



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **15TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2004** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Leonard, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Harry Auerbach, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Curtis Chinn, Sergeant at Arms.

On a Y-5 roll call, the Consent Agenda was adopted.

CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION	
Mayor Vera Katz	
1079 Confirm appointment of Maryhelen Kincaid to the Portland International Airport Citizen Noise Advisory Committee (Report) (Y-5)	Disposition: CONFIRMED
*1080 Extend Legal Service Agreement with Preston Gates Ellis, LLP, for outside counsel (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34486) (Y-5)	178742
*1081 Authorize and execute Supplemental Indenture No. 1 to Indenture of Trust and Custodial Agreement with JPMorgan Chase Bank (Ordinance) (Y-5)	178743
*1082 Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with the Housing Authority of Portland for lobbying services for the Columbia Villa redevelopment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 51927) (Y-5)	178744
Commissioner Randy Leonard	
*1083 Adopt the State of Oregon, 2004 Editions of the Oregon Structural Specialty Code and the Mechanical Specialty Code (Ordinance; amend Titles 24, 27, 28 and 29) (Y-5)	178745
*1084 Extend term of AT&T long-distance telecommunications franchise (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 162822) (Y-5)	178746

September 15, 2004

<p>*1085 Extend term of a temporary, revocable permit granted to TCG Oregon (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 173990) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178747</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	
<p>*1086 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to fund a Portland Harbor Stormwater Source Control Coordinator (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178748</p>
<p>*1087 Authorize contract with the lowest responsible bidder for the Simmons Wastewater Pump Station Construction Project, Project No. 7250 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178749</p>
<p>*1088 Accept a grant agreement for \$19,000 from Environmental Protection Agency for a one-year grant to fund outreach and education projects that improve indoor air quality in commercial and residential buildings (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178750</p>
<p>1089 Authorize a contract and provide for payment for the construction of water mains in the SW Taylors Ferry Road and Capitol Highway Mains Package, Project Nos. 7225 and 7228 (Second Reading Agenda 1072) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178751</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Erik Sten</p>	
<p>*1090 Authorize subrecipient contract with Transition Projects, Inc. for \$1,846,224 for shelter and services for homeless men and women and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178752</p>
<p>*1091 Authorize a subrecipient contract with Portland Development Commission for \$8,905,899 for activities associated with the development of affordable rental housing, homeowner rehabilitation, neighborhood improvements and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178753</p>
<p>*1092 Authorize subrecipient contract with Open Meadow Learning Center for \$104,259 for the Corps Restoring the Urban Environment Program and to provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178754</p>
<p>*1093 Authorize subrecipient contract with Housing Development Center for \$129,603 to provide technical services to non-profit developers of affordable housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178755</p>

September 15, 2004

*1094 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Bureau of Labor and Industries for \$20,184 for the Civil Rights Enforcement Services Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)	178756
*1095 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Housing Authority of Portland and the Portland Development Commission for \$60,000 to support a Housing Policy Manager and receive funds (Ordinance) (Y-5)	178757
REGULAR AGENDA Commissioner Randy Leonard	
1096 Declare that the Oregon Constitution is no place for unequal treatment and encourage the citizens of Portland to vote No on Constitutional Amendment 36 (Resolution) (Y-5)	36252

At 10:16 a.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

For a discussion of agenda items, please consult the following Closed Caption File.

September 15, 2004

WEDNESDAY, 6:00 PM, SEPTEMBER 15, 2004

**DUE TO LACK OF AN AGENDA
THERE WAS NO MEETING**

September 15, 2004
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast.

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2004 9:30AM

Katz: Good morning. [roll call taken] all right. Communications, 1079.

Moore: We don't have communications, we just have the consent agenda.

Katz: Yes, you're right. I need to wear my glasses. All right, consent agenda. Any items to be removed off the consent agenda? Roll call on consent agenda.

Francesconi: Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] why are you all here? Oh, there is an item on the agenda. [laughter] 1096.

Item 1096.

Katz: Commissioner Leonard, did you want to start?

