S. HRG. 107–591

# VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE: THE EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM AND WHAT GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS ARE DOING ABOUT IT

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE, FOCUSING ON COORDINATED COMMUNITY RESPONSE PARTNERSHIPS WITH EMPLOYERS, TO EDUCATE THEM ABOUT DANGERS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING, AND ASSIST THEM IN ESTABLISHING EFFECTIVE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

JULY 25, 2002

Printed for the use of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81–045 PDF WASHINGTON : 2003

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JAMES M. JEFFORDS (I), Vermont
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
JOHN EDWARDS, North Carolina
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York

JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
BILL FRIST, Tennessee
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
MIKE DeWINE, Ohio

J. MICHAEL MYERS, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
TOWNSEND LANGE MCNITT, *Minority Staff Director*

# C O N T E N T S

## STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2002


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Wellstone, Hon. Paul D., a U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota | 1 |
| Stuart, Diane, Director, Violence Against Women Office, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC | 3 |
| Dodd, Hon. Christopher J., a U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut | 6 |
| Evsich, Kathy, Vice President, Women Against Domestic Violence; Sidney Harman, Executive Chairman, Harman International Industries, Inc.; and Kathy Rodgers, President, NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund, Washington, DC | 17 |


## ADDITIONAL MATERIAL


| | |
|---|---|
| Statements, articles, publications, letters, etc.: | |
| Diane Stuart | 30 |
| Liz Clairborne | 33 |
| Kathy Rodgers | 34 |

# VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE: THE EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM AND WHAT GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS ARE DOING ABOUT IT

**THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2002**

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS,
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m., in room SD–430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Wellstone, presiding.

Present: Senators Wellstone, Dodd, and Murray.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR WELLSTONE

Senator WELLSTONE. [presiding]. I want to call the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions to order.

I want to thank the chairman of this committee, Senator Kennedy, for agreeing to hold this most important hearing today. The issue of violence against women in the workplace and the economic security of battered women is something that I and Senator Murray and Senator Kennedy and others have worked on for a very long time.

I am honored to have such distinguished witnesses who can discuss better than I the extraordinary implications that domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking have on families and on women's ability to be economically independent through work.

We are here today to better understand how violence intersects with and impacts women's ability to work and thus support themselves so they may provide permanent safety for themselves and their children.

It is quite obvious that the impact of domestic and sexual violence extends far beyond the moment the abuse occurs. It strikes at the heart of victims and their families' self-sufficiency. Too often women are forced to choose between protecting themselves from abuse and keeping a roof over their head. This is a choice that no mother should have to make.

Nor should any person face the double tragedy of first being abused and then losing a job, health insurance, or any other means of self-sufficiency because they were abused.

Economic independence is a clear reason why people who are in abusive relationships may return to abusers or may not even be able to leave abusive situations in the first place. Abusers will go to great lengths to sabotage their partners' ability to have a job or

get an education so that their partners will remain dependent on them.

If we want battered women and victims of sexual violence to be able to escape the dangerous and often life-threatening situations in which they are trapped, they need the economic means to do so. Yet victims of domestic and sexual violence face very serious challenges to self-sufficiency every day.

The link between domestic and sexual violence and poverty is clear. As many as 50 percent of domestic violence victims have lost a job due at least in part to domestic violence, and almost 50 percent of sexual assault survivors have lost their jobs or were forced to quit in the aftermath of assault.

More than half of women on welfare have been victims of domestic violence. There is also a clear link between domestic violence and reduced worker and corporate productivity. The Bureau of National Affairs has estimated that domestic violence costs employers between $3 and $5 billion in lost time and productivity every year. Ninety-four percent of corporate security and safety directors at companies nationwide rank domestic violence as a high security concern.

Homicide is the leading cause of death of women in the workplace. This hearing will address the things that Government and business can and should do to respond to this cycle of violence and dependence.

In the fight against violence against women, and after the passage of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000, addressing the economic security of battered women and sexual assault and stalking victims, and the negative impact of this violence on business, is the next most crucial and critical step in ending the violence that plagues too many homes and too many families.

I know that through the excellent work of the Violence Against Women Office, the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the Family Violence Prevention Fund, and through the dedication and leadership of companies like Harman International, 3M, and U.S. Bank in Minnesota, to name just a few, State and corporate responses are getting better and better. But obviously, we have far more to do.

This hearing is a start to a conversation here in the Congress that will acknowledge the great work of so many who have already done so much, but also and most important, will lead to productive changes on the Federal, State, and local workplace level so that no woman will ever have to face a situation like Ms. Evsich and like so many people do every day, where they are forced to trade their families' personal safety for their economic livelihood.

I am pleased to introduce Diane Stuart. Ms. Stuart has served as director of the Violence Against Women Office at the U.S. Department of Justice since her appointment by President Bush in October of 2001.

My colleagues may remember the strong support Ms. Stuart garnered from domestic violence organizations at the time of her nomination. This is a tribute to her lifelong commitment—lifelong commitment—to this most important issue.

Prior to her appointment to the administration, Ms. Stuart was State coordinator for the Utah Domestic Violence Cabinet Council,

serving in that capacity since 1996. Prior to that, she worked as a domestic violence victim advocacy specialist in the Division of Child and Family Services for the State of Utah. From 1989 to 1984, Ms. Stuart was director of the Battered Women's Shelter and Rape Crisis Center in Logan, UT.

So for the record, colleagues, we can see that Ms. Stuart is well-qualified on many, many levels to address this issue.

Before you begin, Ms. Stuart, I want to thank you for your enthusiasm in testifying. It shows me that your office and the administration take the issue very seriously, and as I said to you earlier, I am joined by Jill Morningstar, who does so much of our staff work, and my wife Sheila sends her apologies to you and others. This is her work and what she so believes in, and she went back to Minnesota to represent me today at a number of gatherings, but she sends her best to you.

Ms. Stuart, thank you.

**STATEMENT OF DIANE STUART, DIRECTOR, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OFFICE, OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WASHINGTON, DC**

Ms. STUART. Thank you, Senator.

It is certainly my pleasure to be here and to be able to speak on, as you say, this very, very critical issue.

Violence against women articulated in the workplace may differ from other types of workplace violence due to the victim's intimate relationship with the offender. The reality is that victims of domestic violence and stalking often find little safety from their abusers even in the workplace.

However, if employers take the responsibility to put appropriate protections in place, the workplace can be a safe place for women who experience these horrifying crimes.

