

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	AnnMarie Logan to William T. Glunz at 22:24:45.00. Subject: Re: New email address. (4 pages)	09/28/2000	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Domestic Partners])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/2000 - 10/04/2000]

2013-0028-F

ab1140

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or
financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President
and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of
an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial
information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of
personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement
purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of
financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information
concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed
of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C.
2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-2000 19:52:34.00

SUBJECT: Radio Address

TO: Eric P. Liu (CN=Eric P. Liu/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Lowell A. Weiss (CN=Lowell A. Weiss/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Karin Kullman (CN=Karin Kullman/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Bruce and Eric -

We are moving ahead with the radio address on FMLA/paid leave. I wanted to update you and raise a few issues with you before proceeding.

Right now, we are focusing on three issues:

- (1) FMLA legacy -- served approximately 20 million families, etc.
- (2) Pushing for Expanded FMLA through the legislative agenda -- Support legislation that expands to businesses with 25 employers or more and allows for 24 hours leave for school-related purposes (e.g. parent-teacher conference) or non-emergency medical issues (such as a child's doctors appointment).
- (3) Laying the ground work for the future by exploring paid leave -- Re-iterate the BAA-UI regulation (comments are in and DOL hopes to have final reg done by end of April) and the \$20 million for competitive grants to states to explore ways to provide for paid leave. [The two issues we have with promoting the UI reg in this context is that the critics have accused us of using UI to make FMLA paid leave. DOL has tried to de-couple the FMLA and the proposed BAA-UI reg and is a bit concerned about linking them. They are also concerned that the proponents of this reg would like to open it up beyond new parents to Family and Medical leave more generally -- Kennedy wrote a letter to Secty Herman on this point. In this announcement we are talking about UI in relation to new parents and then in our next breath talking about allowing States to more generally explore FMLA. I think that if we frame it in terms of exploring a number of creative options to provide for paid leave that it will be fine, but it could leave us open to some criticism from our friends who want us to do more.]

There are several other FMLA issues that we have not commented on

previously:

(1) The Dodd/Kennedy FIRST (Family Income to Respond to Significant Transitions) bill: Dodd sent a letter to Podesta during our budget considerations to ask for the inclusion of \$400 million in our FY 2001 to support this bill. The bill would authorize up to \$400 million to provide demonstration projects in States to provide for paid leave through UI or TDI, or other mechanisms. Our \$20 million, as you know, would only allow for approximately 15 competitive grants to States to explore options for developing paid leave initiatives.

I do not recommend that we support this bill. Instead, I think we point to the fact that we are allowing States to explore paid leave in the case of new parents through UI and, more generally, through grants to States to look more in-depth at this issue through the \$20 million. I do think, however, that in q&as we should signal general kudos to the Senators for putting this on the table and should also signal the support Dodd and Kennedy have demonstrated for our BAA-UI reg.

(2) Representative Maloney's extended family leave bill to expand FMLA to domestic partners, parent-in-laws, adult children, siblings, or grandparents. Internally, we have discussed a desire to signal support for this type of expansion, but Nicole and I did recognize that we wanted to continue to push for the top legislative priorities of 25 employers and 24 hours before muddying the waters with this bill. I would recommend, however, that at a later date we both rollout an EO to open up FMLA for the Federal government to domestic partners and others and to possibly endorse this bill. Do you agree that we should wait on the announcement of an intended EO and that at that time we might be able to signal a support for Maloney?

Lowell Weiss is writing the speech and will share a draft with us tomorrow and we'll have press paper for your review by Noon.

Thanks.

-Ann

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-FEB-2000 18:51:53.00

SUBJECT: potus

TO: Jonathan M. Young (CN=Jonathan M. Young/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Knight Initiative/Prop 22 Heats Up as March 7th California Primary draws near: Governor Davis, Senators' Feinstein and Boxer and both Gore and Bradley have spoken out against this controversial Initiative. The right wing has characterized the initiative as defining marriage between a man and a woman, yet, same-gender civil marriage is already illegal in California. Democratic leaders speaking out against the Knight Initiative do not support gay marriage, but understand that this ballot measure is divisive and represents classic wedge issue politics. The gay, lesbian and progressive community is very fearful that if passed, this legislation will create legal grounds for the right wing to deny other equal rights and responsibilities like hospital visitation, domestic partnership laws and non-discrimination laws.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jason H. Schechter (CN=Jason H. Schechter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-FEB-2000 08:58:08.00

SUBJECT: guidance requests - early briefing. pls have by 10:15 am. thanks

TO: William Marshall (CN=William Marshall/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Devorah R. Adler (CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Patrick M. Dorton (CN=Patrick M. Dorton/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Anna Richter (CN=Anna Richter/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: James E. Kennedy (CN=James E. Kennedy/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

dpc

vermont/gay marriage (nyt/wp) - domestic partnership system instead of marriage statutes - our thoughts

nec

oil (wsj) - richardson comments in meeting with northeast lawmakers - spr ruled out? how will we improve supplies of heating oil?

social security/hastert/repeal of earnings limit (wsj) - our response

health care

medicare (nyt pear article) - why have cost estimates increased; our response to snowe/wyden proposal

fda/labeling (nyt/wp) - should fda be regulating diet supplement industry?

counsels

judicial appointments (wash times al) - our response

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: William Marshall (CN=William Marshall/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-FEB-2000 09:33:19.00

SUBJECT: guidance requests - early briefing. pls have by 10:15 am. thanks

TO: Sarah Wilson (CN=Sarah Wilson/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mark Childress (CN=Mark Childress/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Please note the request for press guidance on nominations. Call Jim if you have any ideas.

----- Forwarded by William Marshall/WHO/EOP on 02/10/2000
09:31 AM -----

Jason H. Schechter
02/10/2000 08:58:00 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: James E. Kennedy/WHO/EOP@EOP, Richard L. Siewert/WHO/EOP@EOP,
Jennifer M. Palmieri/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject:guidance requests - early briefing. pls have by 10:15 am.
thanks

dpc
vermont/gay marriage (nyt/wp) - domestic partnership system instead of
marriage statutes - our thoughts

nec
oil (wsj) - richardson comments in meeting with northeast lawmakers - spr
ruled out? how will we improve supplies of heating oil?
social security/hastert/repeal of earnings limit (wsj) - our response

health care
medicare (nyt pear article) - why have cost estimates increased; our
response to snowe/wyden proposal
fda/labeling (nyt/wp) - should fda be regulating diet supplement industry?

counsels
judicial appointments (wash times al) - our response

Message Sent

To:

Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP
Patrick M. Dorton/OPD/EOP@EOP
Devorah R. Adler/OPD/EOP@EOP
Christopher C. Jennings/OPD/EOP@EOP
William Marshall/WHO/EOP@EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Hoag, Jamie" <Jamie.Hoag@mail.house.gov> ("Hoag, Jamie" <Jamie.Hoag@mail.