Leonard: Just briefly, I'm happy we can have this hearing today to provide a forum for members of the community to discuss this ballot measure and the proposal before the council to recommend voting against the ballot measure. Just so that we can frame the issue, I think for me the issue here is one of equality. Our constitution, both at the state and federal level, has survived the test of time to provide equal rights to all citizens, notwithstanding what the majority of our citizens may have desired at any given point in our history. Equality is not the privilege of the majority. We must send a message here today that civil rights are not negotiable. And this becomes really a -- the issue of same-sex marriage becomes an issue of really not just fair treatment to citizens, but to children of those citizens. Some of what could occur, or does occur when loving couples are not allowed to join in marriage they can't visit a partner or a patient or a partner's child in a hospital because they're not considered to be family members, inherit from their partner if there isn't a valid will. They can't obtain joint health, home and auto insurance policies. They can't enter joint rental agreements. They can't make medical decisions on the partner's behalf in the event of an illness. Can't determine a final resting place for a deceased partner. Cannot obtain wrongful death benefits for a surviving partner and children. And the list goes on. So the last thing I think we want to do is amend our constitution to have some group of people feel that they've somehow preserved the institution of marriage by denying it to a minority of our population. It is the wrong thing to do. I believe that the council thinks it's the wrong thing to do. And I think the majority of Oregonians think it's the wrong thing to do. Thank you, mayor.

Katz: Thank you. Ok, let's open it up to public testimony.

Moore: Come up three at a time.

*****: Members of the Portland city council, I appreciate the opportunity to address --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Eric Delehoy: My name is Eric Delehoy. Sorry. I appreciate the opportunity to address you this morning. My partner and I moved to Portland two years ago. We chose Portland because it felt like home to us, not because of its location between mountain and coastline and its myriad of bridges, but because its people and its protections. Portland is an open and welcoming city to all. Last August we held our commitment ceremony, a declaration of our love and dedication to each other and our relationship. Then in April we filed for a marriage license with the Multnomah County. For us this was logical progress, in the logical place, because we knew that Portland embraces its diversity. We also knew that our celebration would be short-lived and that opponents

September 15, 2004

of our relationship and more so our civil rights would gather enough signatures to place amendment 36 on the november ballot. Proponents of 36 called the amendment a moral issue. They are partially right. However, the moral issue at stake is not whether two men or two women can marry.

The true moral issue is whether or not Oregon's constitution should be amended to legalize discrimination. My partner and my relationship is one of trust and love, protection and support. We depend on each other, on two jobs, two paychecks, we file two tax returns, we have two separate medical policies, we even have two anniversaries, one in august, one in april. Yet marriage is not defined as two this, two that. Instead marriage is the merging of two into one, a bond that is sacred, regardless of the gender of its participants. No committed couple should be denied its civil rights. If amendment 36 passes there are real anti-commitment, anti-support, anti-relationship ramifications. Jed and I will not be able to make medical decisions for each other. We may be denied the right to see each other in the emergency room. If one of us dies, the other loses our home and will not receive inheritance and retirement benefits earned by the other. When one of us needs the support, that support will be absent. Imagine if you were to lose your spouse or partner, then consider the protections afforded by marriage. Jed and I do not share those same basic rights. I fully believe that the city of Portland is invested in protecting the rights of all of its citizens. In 2001 Portland passed an anti-discrimination ordinance protecting gays and lesbians. Today it's time to send that same clear message. Portland, Oregon, does not tolerate legislation that's discriminatory. Please declaring your opposition to amendment 36. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Katie Potter: Good morning, mayor. Good morning, city councilmembers. My name is katie potter. I live in southeast Portland. I want to thank commissioner leonard for bringing forward this resolution and I also want to thank the entire council for all of your support throughout the years regarding issues of fairness and equality. I have previously testified before council about how inequality has affected our family and the benefits afforded survivors in cases of line of duty deaths.