The Violence Against Women Office administers financial and technical assistance to communities around the country that are creating programs, policies and practices aimed at ending domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking wherever it may occur. Our mission is to provide Federal leadership in developing the Nation's capacity to reduce violence against women, to administer justice, and to strengthen services for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics within the Office of Justice Programs reports that an average of 1.7 million violent incidents occur in the workplace each year. That is staggering—1.7 million violent incidents. For women, homicide is the leading cause of death on the job, and 20 percent of those murders were perpetrated by a woman's partner.

Let me just take a moment to give you a real life example. In Grand Junction, CO, Sarah Miller Anderson—and I say that with a little bit of reverence—Sarah Miller Anderson was in the process of leaving her husband Chad. After a violent argument where Chad tried to suffocate her, Sarah filed a temporary restraining order, a temporary protective order. A few weeks later, Chad showed up briefly at her workplace where she worked as a checker. And I think it is interesting to note that he probably—probably—violated

that protective order in doing so. They spoke for a moment, and he left.

Sarah did not call the police, but she called her father and asked him to come to the store. Before he could get there, Chad returned to the store and gunned down his wife, two bystanders, and himself.

That just illustrates what you were speaking of just a moment ago.

As I mentioned earlier, domestic violence has unique characteristics that differentiate it from other forms of violence in the workplace. Domestic violence is a pattern of assaults and controlling behavior perpetrated by an intimate partner which can be physical, psychological, and/or financial. It spills into the workplace because it is an easy place for the abuser to find the victim. In many cases, the abuser is threatened by the fact that the victim is working outside of the home and may feel intense jealousy and rage that her attentions are directed elsewhere.

For many victims of domestic violence, the workplace may be the only place where they are not under the watchful eye of the abuser. It may be the one place where the victim is free to seek assistance without fear of retribution.

To their credit, as you mentioned, many employers have trained supervisors, employees, and support personnel on the dynamics of domestic violence and the appropriate responses to violent situations as they enter the workplace. When effective training occurs, coworkers and supervisors are prepared to assist the employee to deal with her abusive and often violent situation as it impacts her work environment. That is far and beyond whether the violence actually comes to the workplace. It impacts her work environment if she has violence in the home and whatever she is doing.

The Violence Against Women Office is addressing the issue of violence against women in the workplace in collaboration with other Federal agencies, and I would like to give you five examples.

First, the National Institute of Justice, another agency of the Office of Justice Programs, together with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the Department of Health and Human Services, found through a survey that the most common activity engaged in by stalkers included standing outside the victim's place of work. The survey also found that stalking victims go to extraordinary lengths to keep themselves safe, including switching jobs so that stalkers cannot find them.

Second, again with the Office of Justice Programs, is the Office of Victims of Crime, which has worked with the Family Violence Prevention Fund that you mentioned a few moments ago, to establish the National Workplace Resource Center on Domestic Violence. It is this project that serves as a clearinghouse of information on national and local responses to domestic violence as a workplace issue.

Third, the Office of Victims of Crime has also produced an award-winning video entitled, "Domestic Violence: The Workplace Response." This is a marvelous video that outlines steps that workplaces can take to help employees who are in abusive relationships, and I highly, highly recommend it.

Fourth, you may be aware that the Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families provides funding through the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to support the Domestic Violence Resource Network, which has a series of components. One component is the Health Resource Center. This Center reports that 94 percent of corporate security directors rank domestic violence as a high-security problem at their company. Seventy-one percent of human resource and security personnel surveyed had an incident of domestic violence occurring on the company property.

Fifth and finally, the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services, as you are aware, in one of the most effective collaborations I have ever worked with, guided the National Advisory Council on Violence Against Women to develop the web-based Toolkit to End Violence Against Women. The chapter on workplace violence in this Toolkit discusses promoting safety in the workplace and presents a number of recommendations that businesses and communities can consider. Those recommendations include the development of policies, which is critical, prevention strategies, referrals to service providers, and public awareness of the issue.

In response to concerns about workplace violence, the United States Office of Personnel Management developed "Responding to Domestic Violence," where Federal employees can find help, as well as a shorter pamphlet that has been made available to all Federal employees in the Nation. And I have to tell you that that pamphlet sat on my desk in Utah for a lengthy period of time and was the prototype I used to create a similar pamphlet in Utah.

The response document, the guidance document, is considered one of the best of its kind in the Nation, guiding supervisors through an array of management tools that can be used to assist Federal employees in abusive relationships. And I suspect that that also has been used as a model for other policies and other businesses and State governments.

The Violence Against Women Office is working to further efforts such as this. In 2001, in order to enable even small businesses to assist employees threatened by violence, we provided funding support to the Family Violence Prevention Fund to develop State leadership teams of businesses, victim services, and law enforcement to create models of multidisciplinary response to domestic violence in the workplace.

And as you know, the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 requires the Department of Justice to develop a report to Congress on violence against women in the workplace. Our office is in the process of writing this report and has engaged the Family Violence Prevention Fund to help us fulfill this mandate. The report will describe the results of a national survey developed to assist employees and employers in appropriate responses relating to victims of domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault. The report will also analyze the effects of these crimes on small, medium, and large businesses as well as provide a bibliography of current resources available—so very, very critical. We hope that this report will make a significant contribution to the understanding of the issue of violence against women in the workplace.

Through these and other initiatives, the Department of Justice is working with its colleagues in the private and public sectors to better understand and address the problem of violence against women specifically in the workplace.

From our work on this issue, we have learned that it is only through a coordinated community response that we can be successful in our efforts to end violence against women. Working in partnerships with employers, we can help educate about the dangers of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking, and assist with establishing effective policies and programs.

Violence against women in the workplace is a criminal justice issue, a health issue, and an economic issue. If we are to make any headway in eliminating its threat, the public and private sectors must all work in collaboration. Women's lives depend on it. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Stuart may be found in additional material.]

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you, Ms. Stuart.

Before we go to questions—and I have one for you about family and medical leave and whether it could apply to women in these circumstances, and the author of that bill is here—I just wanted to first of all defer to my colleague, Senator Dodd from Connecticut.

Some members, including the chairman of the committee, are in a Judiciary Committee hearing right now on homeland defense, and that is why they are not here; but it does not surprise me that Senator Dodd is here, because I do not know of anybody in the Senate who has worked more on children and family issues than Senator Dodd.