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-FEB-2000 16:51:51.00

SUBJECT:

TO: Jared Powell (CN=Jared Powell/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

THE ADVOCATE Wednesday, February 23, 2000

Vermont partnership tally nears

A vote may come as early as Wednesday in Vermont on a final bill for gay and lesbian domestic partnerships. Legislators on the house judiciary committee, which is drafting a bill to give gay and lesbian couples the same legal protections and rights afforded heterosexual married couples, are trying to line up support for the final bill. They say support hinges on such issues as whether the bill is expanded to cover unmarried opposite-sex couples and if it includes a definition of marriage exclusively as a union between a man and a woman. Discussion also continues about what to call the partnership legislation. On Tuesday legislators considered "civil union" after earlier trying out "civil domestic union." "The nomenclature and terminology is very important to people," said committee chairman Thomas Little. "We're trying to come up with something reasonably descriptive that doesn't ring any bells that people don't want to ring."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-FEB-2000 12:56:55.00

SUBJECT: Re: GLBT: Non-discrimination and domestic partner benefits

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have a meeting at 1:30 -- so 12:30 or 2:30 on Monday would be better.
Nope --I think Ann is the only other one. Thanks,M ary

Elizabeth J. Potter

02/23/2000 12:50:59 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: GLBT: Non-discrimination and domestic partner
benefits

how about monday...at 1:00. and...besides Ann o'leary, is there any one
else I should invite?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:23-FEB-2000 12:51:03.00

SUBJECT: Re: GLBT: Non-discrimination and domestic partner benefits

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

how about monday...at 1:00. and...besides Ann o'leary, is there any one
else I should invite?

[illegible]

Proposition 22 in California
Q&A
February 25, 2000

Q: What is the Administration's position on Proposition 22 in California which would allow California to decline to recognize same-sex marriages performed in another state?

A: I do not know if the Administration has taken a position on this specific ballot measure in California. The President does support more equal treatment for domestic partners, and has fought hard to combat discrimination against gays and lesbians. But he has said that he does not support formal recognition of marriage between persons of the same sex.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:29-FEB-2000 10:47:16.00

SUBJECT: Re: Proposition 22 Q&A

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: vincent fry (CN=vincent fry/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: edward w. correia (CN=edward w. correia/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: ann o'leary (CN=ann o'leary/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: minyon moore (CN=minyon moore/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: sean p. maloney (CN=sean p. maloney/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: paul oetken (CN=paul oetken/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: maura m. pally (CN=maura m. pally/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: carolyn t. wu (CN=carolyn t. wu/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: lisa m. brown (CN=lisa m. brown/O=ovp@ovp [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary l. smith (CN=mary l. smith/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: william marshall (CN=william marshall/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: karen tramontano (CN=karen tramontano/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: anna richter (CN=anna richter/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

FYI -- Attached are Qs & As on the December Vermont Supreme Court decision, in which we said that the President supports "more equal benefits for domestic partners" (and distinguished "formal recognition of marriage") -- in case people decide to add this point.===== ATTACHMEN
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

**Domestic Partners
Q&A
December 21, 1999**

Q: What is the President's opinion on the Vermont Supreme Court's decision that gay couples must be granted the same benefits and protections given married couples of the opposite sex?

A: We are pleased that the decision will result in more equal treatment of domestic partners in Vermont. In many cases, it is matter of basic fairness that domestic partners are eligible for the same benefits as spouses.

Q: Does the President now support the right of a gay couple to marry?

A: While the President supports more equal treatment for domestic partners, he has said that he does not support formal recognition of marriage between persons of the same sex.

Q: Will the Administration take this position in court?

A: The opinion was based on the Vermont State Constitution, not the Federal Constitution.

Q: What about DOMA? How does that effect the Vermont Court's decision?

A: In 1996, Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), which denies federal recognition of homosexual marriage and allows states to ignore same-sex unions licensed elsewhere. DOMA does not address the provision of benefits for same-sex domestic partners. It only prohibits the recognition of same-sex partners in a formal marriage.

The Vermont Supreme Court decision only applies to statewide benefits for domestic partners. The court said these include access to a partner's medical, life, and disability insurance, hospital visitation and other medical decision making privileges, spousal support, intestate succession, homestead protections, and many other statewide statutory protections. The Court ruled that the Vermont State Legislature will establish a system for determining domestic status partnership in order for domestic partners to qualify for benefits.

Q: Can this be appealed to the Supreme Court?

A: Today's ruling cannot be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court since the Vermont court based its decision on the state Constitution. The Vermont Supreme Court is the state's only appeals court. The court said the Legislature will determine whether such benefits will come through formal marriage or a system of domestic partnerships.

Q: What do think of the Vice President's comments on the Court's ruling?

A: Like the Vice President, we are pleased that the Vermont decision supports equal treatment for domestic partners.

Q: Does the President support legal protections for domestic partnerships?

A: While the Administration has not taken a formal position on this question, the President is heartened by the Vermont Supreme Court's decision. This Administration has been very supportive of gays and lesbians during his Administration. The President has supported the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which prohibits workplace discrimination against gays and lesbians, and has signed an executive order prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in the federal workplace. He has also championed new legislation to prohibit hate crimes based on sexual orientation.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 1-MAR-2000 11:41:22.00

SUBJECT: State Department Qs & As on domestic partner benefits

TO: Annette E. Rooney (CN=Annette E. Rooney/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Edward W. Correia (CN=Edward W. Correia/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Annette --- The people cc'd on this e-mail make up the group I mentioned that is looking at domestic partner benefits issues. If you receive draft State Department answers to Sen. Helms' questions on DP benefits in the normal OMB clearance process (or if you track them down), we would appreciate being in the loop.

Thanks.

Paul
66297

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Seiden, Suzanne B." <SBSEIDEN@opm.gov> ("Seiden, Suzanne B." <SBSEIDEN@op

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAR-2000 13:59:09.00

SUBJECT: EEO on Domestic Partners

TO: Edward W. Correia (CN=Edward W. Correia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Eddie:

Just a reminder to send me any materials which would be helpful for our
look
at circumstances where agency heads may exercise authority to extend
benefits to domestic partners. My fax is 606- 2609. thanks! suzanne

-- E-Mail scanned for viruses. --

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 2-MAR-2000 10:40:33.00

SUBJECT: Knight initiative

TO: Jennifer M. Palmieri (CN=Jennifer M. Palmieri/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

SHAW: An Internet question for you, Vice President Gore from the latimes.com. &On California's ballot is Prop 22. If passed, only marriages between a man and a woman would be valid or recognized in California. Do you support or oppose it? 8

GORE: I oppose it.

GORE: Right now under current California law, only marriages between a man and a woman are recognized. Frankly, I think that we should have legal recognition for domestic partnerships that have legal protections. I do not favor changing the definition of a traditional marriage as it has always been understood between a man and a woman.

But this Knight initiative, Prop. 22, as it's also known as, I think is in part a kind of a mean-spirited wedge initiative, and I just think it's time for us to put this discrimination against gays and lesbians behind us. We are a brave people in America. We address the issue of racial discrimination. We've still got work to do, discrimination against people with disabilities or with a different religion, I think that it's time just to leave people alone because of the way God made them and stop the discrimination.

SHAW: Senator?

BRADLEY: I don't support the Knight initiative. Like Al, I don't support gay marriage, but I do support domestic partnership legislation that would provide to gays and lesbians all the legal and financial rights that accrue to a state of marriage. But this is an issue that is bigger than just this initiative and this year, because we're going to have our work cut out for us in a general election, and I started that work last March.

I was down in Austin, Texas, and there was an anti-hate crime bill pending before the Texas state legislature. There was a hate-crime bill in the wake of the James Byrd murder and the Matthew Shepard murder, and it said that there will be additional penalties for hate crimes based on race, gender, sexual orientation, and disability. The governor of Texas let it be known he did not want to see that bill come forward. I called a press conference, I told the governor's press corps that if I am the nominee of the Democratic Party and he's the nominee of the Republican Party and he has failed to support this legislation that I would make it an issue in the presidential campaign...

SHAW: Time.

BRADLEY: ... and I will.