The charter change that occurred a couple years ago allowing my partner access to death benefits as the spouses might have peers provided a measure of comfort to me, and i'm grateful for that work, as i'm sure that those benefits will undoubtedly be needed in raising our two children should such an event occur. Oregon however does not recognize my partner as eligible for line of duty death benefits. Although we've been together for 14 years, raising two children, and have spent a combined 37 years of service to this community, if one of us is killed in the line of duty, we are eligible for nothing through the state. The spouses of our peers, however, are eligible for a \$25,000 lump sum payment, continued health insurance, and a mortgage and education benefit. If measure 36 passes, it will ensure that my family is more vulnerable than those of the folks that I work with. This discrimination that it imposes has serious consequences for real people and real families. Of course, sudden death is the last thing on earth that I want my family to experience. But i'd like to worry a little less about their protection. I'd like to know that my family would be cared for as any other family of any other police officer if a line of duty death occurs. I believe in what I do. I have stood up to protect the rights of people with whom I strongly disagree. I stand up because I understand that disagreement should not translate into discrimination. Measure 36 discriminates against families like mine. It is so important to share this message so people understand that this is not just about marriage, but what exclusion from marriage means for families. Thank you for doing what you can to get this message out.

Marylyne Digs: Good morning. My name is marylyne digs. My partner and I live in northeast Portland. We've been together for 17 years. Like many in this community i'm astounded by the audacity of constitutional amendment 36. Think about what measure 36 would do to our system of democracy. Measure 36 would make equal treatment of Oregon citizens unconstitutional. Let me say that again, because it's so antithetical to american and Oregonian values, that i'm not sure our minds can actually process that sentence. Measure 36 would make equal treatment

September 15, 2004

unconstitutional. As angry as this makes me and my partner, we also feel afraid, afraid of the enormous measure 36 would have on us as we age, as medical decisions become more frequent, probably more critical, as healthcare becomes more expensive, especially after one or both of us retire, or when one of us dies and the other must pay inheritance taxes on what we built, bought, saved, over the course of what we hope will be our 50, 60 years together as a couple. We know that marriage is much more than these elements of legal and financial equality. After all, we've considered ourselves married in the absence of any of these legal protections for 17 years. And so far we have been extraordinarily lucky. Nonetheless, our standard of living, and even our ability to survive, depends heavily on whether we're treated equally in the future. Measure 36 makes that highly unlikely. Amidst all this anger and fear, I also feel immense appreciation for what the city council is doing here today. With your resolution, and with your willingness to stand up for fairness and equality regardless of whether voters have the conscience to do the same, we get one step close to maintaining equality and justice for all Oregonians. It reassures citizens like me that whatever bigotry may exist Oregonians as a whole are fair-minded and at the very least my local government understands that liberty and justice for all means liberty and justice for all. Thank you for considering this resolution.

Katz: Thank you.

Francesconi: That was nice testimony. Very nice testimony.

Charles E. Long: Good morning. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Charles E. Long. I live at 420 Northeast Mason Street. In less than one month the ballots for the Oregon election will be in the mails, and also the voters pamphlet which will contain many arguments, both pro and con, on this issue. I think this is the wrong venue to bring up this issue. I would like to quote two verses from the New Testament, Book of Job -- I mean the New Testament, Book of Jude rather, verses six and seven. And the angels left their own habitation, God has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Even as cities are giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. I think it would be more appropriate for the Randy Leonard to propose a charter change, to change the name of Portland to Sodom on the Willamette. Thank you.

Tiffany Harris: Good morning. My name is Tiffany Harris. I'm actually a second-year associate at one of the law firms right in this neighborhood. And I have to confess, I'm a little starstruck, so thanks for having me. It's a real pleasure to address you. First, maybe it's important as an attorney just to point out that whatever the Supreme Court decides in this coming term with respect to the application of Article I, Section 20, that would obviously have no bearing on the way that any community of faith or church were to decide who should receive the blessing of marriage and who shouldn't. You know, sometimes it bears repeating that we have a very robust separation of church and state in the state of Oregon, and obviously no matter how anyone feels with respect to the civil benefits associated with marriage, which is defined as a civil contract, again, that would have no impact on the ability of a church to decide who should receive the blessing of marriage or who shouldn't. Just thought I'd throw out there that in response to the previous speaker. I'd just like to say that Amendment 36, Constitutional Amendment 36, would hurt real Oregonians by essentially freezing their legal status in time. Currently nobody has the right to make life-saving medical decisions for a loved one, unless they are legally married. Nobody has the right to remain in the family home upon the death of a loved one unless they have the legal right to marriage. Nobody has the right to sue for the wrongful death of a loved one unless they have the legal right to be married. I could go on and on. So obviously those rights don't exist now, but the proposition of freezing the denial of those rights conclusively in our constitution is decidedly untraditional. Oregonians are fair-minded people. They've always managed to tolerate having disagreements on social issues without resorting to a constitutional amendment. I don't see any reason why we can't pull that off now. I'd also like to dispel the notion that this constitutional amendment is an effort of