Senator Dodd, thank you for being here.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Senator DODD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am grateful to our witnesses for being here, and I do not want to delay your proceedings, but I do want to thank you for leading on this. This is a tremendously important issue, and you have a very good group of panelists coming up on Panel 2 as well.

This is a tremendously important issue, and I thank you for raising it and bringing it up. It is a sad truth that this kind of violence affects the lives of far too many women in our society. The numbers bear that out. According to some studies, the incidence of domestic violence approaches one in every four women over the course of their lifetime. These are stunning numbers. I do not think that that is said often enough. It is an enormously troubling statistic that we must find some resources to combat, I think.

Of course, you, Mr. Chairman, have said for years during your entire service here—I do not know of a time when you have not been involved in this issue—you have considered it one of the most important. So I thank you for your leadership on this, going back to your first days here—and I know even before you arrived here, but during your tenure in the Senate, this has been tremendously important to you.

For this reason, by the way, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation on the Violence Against Women Act, which many of my colleagues have joined, and I continue to support the provisions of

that bill to build on the success of the original bill that we introduced.

It is also important to recognize that when a woman is abused, the abuse does not stay at home. We therefore cannot fight this battle on only one front. Domestic violence is often seen as a personal issue, a private issue, and certainly the right of privacy of any victim should always be respected. However, the suffering endured at home often follows a woman into her place of employment, tainting and violating the environment that should be a safe haven from the violence at home, so compromising the workplace security of her coworkers and interfering with her ability to hold a job and perform her duties with confidence and peace of mind.

So when domestic violence crops up in the workplace, it becomes a concern for all of us. The issue of whether we can incorporate some of this in the Family and Medical Leave Act—I appreciate your referencing that specifically—is an idea worth exploring as to how we might accommodate it.

I would ask unanimous consent that some additional remarks be included in the record, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to the panelists and look forward to some questions.

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you, Senator Dodd.

[The prepared statement of Senator Dodd follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Good Morning. I would like to thank our Chairman today, Senator Wellstone, for convening this hearing on the powerful topic of domestic violence against women, and its effects in the workplace. It is my pleasure to be here today, and I would like to welcome all of our witnesses to the Committee and thank them as well for coming here today to give us their testimony on an issue that is both compelling and of vital importance.

Mr. Chairman, it is a sad truth that violence affects the lives of too many women in our society. According to some studies, the incidence of domestic violence approaches one in every four women over the course of their lifetime; an enormously troubling statistic that we must find the resources to combat. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the victims of domestic violence and other forms of violence against women face a unique form of terror at the hands of their attackers, and we need to move aggressively to ensure that these women do not continue to live in fear. For this reason I was proud to be a cosponsor with many of my colleagues of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), and I continue to support provisions that build on the success of the original bill.

It is also important that we recognize that when a woman is abused, the abuse does not stay in the home, and we therefore cannot fight this battle on only one front. Domestic violence is often seen as a personal issue, a private issue, and certainly the right to privacy of any victim should always be respected. However, the suffering endured at home often follows a woman to her place of employment, tainting and violating an environment that should be a safe haven from the violence at home, compromising the workplace security of her coworkers, and interfering with her ability to hold a job and perform her duties with confidence and peace of mind. When domestic violence creeps into the workplace, Mr.

Chairman, it becomes a concern for all of us. Indeed, according to the American Institute on Domestic Violence. 94 percent of company security directors surveyed ranked domestic violence as a "high workplace security risk."

In addition, not only is the security of the workplace jeopardized, but the economic impact for employers in terms of productivity slow-downs, absenteeism, and enormous health care costs is unacceptable. Companies are losing an estimated $3 to $5 billion each year to domestic violence, and many have begun to institute specific domestic and workplace violence initiatives to help deal with this growing problem.

I therefore hope that today's hearing will not only shed much needed light on the deeply troubling problem of workplace violence, and the effect this abuse has on women's health and well-being, but will also suggest some possibilities for actions that we may take to help address and confront these problems.

With that, I yield, and I look forward to today's testimony.

Senator WELLSTONE. Let me start, Ms. Stuart—before you arrived, Senator Dodd, I was thanking Ms. Stuart for her work. When we talked with her about this hearing, she had absolutely no hesitation about being here. She has just an unbelievable background, with tremendous support around the country. So you are the right person, Ms. Stuart, and we really appreciate you being here, and I know that Bonnie Campbell is pleased to see you in this position as well; she was such a strong advocate.

You talked about the Toolkit and described that, and then, the OVC video and other programs such as the State leadership teams. Do they include recommendations to allow women—I guess this goes right to Chris' point—to take leave from work to address domestic violence needs such as, for example, the need to appear in court or to find shelter or counseling or to go to a lawyer or to get medical care without penalty?

Ms. STUART. That is an excellent point. That is the kind of thing that they want those groups, those teams, to consider. It is issues such as that—to see how it fits into the environment of that particular company—is that something that that company can consider; how would it work; what are the steps they would go through. So that would certainly be one of the conditions that would be on the table for that team to consider as they look at the entire picture of all the protections that can be offered to a victim of domestic violence—you bet.

Senator WELLSTONE. I would really urge you—and again, this is not a hearing today on legislation, and I am not trying to pin you down on yes or no answers—but I do think this is an area that is really well worth exploring, because right now, Chris, there is not this kind of coverage, but again, it certainly fits in. Unfortunately, this is the experience for too many women, and now she needs to go to court or needs to go and get some help or needs to go to a doctor, needs to go to see a lawyer, needs to go to see an advocate, and it seems to me that, if so, she should not have to run the risk of losing her job, and it would be nice to provide that kind of protection. We know that unfortunately this is a huge issue in many families, so I hope that you will consider this in your work.

Would you agree—and I guess I am interested in what would be your recommendations—that one of the things that we have to do is work to ensure that companies do not fire someone just because they are victims of violence? Would you agree with that, and what would be some of the recommendations that you would make about what we need to do?

Ms. STUART. That really gets directly to the point of awareness, because as companies learn about the issue of domestic violence—or before they learn—they make assumptions about what a victim can do and cannot do. That is why it is so critical that policies be put together—and before policies can be put together, they have to learn—again, it goes back to the coordinated community response—they have to reach out to the experts in the community, those in the State coalitions, for example, or those State administrators in the key programs throughout the State that are dealing with this so that they can go ahead and learn these things.