GORE: I think it will be an issue in the presidential campaign, and it should be. I met here in Los Angeles two weeks ago with Judy Shepard, the

mother of Matthew Shepard. What suffering that family went through when that young man was crucified on a split-rail fence by bigots.

Yes, we need hate crimes legislation. Those crimes are fundamentally different. We also need the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to end discrimination in the workplace. I worked on that two years ago and we came within one vote of passing it in the Senate. If you entrust me with the presidency...

SHAW: Time.

GORE: ... we'll make it law.

SHAW: Senator.

BRADLEY: I think that another thing that's important, sure, gays and lesbians in the military openly, yes, adding the sexual orientation to the Civil Rights Act of '64. But what's also important is for us to convey to people that gays and lesbians are no different than the rest of us. They just have a different attitude, like a different color of hair. It's no different. And we have to respect them, and we have to accord them the dignity that every person in this world deserves.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-2000 13:57:45.00

SUBJECT: prop 22: debate technicality

TO: Morley A. Winograd (CN=Morley A. Winograd/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa B. Ratcliff (CN=Melissa B. Ratcliff/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lisa M. Brown (CN=Lisa M. Brown/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Technically, California law currently defines marriage to be between a man and a women which is PERFORMED in California This Initiative will now extend that definition to any outside marriage seeking to be recognized and valid in California.

So, the VP's statement is accurate in relation to marriages performed in California.

SHAW: An Internet question for you, Vice President Gore from the latimes.com. "On California's ballot is Prop 22. If passed, only marriages between a man and a woman would be valid or recognized in California. Do you support or oppose it?"

GORE: I oppose it. Right now under current California law, only marriages between a man and a woman are recognized. Frankly, I think that we should have legal recognition for domestic partnerships that have legal protections. I do not favor changing the definition of a traditional marriage as it has always been understood between a man and a woman.

But this Knight initiative, Prop. 22, as it's also known as, I think is in part a kind of a mean-spirited wedge initiative, and I just think it's time for us to put this discrimination against gays and lesbians behind us. We are a brave people in America. We address the issue of racial discrimination. We've still got work to do, discrimination against people with disabilities or with a different religion, I think that it's time just to leave people alone because of the way God made them and stop the discrimination.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 3-MAR-2000 12:08:32.00

SUBJECT: POTUS

TO: Christine A. Stanek (CN=Christine A. Stanek/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Virginia M. Apuzzo, will serve as interim NGLTF Political Director. Apuzzo is the current holder of the Virginia Apuzzo Chair for Leadership in Public Policy at the NGLTF Policy Institute and the former Executive Director. She will be in charge of NGLTF's program efforts, which include state and federal advocacy, communications operations and local organizing and training, including NGLTF's annual "Creating Change" conference.

Vermont House committee overwhelmingly passed a bill that would create "civil unions" for homosexual couples. This is a key step toward creating the nation's most far-reaching law for gay domestic partnerships. The bill grants all of the benefits and rights of marriage that the state can legally offer, but it cannot grant the tax advantages and hundreds of other benefits that the federal government provides. Advocates have mixed feelings about the creation of a "separate but equal" system.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Cynthia Harrison <harrison@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Cynthia Harrison <harrison

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-MAR-2000 16:12:37.00

SUBJECT: link is fixed

TO: Valerie Dulk-Jacobs <adaction@ix.netcom.com> (Valerie Dulk-Jacobs <adaction@ix.
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sheenae Noh <snoh@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Sheenae Noh <snoh@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> [
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: "Lauren M. Grover" <lmg8@mindspring.com> ("Lauren M. Grover" <lmg8@mindspring.c
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Hornstein <khornste@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Karen Hornstein <khornste@gwis2.
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jeanne Konicki <jkonicki@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Jeanne Konicki <jkonicki@gwis2.ci
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dionne Koller Fine <dkoller@main.nlc.gwu.edu> (Dionne Koller Fine <dkoller@main
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carolee Ann Sparks <carolees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Carolee Ann Sparks <carolees@
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ami M. Lynch (CN=Ami M. Lynch/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Vanessa McMullin <vmcmulli@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Vanessa McMullin <vmcmulli@gwis
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Silvia Henriquez <silvia@feminist.org> (Silvia Henriquez <silvia@feminist.org>
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Robert A Wagner <wagner@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Robert A Wagner <wagner@gwis2.circ
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kirsten E Byerts <kbyerts@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Kirsten E Byerts <kbyerts@gwis2.
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jennifer Smith <jennsmithlusa@netscape.net> (Jennifer Smith <jennsmithlusa@nets
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gyoung Sun Jang <jangsun@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Gyoung Sun Jang <jangsun@gwis2.ci
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Christi Fanelli <cfanelli@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Christi Fanelli <cfanelli@gwis2.
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Amy Robb <amyrobb@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> (Amy Robb <amyrobb@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu> [
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I'm happy to announce that the link is fixed for the HRC report on
domestic partner benefits for gay and lesbian couples. Let's reschedule it
for next time.

Cynthia Harrison
Associate Professor, History/Women's Studies
Funger 506G,
The George Washington University
2201 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20052
telephone & fax: 202-363-4356 e-mail: harrison@gwu.edu

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Edward W. Correia (CN=Edward W. Correia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:15-MAR-2000 15:58:54.00

SUBJECT: Domestic Partners

TO: sbseiden@opm.gov (sbseiden@opm.gov @ inet [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

How are you coming in finding cases where agency heads have discretion to give benefits to domestic partners?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Edward W. Correia (CN=Edward W. Correia/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:20-MAR-2000 14:07:05.00

SUBJECT: FW: list of government benefits

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here's something from OPM on domestic partners. Let's get together soon to discuss it.

----- Forwarded by Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP on
03/20/2000 02:06 PM -----

"Mitchelson, Mary S." <MSMITCHE@opm.gov>

03/20/2000 01:49:44 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: FW: list of government benefits

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Mitchelson, Mary S.

> Sent: Monday, March 20, 2000 12:15 PM

> To: 'EdwardW.Correia@who.eop.gov'; Seiden, Suzanne B.; Abow, Steven

> Subject: list of government benefits

>

> Eddie,

> Suzanne promised you a list of government benefits that may be relevant

> to domestic partners. We have met with a number of individuals here in

> OPM and compiled the attached list. Please call me or Steve Abow at

> 606-1700 if you want to discuss this.

> Thanks, Mary Mitchelson

> cc: Suzanne Seiden

> Steve Abow

>

> <<Domestic Partner Benefits.doc>>

-- E-Mail scanned for viruses. --

[illegible]

Domestic Partner Benefits

The following list contains OPM-administered programs under which an agency may include domestic partners without statutory change, as well as some subjects that are not administered by OPM that may be conducive to including domestic partners.

I. OPM-administered programs

A. Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8705(a)

5 C.F.R. § 870.802

Under this statute and regulation, an insured individual may file a designation of beneficiary. The designation must be in writing, signed by the insured individual, and witnessed and signed by two people. A designee may be a domestic partner or anyone else.

B. Civil Service Retirement System (Survivorship benefits)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8339(k)(1)

5 U.S.C. § 8341(c)

At the time of retirement, an annuitant may elect a reduced annuity and name in writing an individual with an insurable interest to receive an annuity after the annuitant's death. The survivor named receives 55% of the reduced annuity of the retired employee the day after the employee's death. The individual may be a domestic partner if he or she has an insurable interest.

C. Federal Employees' Retirement System (Survivorship benefits)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8420

5 U.S.C. § 8444

At the time of retirement, an annuitant may elect to have a reduced annuity in order to provide an annuity for an individual having an insurable interest in the employee.

