



**CALIFORNIANS FOR
GRAY DAVIS**

Californians For Gray Davis
 9911 West Pico Blvd
 Suite 980
 Los Angeles, CA 90035

Fax: (310) 201-0922
 Telephone: (310) 201-0344

Fax

To: Candidate Survey: Spectrum Institute From: Tal Finney

Fax: (213) 252-8099 Pages: 5

Phone: Date:

Re: CC:

Comments:

**Candidate Survey on Family Diversity,
Domestic Partnership, and Marital Status Discrimination**

Name of Candidate GRAY DAVIS District _____
(Please Print Clearly) GOVERNOR

Questions about Family Diversity: (Select only one answer for each question.)

1. In a national survey done by Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., 1,200 adults were asked to select a definition of family. A minority (22%) selected a restrictive definition: "a group of people related by blood, marriage, or adoption." The majority (74%) selected an inclusive definition: "a group of people who love and care for each other."

If you had to make a choice, which *one* of these definitions would you select?

A "family" is a group of people related by blood, marriage, or adoption.

A "family" is a group of people who love and care for each other.

2. After a two-year study completed in 1988, the 38-member Los Angeles City Task Force on Family Diversity recommended that lawmakers, such as the City Council and state Legislature should be sensitive to the fact that "family" is now a term of art, capable of many variable definitions. The Task Force recommended that when the term "family" is used in proposed legislation, public officials should consider relevant definitional options and use an inclusive rather than restrictive definition of "family."

I support legislators defining "family" in an *inclusive* way in proposed laws.

I support legislators using a *restrictive* definition of "family" in proposed laws.

3. The first-year report of the state Legislature's 26-member Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family, issued in 1989, observed that no single description of California's families adequately captures their breadth and complexity. The Task Force found the following statement of the California Supreme Court, made in 1921, still relevant today: "Family may mean different things under different circumstances. The family, for instance, may be a group of people related by blood or marriage, or not related at all, who are living together in the intimate and mutual interdependence of a single home or household." In this spirit, the Task Force saw unmarried long-term partners as part of the mosaic of family diversity, recommending that "if those couples assume the responsibilities of a family, public policy should recognize them as a families and prohibit discrimination that impedes the economic well-being of their family members."

I believe that if unmarried partners function as a family unit, then the law should treat them as a family.

I believe that the law should not treat unmarried couples as a family unit.

Questions about Domestic Partnership: (Select only one answer for each question.)

4. Dozens of municipalities and school districts and hundreds of private employers throughout the nation now provide health, dental, and leave benefits to the domestic partners of their employees. The term "domestic partnership" has customarily been defined as: (1) two unmarried adults; (2) living together as a family unit; (3) sharing the common necessities of life; and (4) assuming responsibility for the general welfare of each other. Some government and private employers restrict domestic partnership benefits to same-sex couples. Most allow all unmarried couples, regardless of gender, to apply for domestic partnership benefits. Groups such as the National Organization for Women and the Congress of California Seniors, oppose the exclusion of opposite-sex partners from dp benefits plans. The California Labor Commissioner ruled that it is illegal sexual orientation discrimination for government employers to exclude opposite-sex partners from dp benefits programs.

I support the extension of employment benefits to domestic partners, but I believe that domestic partner benefits should be *limited* to same-sex couples.

I support domestic partner employment benefits, but I oppose the "same-sex only" limitation. I believe that all domestic partners should be eligible for benefits, *regardless of the gender* of the partners.

I oppose all domestic partner benefits programs.

5. Bills have been introduced in the past few years to protect the rights of domestic partners (regardless of gender). The following are two examples. Please indicate whether you support or oppose the objective of each of the following bills. (Select one answer for each.)

A. 1994 (AB 2810) / 1995 (AB 627) / 1997 (AB 54) [Registry and Basic Protections]

Would create a procedure for domestic partners to register with the Secretary of State. Would extend basic humanitarian protections to registered partners (a place to designate a dp on the statutory will form, hospital visitation rights, notice of conservatorship proceedings, priority to be appointed as a conservator). The bill passed both houses in 1994 but was vetoed by the Governor.

I support creation of a registration procedure and basic humanitarian protections.

I oppose a registry and oppose any legal recognition of domestic partners.

B. 1994 (SB 2061) / 1997 (AB 2061) [Benefits for state and local workers]

Would extend health and dental benefits to the domestic partners of state employees (such as New York, Vermont, and Oregon have done). Would also authorize the Public Employee Retirement System to administer such a benefits program for municipalities that participate in PERS if such municipalities want to extend health benefits to the domestic partners of their employees.

I support extending dp benefits to state employees and allowing PERS to administer such benefits for municipalities that want to give benefits to domestic partners of their workers.

I oppose extending benefits to domestic partners of state or local government employees.

Marital Status Discrimination: (Select only one answer for each question.)

6. There are more than ^{10 MILLION} ~~10,000~~ unmarried adults in California, making "singles" the largest minority in the state (since women are a numeric majority). If demographic trends continue, within a few years the majority of adults in California may be unmarried. Despite their large numbers, widespread marital status discrimination has been documented by government study commissions such as the Los Angeles City Task Force on Family Diversity, the San Francisco Mayor's Advisory Task Force on Family Policy, the Legislature's Joint Select Task Force on the Changing Family, the Los Angeles City Attorney's Consumer's Task Force on Marital Status Discrimination, and the Insurance Commissioner's Anti-Discrimination Task Force. Please answer the following questions about your position on marital status discrimination in California. (Select only one answer for each category.)

A. General Philosophy

I believe that married people deserve more rights than single people.

I believe in equal rights for all people, regardless of their marital status.

B. Housing Discrimination

I believe that landlords should have the right to refuse to rent to unmarried couples.

I believe that housing discrimination against unmarried couples should be illegal.

C. Employee Benefits Discrimination

I believe in equal pay for equal work. Employees who are single or who have a domestic partner should not receive less pay (in terms of benefits compensation) than married workers if they perform the same work. Such discrimination should be illegal.

I believe that married workers should receive greater benefits compensation than single workers or those with domestic partners. Such discrimination should not be outlawed.

D. Insurance Discrimination

I believe that insurance companies should be entitled to discriminate against individuals on the basis of group characteristics, such as race, religion, sex, or marital status, if actuarial data shows that one group is a higher risk than another.

I believe that responsible single individuals should not have to pay higher premiums just because they are not married. Discrimination on the basis of group characteristics, such as race, religion, sex, or marital status, should be illegal, so that individual merit, responsibility, and past conduct, are the primary basis for determining premiums.

E. Consumer Discounts

If businesses give discounts and other perks to "spouses" and "family members," then the law should require them to give such discounts to domestic partners.

Businesses should not be required to treat domestic partners the same as they treat family members or spouses. Businesses should have the right to discriminate like this.