An example might be in the State of Utah—and forgive me for going back, but that is where my experience is coming from—there was a two-pronged program going on. One was established by our attorney general and was called "Safe at Home," by which teams were put together all over the State and went into businesses at noontime and gave an hour presentation. It was really just to raise awareness. The first 15 minutes was a video, and they showed that video which showed the dynamics of violence between intimate partners. Then, there was a law enforcement officer or a lawyer who talked about the legal issues, and there was a shelter provider who talked about the resources. There were different individuals from that community surrounding that business who would be resources for that business to come in and talk about their part in the whole program, and then a period of questions and answers. It was all done in an hour, all as a brown bag lunch, and it was a great way to raise awareness so that employers could begin to understand that there are unique differences for these folks. And then, how they could respond to them would be the second phase and putting together policies.

Senator WELLSTONE. I appreciate that, because the question that I am really asking—and Dr. Harman represents a very progressive company, and I can think of others in Minnesota and around the country—but what I am interested in is what about the hundreds of thousands of women who work for companies that right now do not want to help. In other words, the really horrible situation that I have been made aware of more than once is that it is not her fault, and this guy wants the power over her—he does not want her to be working, and he does not want her to be independent—and he comes to the workplace and is very threatening and so on, and the employer says to her, "We cannot have this; this is bad for the employees' morale," and he fires her.

Are you saying that you think the answer to this is just the education, or are there other things that we need? Given your position, what are some of the things you think we can do to provide these women with more support and more protection? Are you just emphasizing the education approach, or do you see other things?

Ms. STUART. You have to emphasize education, because that is a critical component. But it is the networking back and forth, and

the education comes at all kinds different levels. My mind goes to the community organizational groups who speak out as a group that this is an inappropriate thing to do, that to fire someone because they are a victim of domestic violence would be an inappropriate action. So the different organizations within the communities take a stand. That goes back to the networking with the coalitions and that kind of thing, as new and creative ways of dealing with that for that particular community.

What I think, Senator, is that what may work in one community may differ from what may work in another. Certainly a large organization like a large corporation can put together rules and conditions because they are educated, so the policy would say that an individual be released because of someone else's crime upon them. Those are the kinds of policies that companies need to create.

But smaller businesses need guidance from the larger businesses and need the support of the larger community to pull it off, to make it work.

Senator WELLSTONE. We have been joined by Senator Murray, who has been unbelievable in her commitment to these issues. Since I am chairing the committee, and I will be here the whole time, and Senator Dodd and Senator Murray might not be able to stay for the whole time, I will end my questions with one final question and then, if it is okay, Senator Dodd, will turn to Senator Murray, and then you can make a statement as well as ask some quick questions of Ms. Stuart.

Rather than put it in the form of a question, I will just make two points for your consideration. One—and again, this is not about the legislation—but the Victims Economic Security and Safety Act, I would just on the record ask you to take a close look at that, and where we agree, we agree, where we do not agree, we do not agree, but we would like to work with the administration on that, and I make that appeal to you.

The second appeal I would like to make—which could lead to an hour's exchange of views, which we will not do—is just for you to really—and I do not mean this in a gratuitous way, and you have probably already done it—but to really look very carefully at the link between domestic violence and poverty and, moreover, the link between domestic violence and welfare as it affects this welfare reform bill. I would really urge you to do so, because right now, in terms of what I have seen come over from the House, I do not think there is anywhere near the adequate protection there needs to be.

One thing you do not want to do is put a woman in a position where she has no other choice but to stay in a home where she should not be and her kids should not be. So you have got to be pretty careful about all of this and take into account the very special circumstances of the lives of women and children who have been through this.

I do not see that in that bill, and I would like for you to—and you do not have to answer now—but please take this into account and be a voice in helping to shape the administration's viewpoint. That would be much appreciated.

Ms. STUART. We certainly will review it.

Senator WELLSTONE. And we will hear from Dr. Harman, but I want to note, just in case the Congresswoman has to leave, that we have been joined by Congresswoman Jane Harman. I was saying earlier, Congresswoman, that a number of our colleagues including the chair of this committee are now in the Judiciary Committee on the homeland defense bill. But we thank you for being here. We have all seen you on television and in the discussions, and you have done a great job, and we thank you.

Ms. HARMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator WELLSTONE. Senator Dodd?

Senator DODD. I will defer to Senator Murray. I know she is chairing the Appropriations Committee.

Senator WELLSTONE. Fine.

Senator Murray?

Senator MURRAY. Senator Dodd wants to make sure I do not lose track of his State.

Senator DODD. I want to make sure our projects are included in the appropriations bill.

Senator WELLSTONE. I say get back to Appropriations. [Laughter.]

Senator MURRAY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Senator Dodd. It is a busy day on my Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, but I did want to come to this hearing, first of all to thank Senator Wellstone for his tremendous advocacy on behalf of battered women and his work on VAWA and his work on the Victims Economic Security and Safety Act. He and his wife Sheila are really leaders in the country in making sure the rest of us do not forget people who are often forgotten and behind closed doors. And I thank Senator Dodd as well for his compassion and his work on this issue.

We have a lot of work ahead of us, certainly, and I found the statistics in your prepared statement, which I had a chance to look at, to be pretty chilling. You noted that almost 10 of every 1,000 women in our American work force have experienced violence in the workplace, including incidence of murder, rape, and aggravated assault, and that workplace homicide is the third leading cause of job-related deaths. For women, homicide is the leading cause of death on the job. I think that is fairly startling and something that we should all recognize, and I think it shows why it is so critical that we eliminate the economic barriers that are facing many abused women and why I believe that women who have to leave their jobs should be allowed access to unemployment compensation and should be allowed to use the Family and Medical Leave Act to seek help and care, and it is why I worked with my colleague, Senator Wellstone, in 1996 to implement the family violence option during the welfare bill.

Your testimony provides a number of steps that the administration is taking to protect women in the workplace. Frankly, I am very concerned about the foundations of these programs in the Violence Against Women Act, because they have been level-funded by the administration. Despite the new authorization that we enacted in 2000, the President has not proposed the authorization funding levels for these programs. I know we all recognize the needs in homeland security and defense, and I do not think any of us will

argue with that, but I do not think we can forget the women and children in their homes today, where "homeland security" has a terribly different meaning.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am going to continue to work for full funding, and I just wanted to give you an opportunity to comment about how or if this administration is going to get funding for these important programs.