D. Sick Leave for Family Care and Bereavement Purposes
(Formerly the "Federal Employees Family Friendly Leave Act,"
P.L. 103-388, October 22, 1994)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 CFR § 630.401(a)(3) and (4)

OPM's definition of family member for this purpose includes "any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship." Under this definition, agencies possess discretion to include domestic partners in this program.

Program is administered under OPM's permanent regulatory authority in 5 U.S.C. § 6311. Currently, employees may use a total of up to 13 days each year to care for a family member or for bereavement purposes. On February 7, 2000, OPM issued proposed regulations to permit Federal employees to use a total of up to 12 weeks of sick leave each year to care for a family member with a serious health condition.

E. Funeral Leave (to attend funerals of immediate relatives in the Armed Forces)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 6326

5 C.F.R. § 630.801.

OPM's regulatory definition includes "any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a

family relationship.” Under this definition, agencies possess discretion to include domestic partners in this program, which permits agencies to grant up to 3 days of leave to attend the funeral of an immediate relative who died while serving as a member of the armed services in a combat zone.

F. Voluntary Leave Transfer Program

5 U.S.C. chapter 63, subchapter III
5 CFR part 630, subpart I

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The voluntary leave transfer program allows Federal employees to donate annual leave to other Federal employees who have a personal or family medical emergency and who have exhausted their own paid leave. OPM’s regulations define “family member” to include an “individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship.” This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

G. Voluntary Leave Bank Program

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

5 U.S.C. chapter 63, subchapter IV
5 CFR part 630, subpart J

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The voluntary leave bank program allows Federal employees to contribute a specified amount of annual leave yearly to their agency leave bank. Leave bank members with personal or family medical emergencies can withdraw leave from the bank if they exhaust their own paid leave. OPM’s regulations define “family member” to include an “individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship.” This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

H. Emergency Leave Transfer Program

5 U.S.C. 6391

5 CFR part 630, subpart K

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The emergency leave transfer program allows Federal employees to donate annual leave to other Federal employees who are adversely affected by a major disaster or emergency, as declared by the President. OPM's regulations define "family member" to include an "individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship." This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

I. Administratively Excused Absences

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

There is no explicit statutory authority for granting excused absence to Federal employees. The authority permitting department and agency heads to grant excused absence is inferred from 5 U.S.C. § 301. Each department or agency has discretion to excuse employees from their duties without loss of pay or charge to leave. OPM advises agencies that they should grant excused absence only in those situations in which the employee's absence, in the department's or agency's determination, is not specifically prohibited by law and satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (1) the absence is directly related to the department or agency's mission; (2) the absence is officially sponsored or sanctioned by the head of the department or agency; (3) the absence will clearly enhance the professional development or skills of the employee in his or her current position; or (4) the absence is brief and is determined to be in the interest of the agency.

J. Employee Assistance Programs (drug and alcohol abuse)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

5 U.S.C. § 7904

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The head of each Executive agency shall establish appropriate prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and services for drug abuse and alcohol abuse for employees, consistent with OPM regulation. Therefore, such programs may deal with problems arising from domestic partnerships.

II. Subjects not administered by OPM

A. Moving Expenses, househunting, shipment of household goods

Administering agency: General Services Administration

B. Visits home while on temporary duty or travel

Administering agency: General Services Administration

C. Downsizing and outsourcing benefits

Administering agency: Any Eligible Agency

D. Visa privileges, evacuation procedures, emergency shelters, moving expenses, transportation allowances, housing allowances.

Administering agency: Department of State

E. Thrift Savings Plan

Administering agency: Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board

F. Health Service Programs (Non-drug and alcohol-related)

Administering Agency: Department of Health and Human Services

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 7901

The statute provides that the head of each agency may establish, within the limits of appropriations available, a health service program to promote and maintain the physical and mental fitness of employees under his or her jurisdiction. The agency must consult with HHS before establishing a program. Such programs may deal with problems arising from domestic partnerships.

[illegible]

Domestic Partner Benefits

The following list contains OPM-administered programs under which an agency may include domestic partners without statutory change, as well as some subjects that are not administered by OPM that may be conducive to including domestic partners.

I. OPM-administered programs

A. Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8705(a)

5 C.F.R. § 870.802

Under this statute and regulation, an insured individual may file a designation of beneficiary. The designation must be in writing, signed by the insured individual, and witnessed and signed by two people. A designee may be a domestic partner or anyone else.

B. Civil Service Retirement System (Survivorship benefits)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8339(k)(1)

5 U.S.C. § 8341(c)

At the time of retirement, an annuitant may elect a reduced annuity and name in writing an individual with an insurable interest to receive an annuity after the annuitant's death. The survivor named receives 55% of the reduced annuity of the retired employee the day after the employee's death. The individual may be a domestic partner if he or she has an insurable interest.

C. Federal Employees' Retirement System (Survivorship benefits)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8420

5 U.S.C. § 8444

At the time of retirement, an annuitant may elect to have a reduced annuity in order to provide an annuity for an individual having an insurable interest in the employee.

D. Sick Leave for Family Care and Bereavement Purposes
(Formerly the "Federal Employees Family Friendly Leave Act,"
P.L. 103-388, October 22, 1994)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 CFR § 630.401(a)(3) and (4)

OPM's definition of family member for this purpose includes "any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship." Under this definition, agencies possess discretion to include domestic partners in this program.

Program is administered under OPM's permanent regulatory authority in 5 U.S.C. § 6311. Currently, employees may use a total of up to 13 days each year to care for a family member or for bereavement purposes. On February 7, 2000, OPM issued proposed regulations to permit Federal employees to use a total of up to 12 weeks of sick leave each year to care for a family member with a serious health condition.

E. Funeral Leave (to attend funerals of immediate relatives in the Armed Forces)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 6326

5 C.F.R. § 630.801.

OPM's regulatory definition includes "any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a

family relationship.” Under this definition, agencies possess discretion to include domestic partners in this program, which permits agencies to grant up to 3 days of leave to attend the funeral of an immediate relative who died while serving as a member of the armed services in a combat zone.

F. Voluntary Leave Transfer Program

5 U.S.C. chapter 63, subchapter III
5 CFR part 630, subpart I

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The voluntary leave transfer program allows Federal employees to donate annual leave to other Federal employees who have a personal or family medical emergency and who have exhausted their own paid leave. OPM's regulations define “family member” to include an “individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship.” This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

G. Voluntary Leave Bank Program

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

5 U.S.C. chapter 63, subchapter IV
5 CFR part 630, subpart J

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The voluntary leave bank program allows Federal employees to contribute a specified amount of annual leave yearly to their agency leave bank. Leave bank members with personal or family medical emergencies can withdraw leave from the bank if they exhaust their own paid leave. OPM's regulations define “family member” to include an “individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship.” This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

H. Emergency Leave Transfer Program

5 U.S.C. 6391

5 CFR part 630, subpart K

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The emergency leave transfer program allows Federal employees to donate annual leave to other Federal employees who are adversely affected by a major disaster or emergency, as declared by the President. OPM's regulations define "family member" to include an "individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship." This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

I. Administratively Excused Absences

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

There is no explicit statutory authority for granting excused absence to Federal employees. The authority permitting department and agency heads to grant excused absence is inferred from 5 U.S.C. § 301. Each department or agency has discretion to excuse employees from their duties without loss of pay or charge to leave. OPM advises agencies that they should grant excused absence only in those situations in which the employee's absence, in the department's or agency's determination, is not specifically prohibited by law and satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (1) the absence is directly related to the department or agency's mission; (2) the absence is officially sponsored or sanctioned by the head of the department or agency; (3) the absence will clearly enhance the professional development or skills of the employee in his or her current position; or (4) the absence is brief and is determined to be in the interest of the agency.