September 15, 2004

last resort for those who disagreed with the Multnomah county commissioners' actions earlier this spring. The reality is that four versions of constitutional amendment 36 were filed with the Oregon secretary of state in february, several weeks before anybody knew that marriage licenses would be available to same-sex couples. The so-called process has never really been the focus of the proponents of constitutional amendment 36. They dropped those claims before their lawsuit went up on appeal. That's not one of the questions that the supreme court has been asked to decide, because that's not really what this is about. I'll keep my remarks very brief and just like to urge you to adopt the resolution that you're considering and thank you very much again for having me.

Katz: Thank you. Ok, paul.

Paul Leistner: I'm paul leisner, speaking on behalf of the southeast uplift neighborhood coalition board of directors. The board would urge you to support commissioner leonard's proposal to oppose measure 36. This was a tough one for the southeast uplift board. A lot of people said this is not a neighborhood issue. I think this is the same thing your people may be saying to you, not an issue for the city council to get involved in. I think for us we recognize that in the neighborhoods of southeast Portland people have many different opinions on this issue and on gay marriage. I think for us it was a more fundamental process issue, that southeast uplift and I think the city council and our whole neighborhood system is committed to dialogue and ongoing give-and-take between citizens to talk about tough issues. There's hope always in our community that we will evolve in our thinking over time. I think what we see this as, as this is shutting the door to that very valuable part of our tradition of discussing issues by putting this in the constitution, we can no longer talk about this or come up with solutions that fit who we are out there in the community. So that was one important piece. Another one is we have to walk our talk. I think southeast uplift and our mission -- in our mission statement, we talk about diversity and protecting the rights of everyone in our statement of unity that we read before every meeting, we talk about protecting the rights of people, of all different sexual orientations. In our hiring policies, when we interview people, when we hire people, that is one of the key pieces that's also part of that process. And for us not to take a stand on this issue, I think would be completely inappropriate, not living up to the standards that we've been saying we support all these years. So keeping the discussion open, keeping this out of the constitution, I think is very important, and being true to the values, we at least on paper and invoice seem to espouse quite often, I think this is our chance to really take a stand. I'm very proud of you all and commissioner leonard for taking a -- bringing this up. I urge you on behalf of the southeast uplift board to support commissioner leonard's proposal.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: I believe in ladies first.

*****: Thank you.

Charmian Casteel: Hi. I live in northeast Portland with my partner and wife. I've done a lot of things in my life i'm proud of. I completed graduate school, helped to bring down the berlin wall, I chose a career saving children's lives at a local children's hospital, but the proudest thing I -- the thing that i'm most proud of is when I shared wedding vows with my partner and wife in march. And -- sorry. And next year we want to have children. And I believe we have a right and a responsibility to be legally married when we have children. And I don't want that taken away. So thank you for giving me the opportunity to be here. Please oppose constitutional amendment 36. Thank you.

Rev. Tara Wilkins: Good morning, mayor and commissioners. I'm reverend tara wilkens, director of the community of welcoming congregations. And I would urge you to support the resolution before you. Growing up gay or lesbian in our culture means that we are often shunned by our families and our religious communities, and yet we grow up and fall in love and find a way to make sacred the covenants that we enter into. In march we had the ability to have public officials who were willing to stand up and allow us to have the legal protections that go along with those

September 15, 2004

covenants that we make. Those legal protections are important, because they help us to keep our families safe and they provide us with the support system that we need. So I -- it means a lot to our community. Around if I could say one thing, it would be that you know how much it means when public officials are willing to stand up and say, you know, we're interested in protecting the families of all of our citizens. I urge you to vote no on constitutional amendment 36.