Ms. STUART. It is so complex, isn't it, and there is so much, as you have stated, to do. I think it is a tremendous challenge for this administration and for our office to be able to utilize the funding that we do have in the most effective way. That is my challenge. As I look at the funding level that I have and I look at the job that I am trying to do, we are trying to do it in the most effective way.

Are we looking at what we need to look at? Are we putting funding into the correct places to accomplish what we want and to accomplish all of those elements that you spoke of, because of the complexity of it, and one relates to another, and back and forth. It certainly is a challenge.

I can tell you that we are committed, this administration is committed, to working our way through all of the intricacies of how it affects women, that we are trying to reach out and be creative, step out of the box, if you will. We have done a marvelous job since the Violence Against Women Act came into effect in 1984, an absolutely marvelous job. I know that from being in a community and in a State, working in a shelter and seeing the effect that it has on those individuals, those who do not have choices and do not have resources. We have done a tremendous amount.

There is much, much more to do, and our emphasis is to go back and look at what are we asking States and communities to do, what are we asking agencies to do; is it the right thing. So we are in a constant review of all of those issues and mandates so that we can, as you are indicating be much more effective than we are now.

The end goal, Senator, I think is to build the capacity of each individual community so that that community can respond appropriately, whatever that means, whether it is through the criminal justice system, whether it is through the health care system, or whether it is through the workplace and the financial systems, to educate banks, to educate any commerce level, any business anywhere, on appropriate responses. And again, this goes back to the awareness thing, being able to make people understand what is going on.

So often, we think, "That would not happen to me; I would not let that happen to me," and because of that element, and because of our personal involvement, it makes it really, really difficult. But I think that we have made giant steps, and our intention is to continue to make giant steps.

Senator MURRAY. Well, I would urge you to remind the administration that fully funding these programs is absolutely critical, especially at a time when many of our communities and our States are looking at depleted budgets, and the economy has slowed, and we know that that has an impact on violence in both the workplace and at home. When people are having a hard time economically, it adds to the pressures at home that contribute to some of this, and at the same time, those States and communities do not have the

resources today to really support the facilities that they need. We need some leadership at the Federal level to fully fund. So I really hope you will push that within this administration.

Thank you so much, Senator Wellstone. Again, I do have a committee that I am putting together today, but I really appreciate all the witnesses who are here and all the people who speak out on behalf of victims of domestic violence both in the workplace and at home. We have got to keep talking.

Thank you very much.

Ms. STUART. We do, Senator. Thank you.

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you, Senator Murray, for dropping by. We know we have your appropriations work, and we thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Murray follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY

Mr. Chairman: I want to thank you for your efforts and leadership in putting this hearing together. It has always been a pleasure working with you to address the devastating impact of domestic violence.

I believe our legislation—the Victims Economic Security and Safety Act—is an important piece of legislation that addresses the serious economic barriers that often trap women and children in violence homes and relationships.

VESSA takes the next step in addressing the impact of violence against women.

The landmark 1994 Violence Against Women Act—and the reauthorization legislation enacted in 2000—provide the foundation for a national strategy to end the violence.

VAWA provides significant resources and assistance to state and local communities in providing an immediate response—including funding for law enforcement and shelter assistance.

Without any doubt, VAWA has been successful.

Our greatest challenge will be working to ensure full funding for the important programs and assistance provided in VAWA.

Now that we've dealt with the immediate safety and public health threats, we must now look for the long term solutions that will address the economic barriers that force women to stay in violence situations or end up on welfare.

Today's hearing is part of our effort to begin the process of addressing economic issues.

We must provide greater job protections for those women who are victimized in the work place or who must flee their jobs in order to escape an abuser.

We must ensure that women can seek protection orders or medical assistance without fear of losing their jobs.

We must also help employers, large and small, understand the need to provide a safe work place for all employees.

I find it unacceptable that a woman who must leave her job to relocate with her husband can receive unemployment benefits, but a woman forced to flee her job because of any abusive spouse is denied these benefits.

Fortunately, 18 states—including my own state of Washington—have enacted laws providing the same access for abused women.

In reviewing the written testimony of today's witnesses, it's clear that violence against women in the work place is a real threat, and it has cost too many women their lives.

I want to thank the witnesses for their testimony and for their efforts on behalf of battered women.

Your testimony will be useful to us as we continue to work at enacting greater economic safety and protection for battered and abused women.

Senator Dodd?

Senator DODD. Mr. Chairman, you have covered a lot of it, but let me just ask you if I can, Ms. Stuart—and I first of all admire what you are doing, and I appreciate what has been done in Utah.

My in-laws are all from Utah. Out there, of course, it is such a strong Democratic State. [Laughter.] Often when I go out there, they call me "the third Senator from Utah," and I tell them, "Those 10 Democrats out there deserve representation." [Laughter.] My in-laws tolerate me.

I appreciate what has been done out there, though. There is a real effort.

Ms. STUART. On many fronts.

Senator DODD. Yes, there really has been, and I admire that. A lot of this can and needs to be done at a local level. We think we need some real emphasis at the national level as well, and we believe we can add some real emphasis to this effort. And the numbers speak so loudly. It needs a lot of cooperation, or it is not going to be done.

I think it is admirable what the State of Utah is doing and what other States are trying, but we have seen what can happen in other areas. For example, hate crimes—if we had left the hate crimes issue exclusively to local jurisdictions, I do not think we would be anywhere near where we are today in raising the profile of these issues. And unfortunately, domestic violence issues, because there is this patina of privacy—that this is our business, and what goes on in our house is none of your business—had we tolerated those views regarding children, had we tolerated those views regarding hate crimes and so forth, think of where we would be today. And we have sort of skipped over the issue of violence against women.

So we have got to get beyond that if we can. This is no longer acceptable by anybody. It should not be acceptable by anyone.

So what we are trying to figure out is how best we can provide assistance to victims on the Federal level. We can start here and set some real examples at the Federal level. Workplace violence is unique compared to other forms of violence. We need to get some better ideas on how employers can tailor their security systems. I will be very interested in talking to my good friend, Sid Harman—and I want to welcome Jane here as well; it is a delight to have you over here with us on the Senate side—to get some ideas on helping at the Federal level and how we can help employers who want help, or how can we set some standards here that will at least require some minimum standards to be met by employers that will at least heighten the possibility of security for people, because unfortunately, we are not encountering people who see this as a priority, and they do not like the idea.

