice intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson. <b>TAPE 142, B</b> Other Substantially "means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially cquivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks ofes SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.067McKeanAnswers no, and that there is a host of federal law.067McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements. <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
Industries. Believes the appropriate approach, would be to not include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.363Chair BrownComments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659.372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.352Sen. RingoDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, BOutme and "substantially equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliResponds that "equivalent of to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.071Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that Oregon partnerships would hot be eligible for.062Chair BrownAsks off a in borgon and may be allowed to marry under this bill.073WcKeanAnswers no and that there is a lost of federal lane.074McKeanAnswers no.	335	Sen. Ferrioli	Clarifies for the record that if the boundary exists, the
363Chair Browninclude the state in state-church relationships, definitions or practices.372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.352Sen. RingoDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his vastantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal banefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.067McKeanAnswers no and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if ano regon state statute could require a federal benefit072 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
363Chair Brown 372practices. Comments that discrimination is discussed in Chapter 659. States his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.352Sen. FerrioliStates this concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.370Chair BrownStates that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson. <b>TAPE 142, B</b> OlfSen. Ferrioli018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.063Chair BrownAsks if ance sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if ance s			
363Chair Brown States his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.352Sen. RingoDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates this perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, BOtherrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.027Sen. FerrioliResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks off it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statu ther han Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.073Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.074McKean <td></td> <td></td> <td>include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or</td>			include the state in state-church relationships, definitions or
372Sen. FerrioliStates his concern is the approach; that a collision between church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.352Sen. RingoDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, BResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilites, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if and pregon state statute could require a federal benefit. Answers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if and regon state statute could require a federal benefit. Answers no.076Chair BrownAsks if and regon state statute could require a federal benefit. Answers no.076Chair			
352Sen. RingoChurch and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and Industries.370Chair BrownStates that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, BNCKcanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalenty to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAnswers he does not think it does.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.070Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal law.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.069Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon			*
352Sen. RingoIndustries.370Chair BrownDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.418McKeanReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity leads to litigation.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.067McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if ame sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill. Answers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownAsks if amore son, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on fede	372	Sen. Ferrioli	
352Sen. RingoDisagrees. States that ultimately the courts have to interpret the language of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate.370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, BOlfAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.067McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tak laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit. Answers no, and that there are a lot of state tak laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits in the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. Ferri			church and state will be resolved at the Bureau of Labor and
370Chair Brownlanguage of the statute. Believes the language is appropriate. States the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson. <b>TAPE 142, B</b> OlfAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean. Responds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit. Orgon partnerships would not be eligible for.076Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit. Orgon partn			Industries.
370Chair BrownStates the intent of "other" in 7(c) is referring to the list in 7(b) to ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, B016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if am esex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.072McKeanAnswers no.073Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.074McKeanAnswers no.075Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.	352	Sen. Ringo	
<ul> <li>ensure the list was inclusive rather than exclusive in case something arises that had not been thought of.</li> <li>Reiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity andambiguit</li></ul>			
417Sen. Ferriolisomething arises that had not been thought of.417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, BAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if asame sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.076Chair BrownInfo	370	Chair Brown	States the intent of "other" in $7(c)$ is referring to the list in $7(b)$ to
417Sen. FerrioliReiterates that a list lead to a boundary and a boundary leads to ambiguity and ambiguity leads to litigation.427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson. <b>TAPE 142, B</b> Asks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an oregon state statute could require a federal benefit. Answers no.076Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit. Answers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the s			
427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, B016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefit.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if and regon state statute could require a federal law.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownAsks if and oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.09			
427Sen. ShieldsStates his perspective as a clergyperson.TAPE 142, BSen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "	417	Sen. Ferrioli	· · ·
TAPE 142, B016Sen, FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen, FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.067McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.069Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.070McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in signific			
016Sen. FerrioliAsks what does "substantially equivalent" mean.018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.070McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the roll will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.		Sen. Shields	States his perspective as a clergyperson.
018McKeanResponds that "equivalent" is defined as equal in value or volume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
027Sen. Ferriolivolume and "substantially" means in the same degree.027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
027Sen. FerrioliReads the standard definition from a dictionary and notes the word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	018	McKean	
word "substantially" could be considered a qualifier. States that creating practical equivalency to marriage in law is a constitutional violation.057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.		~ ~	• •
057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal law.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	027	Sen. Ferrioli	
057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			•
057Chair BrownAsks does SB 1000 provide to same sex couples the exact same rights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
060McKeanrights, responsibilities, and benefits that a marriage provides.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	0.57		
060McKeanAnswers he does not think it does.062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	057	Chair Brown	
062Chair BrownAsks if it is portable to another state other than Vermont, Massachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	0.00		
067McKeanMassachusetts and maybe California. Asks will same sex couples be provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
067McKeanbe provided Medicaid benefits under federal law.067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	062	Chair Brown	*
067McKeanAnswers no and that there is a host of federal benefits that Oregon partnerships would not be eligible for.069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	0.67		
069Chair BrownAsks if same sex couples will be allowed to marry under this bill.070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	067	McKean	
070McKeanAnswers no.071Sen. FerrioliAsks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	0(0		
<ul> <li>071 Sen. Ferrioli Asks if an Oregon state statute could require a federal benefit.</li> <li>072 McKean Answers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.</li> <li>076 Chair Brown Informs that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.</li> <li>094 Sen. Ferrioli States that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.</li> </ul>			
072McKeanAnswers no, and that there are a lot of state tax laws that piggy back on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
076Chair Brownback on federal requirements.076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
076Chair BrownInforms that the California Supreme Court ruled on this issue yesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	072	wickean	
094Sen. Ferrioliyesterday. The court focused on the actual benefits not the language and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	076	Chair Drown	*
094Sen. Ferriolilanguage and concluded that it is not the same.094Sen. FerrioliStates that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	070	Chall DIOWII	
094 Sen. Ferrioli States that the word "the same" is not the problem, it is the quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
quality of the benefits conferred. Concludes that it is his belief this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	004	Son Forriali	
this is an invitation to a collision between church and state that will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.	024		
will result in significant litigation and constitutional questions.			
120 Chan brown States for the record that about a dozen states have passed ballot	126	Chair Brown	
	120		Surves for the record that about a dozen states have passed ballot