Irwin Mandel: Irwin mandel, downtown resident. You, my wife and I have been married a few years back, 54 years, and I think everyone should have the opportunity to have that long-lasting and that close a relationship. Frankly the issue of what to do about measure 36 should require about three microseconds of thought for the members of this council. We elect you not just to take care of local issues, but to provide leadership on overarching issues that affect all of the communities. Therefore I would suggest you also take a look at measure 37 and the effect this land use constriction will have on Portland's growth and development, how it will cripple it. I've heard this described at a previous mayoral debate as detrimental to Portland's land use policies as measure five was to its financial base. I think the council has to take a stance on that. In addition to which, everyone on the council has expressed their interest in developing the schools in Portland and what happens. We have a ballot measure to nullify the I tax in Multnomah county. The effect of that on schools, the justice system, if this occurs, will be devastating. We look to the council perhaps to have resolutions directed to these two issues, as well as to this one. We look to you for leadership on many issues, and we expect you to take that leadership in hand. This issue, as I said, it requires about three microseconds of thought to realize this is a disaster. Thank you.

Lili Mandel: Lilli mandel, downtown resident. Standing up against discrimination is everyone's responsibility. The reverend mentioned that she -- what it means to be -- what it has meant to her to be shunned. I too know what it means to be shunned. I was a child in nazi I have en-- nazi vienna, and the wonderful leader, hitler, decided that my rights were -- I was not the same as everyone else. And of course he included the gays as well. So I to a certain degree know what it feels to be considered less than human. I had my name -- actually I had my name changed in that wonderful, wonderful place, nazi vienna. We all became sara. My name, that was lovingly given to me by my parents, was changed. The men became israel. I cannot sit here and not speak out against any, any injustice. And the world stood by and allowed us to suffer, and that includes the gays who were killed in concentration camps. Luckily my family and I escaped. I lived under hitler for a year and a half, and almost didn't get out. We really have to show -- Oregon has to show that we do not believe in that kind of discrimination or that kind of system. I'm very emotional about this. It's something that's really bothers me greatly. Makes me feel good that you have brought this out and you feel it is your responsibility, which it is. And thank you, commissioner leonard, for doing this. I want to thank you. I think we all should thank you. Want to thank every one of you on your take on civil rights in the past as well. I may be off, i'm very, very emotional about this, because I think this is very, very important to every one of us. We all should stand up and speak out. Thank you.

Kelly Burke: I'm not sure I can go after that. Hello. My name is kelly burke. I'm a resident of the city of Portland. I'm here to testify in support of the city council's resolution to oppose constitutional amendment 36. The passage of constitutional amendment 36 would have devastating effects on my family's well-being. My spouse, delores and i, have been together for 16 years, and lucky to be married earlier this year and the proud parents of a 3-year-old son. As a family we live pretty traditionally. I'm a stay-at-home mom and delores is the sole financial support of our family. Until we were legally married, though, we had none of the supports granted to most families. One of the basic needs for all families is healthcare. While delores and avery could be covered by her employer's health insurance, I was denied coverage because her union employer did not recognize domestic partners as valid family members and only provides benefits to married spouses. We've gone to extraordinary means over the years to try to protect one another and our son with wills, powers of attorneys, other documents, but we know we can only go so far without the social safety

September 15, 2004

net that marriage provides. After marrying this spring, we again approached delores' employer about giving our family it provides to all other married couples. When we presented them with our marriage license, they agreed. For now this decision has brought us great relief. Unfortunately delores has made it clear that should this constitutional amendment pass, it can revoke the protections that we now receive. But this is not just about health insurance for one family member. Our family is just like every other family in Oregon, with the same hopes, dreams and needs. We want to raise our kids, take care of each other, and do our part to make our community a better place. How do I explain to my son that some of his neighbors voted to take away his family's protections but kept them for themselves? As a whole, we elected you to take care of and protect our beloved city and way of life. I need your support, leadership and courage, to help protect my family and thousands of other families like ours. I respectfully ask the council to officially oppose constitutional amendment 36, the well-being of my family depends on it. Thank you.