I know that when we did the Family and Medical Leave Act, it has been proven to be valuable, and many employers today think it poses little or no problems for them; yet to hear the testimony that we went through here for 7 years, before it was signed into law, you would have thought we were loading them up with an incredible amount of burden, when in fact many will argue today that it has actually increased productivity, reduced problems of absenteeism and the like, and it has created a far better relationship between employers and employees because of the sensitivities of knowing that when a child is sick, or a parent or a spouse, where that employee must be, we are not forcing them to make those decisions or, as many witnesses talked about, even lie, saying "I had a flat tire" or "The plumber did not show up on time." That was more understandable than saying their child was sick, because it was unacceptable to admit the you might have a child who was sick in terms of why you could not be at work.

That is sort of what is happening here with this issue, and we have got to get beyond that, and that takes national leadership to get through it.

So I am anxious to hear what you think can be done—what can you do, what can the Attorney General do, what should the President be doing, what should he be saying about this issue.

Ms. STUART. I think there are several levels. I think that whatever we are doing, whatever it is, and speaking out, the leadership that you have and the things that you have done are just fantastic.

The second level is getting people to hear about it, getting people to know, and even when we create laws, getting entities to understand what the law is and what the response should be—this Toolkit with the recommendations that we have in regard to how to deal with these issues—the information is there, but how many know about it?

So part of the leadership that I think you are talking about is doing these things, whether they be laws, whether they be policies as we have done, or whether it be a Toolkit with the recommendations. Those are all wonderful, but the next step is how do you get that information to those who are doing the work in the field; how do you get that information to families; how do you get that information to those who have the greatest need so that they in fact do have the choices that they should have, informed choices. That is our concurrent challenge—it is not only to create these wonderful things that we do, but it is also to get the information down, because so often it trickles down, and those who could use the information, those who could implement the laws, those who would be in a position of power to do that, many do not even know about it. So it is doing what you are doing, which is so commendable, speaking out and saying—and that is part of my job, too, is to speak out and let people know what is available and where to get it, in as many different ways that we can. There are those who are technologically savvy. There are those who only get their utility bill, and maybe they will read what goes in the utility bill. There are those who come from marginal communities, from Asian communities, from Hispanic communities, black communities, whatever the community may be, and their source of information to know what is available may not be adequate; they may not know that. So that

is another challenge that we have is to help those different communities reach out to what is really going on over here.

So I see it as a multilevel thing that all of us—I really firmly believe, Senator, in this coordinated community response method, because when I said that we cannot do it alone, none of us can do it alone. Those of us in Federal Government, those in State government, those in the private sector—we all need to do our part so it will work.

Senator DODD. Yes, I appreciate that. But obviously, it is so helpful—in addition to the enactment of legislation, which is critical in providing the resources, but also the bully pulpit. It is one thing for us here—and I appreciate that—but if the Attorney General or the President started talking about this, it would make a difference, and candidly, we have not heard much, and that is unfortunate.

So I am asking you to go back, if you will, and urge the Attorney General to speak out on this and to have him urge the President to find a venue and a forum where, with CEOs and other people, they could talk about this. In addition to us passing laws, which we are going to try to do, and providing resources, national leadership that would devote as much attention to this as they have to some other issues could make a huge difference.

So we would ask you to carry that back, if you would.

Ms. STUART. Thank you.

Senator WELLSTONE. Ms. Stuart, we really appreciate your being here today, and we appreciate what you are trying to do. I would just join Senator Dodd in urging you to get others in the administration to show the same commitment.

Thank you very much.

Ms. STUART. Thank you, Senator, and may I echo your colleagues in thanking you for all of your work on this issue. It is critical, and I appreciate it.

Thank you.

Senator WELLSTONE. That is very gracious of you. Thank you.

We have a superb panel as our second panel.

Please come up, and I will introduce each of you. And seeing Dr. Harman here, let me also ask unanimous consent—of myself, I guess—to include in the record testimony from Liz Claiborne, a company that has a superb record and wants to go on record with its strong support for the direction that we are going in here.

[The prepared statement of Liz Claiborne may be found in additional material.]

Senator WELLSTONE. Kathy Evsich is a mother of two from North Carolina. She is the vice president of Women Against Domestic Violence, an organization that increases awareness of domestic violence. I had the honor to hear her speak last year, and I have not forgotten the power of her story and the incredible strengthen that she has shown in facing the personal situation that she has had to deal with.

Nobody makes a more compelling argument to address this issue than Kathy. I know that her testimony will provide an excellent context for me and my colleagues to better understand the crucial trap that too many women face when they and their children are

in danger, trying to desperately maintain some independence from their batterer.

Kathy's heroic survival of domestic violence is inspirational, and I thank her for joining us today.

Dr. Sidney Harman, welcome. I want to thank you for being here today and thank you for your superb leadership which everybody agrees on.

Dr. Sidney Harman is executive director of Harman International, a company which he founded in 1952, originally with another name. Harman International is a Fortune 500 company that is a leader in the electronics industry. In addition to his extraordinary success in business, Dr. Harman has an outstanding record in public service and philanthropy. He served as deputy Secretary of Commerce from 1977 to 1978. He founded and is an active member of the Program on Technology, Public Policy, and Human Development at The Kennedy School of Government, and he is chairman of the program committee on the board of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.

Dr. Harman also comes to us as a prolific writer on issues related to productivity and quality of working life.

Dr. Harman, we do not have time to list all of your accomplishments and honors, but will just say thank you for being here.

Kathy Rodgers is president of the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund. Her leadership—and Sheila and I have done so much work with you all—in bringing the issue of violence against women in the workplace and domestic violence in general to the forefront has been extraordinary. NOW Legal Defense chairs the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, which includes over 2,000 national, State, and local organizations. NOW Legal Defense has also provided much-needed advice and support to all Members of Congress, Democrat and Republican alike, dealing with the Violence Against Women Act in 1994 and reauthorization in the year 2000.

The organization, and Geoff Boehm in particular, have worked tirelessly with us in enabling us to draft the Victims Economic Security and Safety bill, which is a bill that I have introduced with Senator Murray that will address a lot of the issues that we are talking about today.

We thank you for being here as well.

Kathy Evsich, we will start with you.

**STATEMENTS OF KATHY EVSICH, VICE PRESIDENT, WOMEN AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE; SIDNEY HARMAN, EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN, HARMAN INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIES, INC.; AND KATHY RODGERS, PRESIDENT, NOW LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND, WASHINGTON, DC**

Ms. EVSICH. Senator, thank you for inviting me here today.