J. Employee Assistance Programs (drug and alcohol abuse)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

5 U.S.C. § 7904

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The head of each Executive agency shall establish appropriate prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and services for drug abuse and alcohol abuse for employees, consistent with OPM regulation. Therefore, such programs may deal with problems arising from domestic partnerships.

II. Subjects not administered by OPM

A. Moving Expenses, househunting, shipment of household goods

Administering agency: General Services Administration

B. Visits home while on temporary duty or travel

Administering agency: General Services Administration

C. Downsizing and outsourcing benefits

Administering agency: Any Eligible Agency

D. Visa privileges, evacuation procedures, emergency shelters, moving expenses, transportation allowances, housing allowances.

Administering agency: Department of State

E. Thrift Savings Plan

Administering agency: Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board

F. Health Service Programs (Non-drug and alcohol-related)

Administering Agency: Department of Health and Human Services

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 7901

The statute provides that the head of each agency may establish, within the limits of appropriations available, a health service program to promote and maintain the physical and mental fitness of employees under his or her jurisdiction. The agency must consult with HHS before establishing a program. Such programs may deal with problems arising from domestic partnerships.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:22-MAR-2000 17:43:23.00

SUBJECT: Re: FW: list of government benefits

TO: Edward W. Correia (CN=Edward W. Correia/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: paul oetken (CN=paul oetken/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary l. smith (CN=mary l. smith/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I have been delinquent on pushing the EO ideas for domestic partners. Given this info. from Eddie, could we get together to discuss next steps? Eddie and I can both meet at Noon tomorrow (Thursday). Does that work for others?

Edward W. Correia

03/20/2000 02:07:03 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP, Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP, Paul Oetken/WHO/EOP@EOP, Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject:FW: list of government benefits

Here's something from OPM on domestic partners. Let's get together soon to discuss it.

----- Forwarded by Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP on
03/20/2000 02:06 PM -----

"Mitchelson, Mary S." <MSMITCHE@opm.gov>

03/20/2000 01:49:44 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Edward W. Correia/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: FW: list of government benefits

```
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Mitchelson, Mary S.
> Sent: Monday, March 20, 2000 12:15 PM
> To: 'EdwardW.Correia@who.eop.gov'; Seiden, Suzanne B.; Abow, Steven
> Subject: list of government benefits
>
> Eddie,
>
> Suzanne promised you a list of government benefits that may be relevant
> to domestic partners. We have met with a number of individuals here in
> OPM and compiled the attached list. Please call me or Steve Abow at
> 606-1700 if you want to discuss this.
>
> Thanks, Mary Mitchelson
> cc: Suzanne Seiden
> Steve Abow
>
>
> <<Domestic Partner Benefits.doc>>
```

-- E-Mail scanned for viruses. --

- Domestic Partner Benefits.doc

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:
Unable to convert ARMS_EXT:[ATTACH.D62]ARMS21553478M.046 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

[illegible]

Domestic Partner Benefits

The following list contains OPM-administered programs under which an agency may include domestic partners without statutory change, as well as some subjects that are not administered by OPM that may be conducive to including domestic partners.

I. OPM-administered programs

A. Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8705(a)

5 C.F.R. § 870.802

Under this statute and regulation, an insured individual may file a designation of beneficiary. The designation must be in writing, signed by the insured individual, and witnessed and signed by two people. A designee may be a domestic partner or anyone else.

B. Civil Service Retirement System (Survivorship benefits)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8339(k)(1)

5 U.S.C. § 8341(c)

At the time of retirement, an annuitant may elect a reduced annuity and name in writing an individual with an insurable interest to receive an annuity after the annuitant's death. The survivor named receives 55% of the reduced annuity of the retired employee the day after the employee's death. The individual may be a domestic partner if he or she has an insurable interest.

C. Federal Employees' Retirement System (Survivorship benefits)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 8420

5 U.S.C. § 8444

At the time of retirement, an annuitant may elect to have a reduced annuity in order to provide an annuity for an individual having an insurable interest in the employee.

D. Sick Leave for Family Care and Bereavement Purposes
(Formerly the "Federal Employees Family Friendly Leave Act,"
P.L. 103-388, October 22, 1994)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 CFR § 630.401(a)(3) and (4)

OPM's definition of family member for this purpose includes "any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship." Under this definition, agencies possess discretion to include domestic partners in this program.

Program is administered under OPM's permanent regulatory authority in 5 U.S.C. § 6311. Currently, employees may use a total of up to 13 days each year to care for a family member or for bereavement purposes. On February 7, 2000, OPM issued proposed regulations to permit Federal employees to use a total of up to 12 weeks of sick leave each year to care for a family member with a serious health condition.

E. Funeral Leave (to attend funerals of immediate relatives in the Armed Forces)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 6326

5 C.F.R. § 630.801.

OPM's regulatory definition includes "any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a

family relationship.” Under this definition, agencies possess discretion to include domestic partners in this program, which permits agencies to grant up to 3 days of leave to attend the funeral of an immediate relative who died while serving as a member of the armed services in a combat zone.

F. Voluntary Leave Transfer Program

5 U.S.C. chapter 63, subchapter III
5 CFR part 630, subpart I

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The voluntary leave transfer program allows Federal employees to donate annual leave to other Federal employees who have a personal or family medical emergency and who have exhausted their own paid leave. OPM’s regulations define “family member” to include an “individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship.” This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

G. Voluntary Leave Bank Program

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

5 U.S.C. chapter 63, subchapter IV
5 CFR part 630, subpart J

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The voluntary leave bank program allows Federal employees to contribute a specified amount of annual leave yearly to their agency leave bank. Leave bank members with personal or family medical emergencies can withdraw leave from the bank if they exhaust their own paid leave. OPM’s regulations define “family member” to include an “individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship.” This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

H. Emergency Leave Transfer Program

5 U.S.C. 6391

5 CFR part 630, subpart K

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The emergency leave transfer program allows Federal employees to donate annual leave to other Federal employees who are adversely affected by a major disaster or emergency, as declared by the President. OPM's regulations define "family member" to include an "individual related by blood or affinity whose close relationship is the equivalent of a family relationship." This definition gives agencies discretion to accord benefits to domestic partners.

I. Administratively Excused Absences

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

There is no explicit statutory authority for granting excused absence to Federal employees. The authority permitting department and agency heads to grant excused absence is inferred from 5 U.S.C. § 301. Each department or agency has discretion to excuse employees from their duties without loss of pay or charge to leave. OPM advises agencies that they should grant excused absence only in those situations in which the employee's absence, in the department's or agency's determination, is not specifically prohibited by law and satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (1) the absence is directly related to the department or agency's mission; (2) the absence is officially sponsored or sanctioned by the head of the department or agency; (3) the absence will clearly enhance the professional development or skills of the employee in his or her current position; or (4) the absence is brief and is determined to be in the interest of the agency.

J. Employee Assistance Programs (drug and alcohol abuse)

Administering Agency: Office of Personnel Management

5 U.S.C. § 7904

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

The head of each Executive agency shall establish appropriate prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and services for drug abuse and alcohol abuse for employees, consistent with OPM regulation. Therefore, such programs may deal with problems arising from domestic partnerships.