Moore: That's all who signed up.

Katz: Anybody else want to testify? If not, roll call.

Francesconi: The constitution that's supposed to be the document that binds Oregonians together under a common set of principles, that most fundamental principle is equal treatment under the law. It's not supposed to be used to divide us. And it's not supposed to be used to divide -- deprive some citizens of the legal rights enjoyed by others. And that's what measure 36 will do. I actually hadn't thought about it as directly and succinctly as was put here, but measure 36 actually makes equal treatment unconstitutional. Now as was also said here very powerfully, we're talking about government benefits here that are provided, and this is the only way that government benefits can be provided equally. So measure -- gay marriage does not require churches to do anything or to believe anything, or individuals to believe anything. It doesn't require that. I've come to understand that at a very personal and deep level. But I also know that we can't put it in the constitution. We can't put discrimination in the constitution. It's the wrong thing to do. It's just flat out the wrong thing to do. And it doesn't take much to get there. Aye and thank you, commissioner Leonard, and the whole counsel, who has always stood up on these issues, led by the mayor, and it's always been consistent on this basic fundamental principle. Aye.

Leonard: I'm struck when I hear biblical passages quoted by my background and love of history, that in the history of this world there has been no more pain, suffering, and inhumanity that's been inflicted upon this planet's populace than by those who have fought to inflict their beliefs on a population, all in the name of their god. I reject that. I will also say, since I've been here for two years, that the mandels have sat across this table and chided me more than once on a number of my positions, but I don't think anybody articulated the real reason for us adopting this resolution better than Mrs. Mandel. I think that says volumes about this community that we have people such as Mrs. Mandel and Mr. Mandel here, speaking out on an issue that I feel very strongly about. And I'll never forget it. I've been blessed in this community more than I realized, growing up here. I didn't appreciate how diverse our population was until I gained adulthood and started traveling in the larger world, and realized that what we take for granted here in this community is foreign to many others throughout this country. We do accept people here based on the content of their character, and judge them by that and that only. When I was a firefighter, nothing disturbed me deeper than to be approached by gay men and women who were firefighters who were afraid that that choice in their life or that orientation in their life would be exposed to other firefighters. Nothing disturbed me more, but nothing made me prouder than to know that they felt they could confide in me and ask me for my guidance. So I'm happy that we're here today, and certainly reflect -- or certainly agree with commissioner Francesconi, that of the issues that divides this council, this is not one of them. Aye.

Saltzman: Throughout its history, Oregon has always been a place for families seeking a better life. 11,000 years ago the people we now call native Americans, or indigenous peoples, walked across

September 15, 2004

the bering straight, seeking more food, forage, but also a place to raise their families. Fast-forward to 200 years ago, influx of european families over the Oregon trail, asian families through boats, up the california coast, all coming for the same reason, a better place to raise a family. Fast-forward to today, we have families in crisis. Our divorce rate hovers around 60%. There seems to be no reason that government should ever do anything to stand in the way of the formation and support of families. There's no higher calling when two people want to make a commitment to each other to raise kids. So I cast this vote against measure 36 today on behalf of children in Portland and in Oregon. I'm particularly proud of the fact that gay and lesbian families have shown true leadership in helping those children who most need families, childrens in foster care, children up for adoption. These kids have nobody. And when couples step up to the plate, or single individuals step up to the plate, and offer to become parents, become that key thing toward the children's success, the most important ingredient in the children's success, is a caring parent. There's no higher calling. And as I said, there's absolutely no reason government should stand in the way of families and people making commitments to one another. Aye.