I, like many millions of women in this country, have been a victim of domestic violence. I also, like millions of other women in this country, desperately needed the economic security of a steady job if I had any hope of getting my children and me out of a violent relationship.

I had been employed as a hostess/waitress at a family-owned restaurant. I loved this job for a very simple but important reason—

it allowed me to start stashing away the money I knew I would need to get away from my abuser.

It was not long before my abuser found my stash of money. He knew that this money was my escape plan and so demanded that I quit my job. I begged him to let me work, knowing this was the key to getting away from him and protecting my children.

It was shortly after he found my get-away money that the harassing phone calls started at my job at the restaurant. My abuser would call many times during the course of a shift and demand that I "Come home right now." When I told him that I could not come home right then, he would use tactics that would get me crying on the job, trying to make me look bad. Somehow I would pull myself together to finish my shift.

He would even leave my children at home alone, park outside the restaurant, and watch me through the windows. He would call me at work and ask my why I hadn't come home yet. Then he started coming into the restaurant and demanding that I leave work right then and come home with him—even though he knew I could not just leave my job like that.

My life was in danger at this point, and I knew it. Now I needed this job more than ever, and my abuser knew that too. On July 3, 1999, my abuser called and demanded to speak to the owner of the restaurant. My abuser threatened the owner. I understood my boss was concerned about his safety, but I still wonder why he did not call the police and get a restraining order against my abuser. I was not the threat; it was my abuser who was the threat. But I was the one who paid the price.

When I was fired, that left me solely financially dependent on my abuser. Everything we owned was in his name. He even said that he would call the police and report the car stolen if I left with it.

My whole world was crushed at this point. How was I going to be able to get away from him now? I had no money, and I had no job. Since I had been employed full-time at the restaurant and had worked for several years prior to that, I went down and applied for benefits at the unemployment office. I thought at least this would be a little something coming in to get me back on my feet. I was refused unemployment not once, but twice.

After I got fired, my abuser refused to let me go back to work for several months. I was not allowed to talk to anyone unless he was present, and I could not go anywhere unless he knew exactly where I was going and when I was coming back. He would also call me all the time on my cell phone just to check up on me.

I needed another job. I had to get out of my prison. In September 1999, I diligently started looking for another job and finally found one at the credit union. The hired me knowing my story and why I needed this job so badly. I was completely honest about my situation.

The first day on the job, my abuser began driving by the credit union and blowing the horn of his car. On the second day, he started driving through the parking lot, parking outside the window where he could watch me, just like he had done when I worked at the restaurant. He was scaring not just me, but my coworkers, too.

I was not due in the office again until 9 a.m. the next morning. My abuser knew that and so started calling the credit union at

8:30 a.m., asking my boss where I was and why I was not at work. When I arrived at work, I was called into the office and told that I no longer had a job with them because of my abuser's behavior. They said that I was a good worker and fast learner, but they could not tolerate what he was doing. It was only my third and last day on the job.

The police said there was nothing they could do about it without a restraining order, but I could not get a restraining order because my abuser and I were still living together, and without my job, I could not afford to move out.

Without a job, I was stuck. Without a job or other means to support my children, I did not know how I was ever going to get away from this monster. If there had been workplace protections for victims of domestic violence, I might have been able to keep my job, a job that I needed desperately if I was ever going to escape. Also, my employer would have known better how to assist me rather than punishing me for something that was out of my control. At the very least, unemployment insurance would have given me the chance to get out and get help.

There is more to my story. My husband left the house, and I used that opportunity to file for a restraining order. I got a job as a gift shop cashier. Two weeks later, he came back, smashing the window in our house. I was scared to death.

My court date for the restraining order was still a few days away, but when it was granted, the judge told me that I was the one who had to leave the house. But at least this time, I had a job and could find a place for my kids and me.

About a month later, on November 10, 1999, my abuser attacked me. He tried to murder me, and I was seriously wounded. I was lucky that my abuser was eventually put in prison. Unfortunately, many women still live in their abusive relationships.

A steady job is critical for women like me. It is the only sure way we can get the economic security that we need to get ourselves out of an abusive situation.

Once again, I want to thank you for inviting me to come and share my story with you.

Senator WELLSTONE. And what a story. We rarely hear more powerful testimony—rarely. Thank you so much. Thank you for being here.

Dr. Harman?

Mr. HARMAN. Senator, if I had no better reason to be here today listening to Ms. Evsich, it would have been reason quite enough. And for that matter, since we are each of us talking about courage of one sort or another, I can simply not restrain my wish to speak of yours and to tell you how inspiring your personal approach to life is. So I am honored to be with you, Senator.

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you.

Mr. HARMAN. I am Sidney Harman. I am executive chairman of Harman International, a worldwide company with over 10,000 employees and annual revenues of nearly $2 billion.

If one thinks domestic violence only affects home life and is not an issue in the workplace, that person is very wrong. Domestic violence does not stay at home when an abused employee goes to work.

My company, like many others, has been adversely affected by domestic violence, and we have chosen to do something about it.

On May 29, 2001, Teresa Duran, a woman 56 years of age and a beloved 24-year employee at Harman, was viciously murdered by her ex-husband as she returned home from work. That incident moved me to create a company domestic violence program that informs all of our employees about the dynamics, the realities, and the consequences of domestic violence.

With the assistance of the Family Violence Prevention Fund, we developed a program which heightens awareness of domestic violence and its effects in the workplace, provides guidance for employees and, equally important, for managers, and creates a safe workplace environment.

A key part of our program has been mandatory training of managers and employees in all of our domestic divisions. Training is comprised of an education component, which provides information about violence, posters, safety cards, brochures, so that employees have the information available when they most need it; support, which often takes the form of an understanding performance appraisal which factors in their domestic circumstances; an atmosphere which encourages employees to seek assistance if needed; and trained staff who do not offer advice but make active referrals to appropriate local community resources, those appropriate community resources, possessed of domestic violence expertise.

Because women are the targets of abuse in an astonishing 85 percent of all reported intimate partner violence, I focus my comments today on women, although we should understand that men can be victims of abuse, and women can also be abusive.

Domestic violence is flat out unacceptable, and there is no excuse for violence whether it takes place in the home or in the office. It is up to all of us—legislators, educators, community and business leaders—it is up to everyone to take the necessary steps to protect women from abuse. Domestic violence has a dramatic impact on the children who witness it, in some cases continuing the cycle of violence into the next generation. Our children are our future; what affects them affects us all.