II. Subjects not administered by OPM

A. Moving Expenses, househunting, shipment of household goods

Administering agency: General Services Administration

B. Visits home while on temporary duty or travel

Administering agency: General Services Administration

C. Downsizing and outsourcing benefits

Administering agency: Any Eligible Agency

D. Visa privileges, evacuation procedures, emergency shelters, moving expenses, transportation allowances, housing allowances.

Administering agency: Department of State

E. Thrift Savings Plan

Administering agency: Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board

F. Health Service Programs (Non-drug and alcohol-related)

Administering Agency: Department of Health and Human Services

No change in statute or regulation is needed to cover domestic partners.

5 U.S.C. § 7901

The statute provides that the head of each agency may establish, within the limits of appropriations available, a health service program to promote and maintain the physical and mental fitness of employees under his or her jurisdiction. The agency must consult with HHS before establishing a program. Such programs may deal with problems arising from domestic partnerships.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 27-MAR-2000 19:44:54.00

SUBJECT: DP benefits

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Ann, Mary: Could you meet with me, Eddie, Julian, and the NGLTF folks (Chai Feldblum and Blake Cornish) on Wed., April 5, at 3:00 to discuss domestic partner benefits? (That's Eddie's last week, and they really wanted to meet once before he leaves. We may also want to meet internally before that.)

Thanks.

Paul

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAR-2000 09:32:57.00

SUBJECT: Re: DP benefits

TO: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I can make it

Paul Oetken

03/27/2000 07:44:46 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP, Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject:DP benefits

Ann, Mary: Could you meet with me, Eddie, Julian, and the NGLTF folks (Chai Feldblum and Blake Cornish) on Wed., April 5, at 3:00 to discuss domestic partner benefits? (That's Eddie's last week, and they really wanted to meet once before he leaves. We may also want to meet internally before that.)

Thanks.

Paul

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-MAR-2000 09:03:10.00

SUBJECT: Re: DP benefits

TO: Paul Oetken (CN=Paul Oetken/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mary l. smith (CN=mary l. smith/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

That works for me and I also agree that we should meet internally before the April 5th meeting. Maybe later this week if Julian is back?

Paul Oetken

03/27/2000 07:44:46 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP, Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP@EOP

CC:

Subject:DP benefits

Ann, Mary: Could you meet with me, Eddie, Julian, and the NGLTF folks (Chai Feldblum and Blake Cornish) on Wed., April 5, at 3:00 to discuss domestic partner benefits? (That's Eddie's last week, and they really wanted to meet once before he leaves. We may also want to meet internally before that.)

Thanks.

Paul

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-JUN-2000 17:05:38.00

SUBJECT: domestic partner benefits

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

With the big three auto makers announcing that they will provide domestic partner benefits -- would we be interested in supporting legislation to provide DP benefits for the federal government? I know that Nicole and Ann have talked with you about this. Thanks, Mary

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JUN-2000 14:37:03.00

SUBJECT: Re: domestic partner benefits

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

In talking with OPM late last year, they gave us more detailed information on the costs of Barney Frank's domestic partner legislation. This legislation would provide domestic partner benefits for life insurance, health insurance, and retirement benefits. OPM says that the total cost over 5 years would be \$335 million or \$67 million per year. What do you think?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:12-JUN-2000 11:34:25.00

SUBJECT: Re: domestic partner benefits

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

As I recall, we looked at this before, and had concerns about the cost.
Do you remember how much it was?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:10-SEP-2000 20:10:09.00

SUBJECT: Re: potus interview for gay.com

TO: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: lisel loy (CN=lisel loy/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: mark a. kitchens (CN=mark a. kitchens/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: paul oetken (CN=paul oetken/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: ann o'leary (CN=ann o'leary/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [opd])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: karen tramontano (CN=karen tramontano/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Just to clarify --we did actually say we strongly support the Vermont decision --we said that that is for Vermont to decide and that the President supports "more equal treatment for domestic partners"

Delia A. Cohen

09/08/2000 02:52:54 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Lisel Loy/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: potus interview for gay.com

david mixner has requested that the president participate in a q&a for his online column in gay.com. please review our attempt at answering these questions and email any edits/suggestions to lisel and me by cob today if possible.

thanks for your help.

Message Sent

To:

Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

[illegible]

Mixner Q&A--DRAFT

1. MIXNER: Mr. President, it has been eight years since your election, and enormous change has happened for the Gay and Lesbian Community since your election. This is the perfect time to reflect on your historical record. What accomplishment on behalf of the Gay and Lesbian community are you most proud of?

POTUS: Well, I agree that a lot has changed since 1992 for the Gay and Lesbian community, and most of it has been for the better. What I'm most proud of is that my Administration is the first in our nation's history to truly stand up for Gays and Lesbians. I've made it a top priority as President and as a person to ensure that every American has the opportunity to live out their dreams, and I knew that I couldn't reach this goal without working to help those communities, like the Gay and Lesbian community, that historically have been denied opportunity. That's why I've made such an effort to pass hate crimes legislation and the Employment Non Discrimination Act, and that's why I signed an Executive Order prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in the Federal government.

I'm also very proud that my Administration has reflected the diversity of our nation. You know, we were the first Administration to have openly gays or lesbians serving in appointed positions, and we were the first to issue a Presidential Proclamation commemorating Gay and Lesbian Pride Month.

2. MIXNER: Sir, what do you wish you could have done differently and done over?

POTUS: Well, I wish that the policies I initiated were fully enacted with respect to my original intent. On so many fronts, I think we had the policy right--ENDA, Hate Crimes and even the Military Policy---but we were faced with so many obstacles. Public opinion, congressional opposition and dealing with sensitive issues that were new and unfamiliar to the American public---all of these factors created a difficult working environment that made progress on these issues very slow.

3. MIXNER: Mr. President, do you feel the battle over the policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" made it more difficult for your administration on the other issues regarding Gay and Lesbian Civil rights?

POTUS: Yes. I think it created a difficult foundation for us to begin to address policies affecting gays and lesbians. The intense public debate and eventual compromise on the DADT policy left many people dismayed and discouraged--not only in the gay community, but fair minded politicians and policy makers-- on what actually could be accomplished in the area of gay and lesbian civil rights.

4. MIXNER: Sir, when you became President, were you surprised at the extent of hatred and discrimination directed toward Gay and Lesbian Americans?

POTUS: Well, yes and no. I have learned that most people fear what they do not understand or that which they do not know. I also realize that those persons who don't have any personal contact or relationships with gay Americans are the most likely to discriminate against them. I truly believe that one of the most important steps toward ending this discrimination is having gay and lesbian people reach out to those that are most distrusting and spend time getting to know each other as human beings

6. MIXNER: Mr. President, you and I are people of great faith. Our belief in God and a deep spirituality are very important in our lives. Some in organized religion have been very strong opponents to your actions in relationship to civil rights for Gays and Lesbians. How have you been able to reconcile your faith with your policies?

POTUS: I don't necessarily think there's anything to reconcile. One of the main tenets of my faith is that we all must love one another as God loves each of us. Therefore, I have never felt that my religious beliefs conflict with my belief that all people, regardless of sexual orientation or any other distinction, deserve to be treated with respect and dignity.

7. MIXNER: What message would you like to give to the opponents of Gays and Lesbians rights? What appeal would you make to them based on your journey with Gays and Lesbians, Mr. President?

POTUS: What I'd like to say is that the movement for Gay and Lesbian rights is an effort to make sure that for every single person in our country the words "all Americans" mean **all** Americans. I believe that every American who works hard, obeys the law, and plays by the rules ought to be treated with dignity and respect and to have a part in our American family, and that is why I've supported Gay and Lesbian rights. I think a major cause of their opposition is that they have an absence of open, personal contact with men and women who are Gay and Lesbian. They do not see Gays and Lesbians in the course of their daily lives, and it prevents them from coming to the understanding that our common humanity as human beings is far more important than this one difference of sexual orientation.