		measures and initiatives that prohibit civil unions; Ballot Measure 36 does not. Expands on what Ballot Measure does not
		do.
	The committee recesses	
154	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 1000-3 amendments dated 6/24/05.
	The committee recesses	to assemble a full committee.
164	Chair Brown	Reconvenes the meeting.
167		VOTE: 5-0-0
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
170	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 1000-6 amendments dated 6/30/05.
170		VOTE: 5-0-0
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
171	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 1000-7 amendments dated 6/30/05.
		VOTE: 5-0-0
	Chair Brown	Hearing no objection, declares the motion CARRIED.
174	Chair Brown	MOTION: Moves SB 1000 to the floor with a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation.
177	Sen. Ferrioli	States concern that the bona fide religious organizations were not
		consulted on the religious exemption. Expands on concerns
		regarding ambiguities and states he will be a no vote.
200		VOTE: 3-2-0
		AYE: 3 - Ringo, Shields, Brown
		NAY: 2 - Atkinson, Ferrioli
	Chair Brown	The motion CARRIES.
200	Con Westland	SEN. BROWN will lead discussion on the floor.
206	Sen. Westlund Sen. Ferrioli	Announces a courtesy Aye vote.
207 211	Sen. Ferrioli Chair Brown	States that there will not be a minority report.
211	Chan BIOWN	Closes the work session on SB 1000 and adjourns the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

## **EXHIBIT SUMMARY**

- A. HB 2862A, Voyager Tuition Assistance Program issue brief, Dave McDonald, 1 p
- B. SB 1000, -6 amendments, staff, 2 pp
- C. SB 1000, -7 amendments, Senator Ben Westlund, 1 p
- D. SB 1000, -2 amendments, staff, 4 pp
- E. SB 1000, -3 amendments, staff, 4 pp