Sten: Well, I think the legal arguments have been made very articulately, and I think they're very compelling, to take away rights, to put that into the constitution. It's a terrible idea. I want to just say this. I think those have been made very well by the testimony, maybe even a step further, and say, you know, I think in an odd way, I think a very small-minded initiative has given this community an enormous opportunity to take a huge step forward by turning this initiative down. We will never have a stronger community, stronger country, but we can start with the city, until everybody who lives here feels safe and strong in who they are. Gays and lesbians are always part of this community, should be part of this community, and should be able to be who they are, in pride, in public, whenever they would like. To say to people who are making wonderful decisions and strong life commitments, that you are somehow lessening my marriage by deciding to get married is absurd. You're strengthening my marriage by showing it makes sense. We'll never be a great community until all children having a loving home. To say to these loving homes you're not wanted, is not only wrong, it's insulting, silly, the wrong way to go about things. We have a great chance to say no and do the other thing. Sometimes you have to have questions called to make statements. I decided when I heard the news that licenses were going to be issued, whenever that was last winter, to go over to the courthouse, or building that morning, and there was a line around the block, and I just went out and decided to walk around. I think that I really wish we could recreate that, and then ask everybody who's undecided on this just to go and have been there, because it was interesting. I watched the morning news all morning. I was stunned by the way it was being played on different television. I was up from 4:00 until 8:00 when I went down, because at the time I had a 1-month-old son. Let me tell you, every child who can have two loving parents ought to have them, because they need them. And not that single parents can't pull it off, but if there's two people that want to do it together, they should do it. I think god blesses them. But I was amazed by -- it was all legalistic and politics and everything else. I got caught up in that, did they have the authority, did the county do the right thing, you know, the process, distraction somebody in the audience calls it. I got caught up in that. And I walked around the block. Within about 10 seconds, I was just overwhelmed with the sea of love and happiness. I mean, it was people who were celebrating each other, celebrating -- there was nothing nasty about it. There was no politics going on. This wasn't about any of the things that people talk about. It wasn't about anything to do with all of the issues that are being pushed by the folks who are yes on 36. It was about people loving each other and having the opportunity to safely come out in public and show that. And if that doesn't make this community stronger, I don't know what does. I have -- and the broadest beams, the happiest people, the most exciting thing I saw were the children. There were children of all ages. And they were beaming and grinning and I know one of the people who testified today, and their wonderful child, and I saw many couples that I knew, and in a couple cases the kids came

September 15, 2004

running up to me and said, you know, "our parents are getting married." they were very, very excited. Whatever you might think out there, these children exist, these families exist. They're wonderful, loving citizens of this community. And to say to them, you can't get married accomplishes nothing, strengthens your marriage in no way at all. This community is stronger if we become the kind of place i'm very, very confident that will happen eventually, and why not make it happen in november and be the place that leads rather than follows. So I think if we all come together, work hard on this initiative, I want to thank commissioner leonard for penning a compelling resolution and putting it in front of this council today to give us the opportunity to talk about this. Why don't we make this an opportunity, why don't we do the work, do the education, it's going to take conversations one-on-one with people, we're not going to win this thing with reyes at the city council, not win it with slogans, legal arguments. The way that this proper next step for society will come about is one-on-one conversations with people who are undecided and the loving couples who are stepping forward and saying we're ready to be married. When people see who we're talking about, I believe their hearts and minds will change. And so i'm very glad to support this and ready to join everyone. We've got 48 days to vote no on 36 and win this and make a real statement for the future. Aye.

Katz: That's exactly what happened on no on nine. The community went out, all over the state, southern Oregon, eastern Oregon, to talk about these issues. And charles, I respect you, you've been here talking to us on a variety of issues, but I want you to think about the fact that we can argue, we can debate, we go disagree with one another. That's fine. We can educate. We can listen. We can talk about our fears. But -- and we can do that all you want. And we need to do that for the very reasons that commissioner Sten laid out. But to use the sacred document of the constitution to deny people rights and privileges is not the way to go. And so as we talk about these issues for the next couple of weeks, charles, please commit yourself to sitting down with a lot of the gay parents and individuals in this community and talk to them about it, because I know that if you open up your heart and hear their -- their issues and their struggles, you will change your mind. And if you can change your mind, then we can change the minds of a lot of Oregonians and defeat this measure. Aye. [gavel pounded] thank you, everybody. There's nothing before us. We stand adjourned. [gavel pounded]

At 10:16 a.m., Council adjourned.