So, my appeal to them is: reach out to those in your communities who are Gay and Lesbian and see if they hold different dreams for their families or have different needs in terms of love, respect, and dignity than you do. If everyone does that, I think we can make even more progress.

8. MIXNER: You have been consistently against traditional marriage for Gays and Lesbians since I have known you. How do you feel about the Vermont decision granting legal protection to same-sex unions and the issues of domestic partnerships?

POTUS: I have strongly supported this decision. While I have not supported the use of the term "marriage" for same-sex unions, I believe that a patient in an intensive care unit should not be

prevented from seeing his or her partner because only "family members" are allowed in the room, and a person who has been with his or her partner for years should not be prevented from being covered under his or her partner's health insurance. These, among other things, are protections that I believe gay and lesbian couples are entitled to, and that is why I support the Vermont judiciary decision.

9. MIXNER: Once again the Democratic Party has broken down another barrier in its selection of Senator Lieberman as the first person of Jewish faith to be on a national ticket. Do you think you will ever live to see the day where a Gay and Lesbian will be on a national ticket?

POTUS: I certainly hope so. Our nation has made great strides in the acceptance of Gays and Lesbians, and I believe that one day in my lifetime -- maybe not in five years, but maybe ten or twenty years from now -- it may happen. You know, I also think our nation will pretty soon elect a woman or a minority President, and once that barrier is broken, I think we'll see more and more fall with ease.

10. MIXNER: Sir, what message would you like to send to young Gays and Lesbians dealing with their sexuality?

POTUS: I think it is important for youth to be honest with themselves and their families. Young people today are faced with an enormous amount of decisions and responsibilities. They need the support of their family and friends to transition into adulthood in a safe environment. In addition, young people should reach out to counselors and youth organizations to make healthy decisions and to meet positive role models.

11. MIXNER: How do you plan to continue your extraordinary leadership on the issue of Gay and Lesbian rights once you leave office?

POTUS: I will continue to work on the fundamental issues of tolerance and diversity. I believe these are key principles in strengthening America's future.

12. MIXNER: How would you like to be remembered by future generations of gays and lesbians?

POTUS: Since I became President, my top priority has always been to come closer toward becoming a community of all Americans, with all of us working together to achieve our common goals. I hope that I will be remembered by the gay and lesbian community, and by all Americans, as having brought us a little bit closer to truly becoming One America. In regard to gay and lesbian issues in particular, I would hope that when they look back on my Presidency, they will see that I appointed qualified individuals, regardless of sexual orientation, to positions within my Administration, and that because of that policy, more than 150 openly gay and lesbian Americans have served in my Administration; that I issued an Executive Order prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in the Federal civilian workforce because of my belief

that everyone deserves the same opportunities; and I hope that, by the time I leave office, Congress will have made hate crimes legislation that addresses crimes based on sexual orientation the law of the land. I hope that they will see that I have tried, in all I have done, to create a climate in America where we genuinely respected one another and committed to giving one another a chance.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Delia A. Cohen (CN=Delia A. Cohen/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:11-SEP-2000 11:33:22.00

SUBJECT: Re: potus interview for gay.com

TO: Christopher K. Scully (CN=Christopher K. Scully/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP on 09/11/2000
11:33 AM -----

Mary L. Smith

09/10/2000 08:09:53 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Delia A. Cohen/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

bcc:

Subject: Re: potus interview for gay.com

Just to clarify --we did actually say we strongly support the Vermont decision --we said that that is for Vermont to decide and that the President supports "more equal treatment for domestic partners"

Delia A. Cohen

09/08/2000 02:52:54 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Lisel Loy/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject:potus interview for gay.com

david mixner has requested that the president participate in a q&a for his online column in gay.com. please review our attempt at answering these questions and email any edits/suggestions to lisel and me by cob today if possible.

thanks for your help.

Message Sent

To:

Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

Paul Oetken/WHO/EOP@EOP

Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP@EOP

Mark A. Kitchens/WHO/EOP@EOP

Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

To:

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

Unable to convert NTNFS305:[ATTACH.D16]ARMS35001HPOM.001 to ASCII,
The following is a HEX DUMP:

[illegible]

Mixner Q&A--DRAFT

1. MIXNER: Mr. President, it has been eight years since your election, and enormous change has happened for the Gay and Lesbian Community since your election. This is the perfect time to reflect on your historical record. What accomplishment on behalf of the Gay and Lesbian community are you most proud of?

POTUS: Well, I agree that a lot has changed since 1992 for the Gay and Lesbian community, and most of it has been for the better. What I'm most proud of is that my Administration is the first in our nation's history to truly stand up for Gays and Lesbians. I've made it a top priority as President and as a person to ensure that every American has the opportunity to live out their dreams, and I knew that I couldn't reach this goal without working to help those communities, like the Gay and Lesbian community, that historically have been denied opportunity. That's why I've made such an effort to pass hate crimes legislation and the Employment Non Discrimination Act, and that's why I signed an Executive Order prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in the Federal government.

I'm also very proud that my Administration has reflected the diversity of our nation. You know, we were the first Administration to have openly gays or lesbians serving in appointed positions, and we were the first to issue a Presidential Proclamation commemorating Gay and Lesbian Pride Month.

2. MIXNER: Sir, what do you wish you could have done differently and done over?

POTUS: Well, I wish that the policies I initiated were fully enacted with respect to my original intent. On so many fronts, I think we had the policy right--ENDA, Hate Crimes and even the Military Policy---but we were faced with so many obstacles. Public opinion, congressional opposition and dealing with sensitive issues that were new and unfamiliar to the American public---all of these factors created a difficult working environment that made progress on these issues very slow.

3. MIXNER: Mr. President, do you feel the battle over the policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" made it more difficult for your administration on the other issues regarding Gay and Lesbian Civil rights?

POTUS: Yes. I think it created a difficult foundation for us to begin to address policies affecting gays and lesbians. The intense public debate and eventual compromise on the DADT policy left many people dismayed and discouraged--not only in the gay community, but fair minded politicians and policy makers-- on what actually could be accomplished in the area of gay and lesbian civil rights.

4. MIXNER: Sir, when you became President, were you surprised at the extent of hatred and discrimination directed toward Gay and Lesbian Americans?

POTUS: Well, yes and no. I have learned that most people fear what they do not understand or that which they do not know. I also realize that those persons who don't have any personal contact or relationships with gay Americans are the most likely to discriminate against them. I truly believe that one of the most important steps toward ending this discrimination is having gay and lesbian people reach out to those that are most distrusting and spend time getting to know each other as human beings

6. MIXNER: Mr. President, you and I are people of great faith. Our belief in God and a deep spirituality are very important in our lives. Some in organized religion have been very strong opponents to your actions in relationship to civil rights for Gays and Lesbians. How have you been able to reconcile your faith with your policies?

POTUS: I don't necessarily think there's anything to reconcile. One of the main tenets of my faith is that we all must love one another as God loves each of us. Therefore, I have never felt that my religious beliefs conflict with my belief that all people, regardless of sexual orientation or any other distinction, deserve to be treated with respect and dignity.

7. MIXNER: What message would you like to give to the opponents of Gays and Lesbians rights? What appeal would you make to them based on your journey with Gays and Lesbians, Mr. President?

POTUS: What I'd like to say is that the movement for Gay and Lesbian rights is an effort to make sure that for every single person in our country the words "all Americans" mean **all** Americans. I believe that every American who works hard, obeys the law, and plays by the rules ought to be treated with dignity and respect and to have a part in our American family, and that is why I've supported Gay and Lesbian rights. I think a major cause of their opposition is that they have an absence of open, personal contact with men and women who are Gay and Lesbian. They do not see Gays and Lesbians in the course of their daily lives, and it prevents them from coming to the understanding that our common humanity as human beings is far more important than this one difference of sexual orientation.

So, my appeal to them is: reach out to those in your communities who are Gay and Lesbian and see if they hold different dreams for their families or have different needs in terms of love, respect, and dignity than you do. If everyone does that, I think we can make even more progress.

8. MIXNER: You have been consistently against traditional marriage for Gays and Lesbians since I have known you. How do you feel about the Vermont decision granting legal protection to same-sex unions and the issues of domestic partnerships?

POTUS: I have strongly supported this decision. While I have not supported the use of the term "marriage" for same-sex unions, I believe that a patient in an intensive care unit should not be

prevented from seeing his or her partner because only "family members" are allowed in the room, and a person who has been with his or her partner for years should not be prevented from being covered under his or her partner's health insurance. These, among other things, are protections that I believe gay and lesbian couples are entitled to, and that is why I support the Vermont judiciary decision.

9. MIXNER: Once again the Democratic Party has broken down another barrier in its selection of Senator Lieberman as the first person of Jewish faith to be on a national ticket. Do you think you will ever live to see the day where a Gay and Lesbian will be on a national ticket?

POTUS: I certainly hope so. Our nation has made great strides in the acceptance of Gays and Lesbians, and I believe that one day in my lifetime -- maybe not in five years, but maybe ten or twenty years from now -- it may happen. You know, I also think our nation will pretty soon elect a woman or a minority President, and once that barrier is broken, I think we'll see more and more fall with ease.

10. MIXNER: Sir, what message would you like to send to young Gays and Lesbians dealing with their sexuality?

POTUS: I think it is important for youth to be honest with themselves and their families. Young people today are faced with an enormous amount of decisions and responsibilities. They need the support of their family and friends to transition into adulthood in a safe environment. In addition, young people should reach out to counselors and youth organizations to make healthy decisions and to meet positive role models.

11. MIXNER: How do you plan to continue your extraordinary leadership on the issue of Gay and Lesbian rights once you leave office?

POTUS: I will continue to work on the fundamental issues of tolerance and diversity. I believe these are key principles in strengthening America's future.

12. MIXNER: How would you like to be remembered by future generations of gays and lesbians?

POTUS: Since I became President, my top priority has always been to come closer toward becoming a community of all Americans, with all of us working together to achieve our common goals. I hope that I will be remembered by the gay and lesbian community, and by all Americans, as having brought us a little bit closer to truly becoming One America. In regard to gay and lesbian issues in particular, I would hope that when they look back on my Presidency, they will see that I appointed qualified individuals, regardless of sexual orientation, to positions within my Administration, and that because of that policy, more than 150 openly gay and lesbian Americans have served in my Administration; that I issued an Executive Order prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation in the Federal civilian workforce because of my belief

that everyone deserves the same opportunities; and I hope that, by the time I leave office, Congress will have made hate crimes legislation that addresses crimes based on sexual orientation the law of the land. I hope that they will see that I have tried, in all I have done, to create a climate in America where we genuinely respected one another and committed to giving one another a chance.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: PMifsud@aol.com (PMifsud@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME:14-SEP-2000 10:29:49.00

SUBJECT: Netherlands To Vote on Gay Marriage-non-aviation

TO: MRSearsKLM@aol.com (MRSearsKLM@aol.com [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

Caroline J. Croft (CN=Caroline J. Croft/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Subj: Re: Netherlands To Vote on Gay Marriage-non-aviation

Date: 9/14/00 7:36:06 AM Eastern Daylight Time

From: (Henry Harteveltdt)

To: PMifsud@aol.com

A news report said that marriage would only be granterd to Dutch citizens
-- the journalist said the country wanted to avoid "marriage tourism".

I see the aviation news as related to past industry turmoil related to
domestic partnership benefits.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-SEP-2000 12:26:25.00

SUBJECT: Re: Are You Okay With This Guidance?

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: anna richter (CN=anna richter/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [opd])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

We did work to anti-gay adoption amendment taken off of the DC appropriations---

Our accomplishments document on gay and lesbian issues...

"Standing up for Basic Fairness, Protecting Adoption Rights. President Clinton blocked republican efforts to pass legislation prohibiting unmarried couples from jointly adopting children in the District of Columbia and legislation which would have denied certain Federal Funds to localities with domestic partnership laws."

It seems we should keep the same message---

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	AnnMarie Logan to William T. Glunz at 22:24:45.00. Subject: Re: New email address. (4 pages)	09/28/2000	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Domestic Partners])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/2000 - 10/04/2000]

2013-0028-F
ab1140

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-SEP-2000 12:49:57.00

SUBJECT: Re: Are You Okay With This Guidance?

TO: Elizabeth J. Potter (CN=Elizabeth J. Potter/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: anna richter (CN=anna richter/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [opd])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Ann -- are you OK with the below?

Elizabeth J. Potter

09/28/2000 12:26:12 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: anna richter/opd/eop@eop, elizabeth j. potter/who/eop@eop

Subject: Re: Are You Okay With This Guidance?

We did work to anti-gay adoption amendment taken off of the DC appropriations---

Our accomplishments document on gay and lesbian issues...

"Standing up for Basic Fairness, Protecting Adoption Rights. President Clinton blocked republican efforts to pass legislation prohibiting unmarried couples from jointly adopting children in the District of Columbia and legislation which would have denied certain Federal Funds to localities with domestic partnership laws."

It seems we should keep the same message---

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Ann O'Leary (CN=Ann O'Leary/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME:28-SEP-2000 13:11:29.00

SUBJECT: Re: Are You Okay With This Guidance?

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: anna richter (CN=anna richter/OU=opd/O=eop@eop [opd])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: elizabeth j. potter (CN=elizabeth j. potter/OU=who/O=eop@eop [who])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Yes -- this is good - thanks.

Mary L. Smith

09/28/2000 12:49:44 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Elizabeth J. Potter/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: anna richter/opd/eop@eop, elizabeth j. potter/who/eop@eop, Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

bcc:

Subject: Re: Are You Okay With This Guidance?

Ann -- are you OK with the below?

Elizabeth J. Potter

09/28/2000 12:26:12 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mary L. Smith/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc: anna richter/opd/eop@eop, elizabeth j. potter/who/eop@eop

Subject: Re: Are You Okay With This Guidance?

We did work to anti-gay adoption amendment taken off of the DC appropriations---

Our accomplishments document on gay and lesbian issues...

"Standing up for Basic Fairness, Protecting Adoption Rights. President Clinton blocked republican efforts to pass legislation prohibiting unmarried couples from jointly adopting children in the District of Columbia and legislation which would have denied certain Federal Funds to localities with domestic partnership laws."

It seems we should keep the same message---

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: "Gerstein, Josh" <Josh.Gerstein@abc.com> ("Gerstein, Josh" <Josh.Gerstein@

CREATION DATE/TIME: 4-OCT-2000 20:02:57.00

SUBJECT: regrettably

TO: Richard L. Siewert (CN=Richard L. Siewert/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

It appears that Mr. Glavin is not a lawyer.

He has however crusaded against benefits for domestic partners.