As the executive chairman of a successful, ethical, multibillion-dollar company, I am not responsible only for the numbers; I am also responsible for all the people I work with. If one of our employees is abused at home, that is my business, and my company has a responsibility to do what it can to give her the support she needs to be safe.

At Harman, we are committed to treating employees who are victims of domestic violence fairly, and we will not make negative employment decisions, including recruiting, hiring, promotion, discipline or termination of employees, based on knowledge or perception that an employee is a victim of domestic violence.

We are also responsible for making sure that our workplace is safe for everyone. At Harman, we will not tolerate acts or threats of domestic violence or violence against any employee while on Harman property or while conducting our business. Any employee who threatens, harasses, or abuses someone at the workplace or from the workplace while conducting Harman business is subject to

corrective or disciplinary action, including termination of employment.

We have looked at the strengths and weaknesses of our internal security systems and developed site-specific plans to address risky situations while taking steps to protect the victim's confidentiality and freedom of personal decision and action. We recognize the need to be flexible and, where possible, will consider relocation and, in appropriate situations, approve and even encourage time off to get an order of protection or to file a police report.

The company will not take action against an employee for taking that approved time. We also have internal emergency funds and other financial support available.

Earlier, I mentioned Terry Duran, who left two children behind and made us take a hard look at whether we were doing enough, whether we were protecting our employees as well as we should. Since we began our domestic violence program, numerous employees in all divisions of our company around the country have come forward and spoken about their domestic violence situations at home. They have told us that were it not for the training, they would not have been comfortable talking about their situations or asking for help. And help, they have received. In one instance, a potentially life-threatening situation was defused, and in several others, referrals were made to local agencies for ongoing support.

We know firsthand that domestic violence can have a devastating impact on the workplace. We also know that it is in the interest of all employers to provide support—not obstacles—to employees threatened by domestic violence. Business is in a unique position to deal with the dirty secret of domestic violence, and it is my hope that other business leaders around the country will join us in that effort.

Senator WELLSTONE. Dr. Harman, thank you.

I want to ask you, Ms. Rodgers, and all here—I think you of all people will understand this—two doors down, there has been a stalling tactic on the convention to end discrimination against women, and they need one vote for a quorum. I would like to suspend this committee meeting for about 3 minutes. I will be right back, but I want to be that vote, if that is all right. [Applause.]

[Recess.]

Senator WELLSTONE. I apologize, Ms. Rodgers, and I apologize to all of you.

Please proceed, Ms. Rodgers, with your testimony.

Ms. RODGERS. Please, Senator, there is no need to apologize. We thank you.

I thank you for having me here and for your leadership on this issue and so many others, which has been absolutely critical to making progress on these issues. I think that your very short break just now is more evidence of your commitment to these important issues. So we thank you.

I am Kathy Rodgers, president of NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund, which is the oldest and largest legal advocacy organization devoted to achieving women's equality.

Two of our goals are to bring an end to violence against women and to eliminate barriers to women's economic security. So to these ends, we chair the National Task Force to end Sexual and Domes-

tic Violence Against Women; we provide legal assistance and information to thousands of domestic violence survivors through our Employment Rights for Survivors of Abuse Project; we have partnered with companies of all sizes, including Fortune 500 companies, to develop best practices and to deal with the effects of violence against women; and we have authored a popular corporate handbook, "Creating Solutions, Creating Change," which I have here and have appended to our testimony.

Now Legal Defense also played a leadership role in the passage of the Violence Against Women Act and its reauthorization, and the pending Victims Economic Security and Safety Act, VESSA.

So what is the scope of this problem? In a word, it is huge. Annually, almost 3 million people are victimized by intimate partners. Over one million women are stalked, and up to 400,000 people are raped. In each year between 1992 and 1996, more than 2 million Americans were victims of a violent crime in the workplace. As many as 56 percent of battered women were harassed at work by their batterers. Violence against women is a workplace issue, plain and simple.

Senator WELLSTONE. Ms. Rodgers, can I interrupt you again? I am looking behind you, and I can read the Congresswoman's face.

Congresswoman Harman, while you are here, please join me up here, because you are following all the testimony anyway. Please join us up here—please—and when you need to leave, you can leave.

Ms. HARMAN. I need to leave in 5 minutes.

Senator WELLSTONE. All right, but I was watching, and as Ms. Rodgers was speaking, the Congresswoman was nodding her head, and I thought, "She ought to be up here."

Ms. HARMAN. Senator, I thank you. Another time.

Senator WELLSTONE. All right.

Mr. HARMAN. Since you have interrupted, Senator, may I thank you. You spoke of the fact that Congresswoman Harman is seen by you frequently on television. I have been reduced to watching the tube in order to get a view of her, so it was a very special benefit to me that you arranged to have her come here so I could see her, literally and pleasurably, this morning. [Laughter.]

Senator WELLSTONE. Ms. Rodgers, please continue.

Ms. RODGERS. Usually, Representative Harman is ahead of, not behind, me.

So as I was saying, there is some light in this picture, because much of this violence and its effects are preventable, and there are many low- or indeed even no-cost changes which employers can make to help protect victims.

But when we suggest talking to her employer, a victim's first response is often: "I am afraid to. I will lose my job." And this, as we have just heard, is a very real fear. One-quarter to one-half of victims lose a job due to domestic violence. Almost 50 percent of sexual assault survivors lose their jobs or are forced to quit. And outside of New York City—the only place that prohibits employment discrimination against victims of domestic violence—we cannot assure an employee that she can keep the job that gives her the means to escape the violent relationship.

Losing a job has forced many survivors to rely on welfare. As many as 70 percent of women on welfare report having been a victim of intimate violence.

Several studies, including one that we did, found that batterers sabotage their victims' efforts to move from welfare to work by destroying clothing, by inflicting visible injuries, by reneging on promises to provide child care, or keeping their victims up late before exams or before a job interview. Kathy Evsich has just made this compellingly real for all of us.

But sound corporate and Government policies can help survivors keep their jobs and stay off of welfare. And forward-thinking companies like Harman International understand the impact of violence on their employees. It undeniably affects the bottom line.

Domestic violence alone costs employers $3 to $5 billion a year in missed days of work and lost productivity. Losing valuable employees generates substantial hiring and training costs. Some employers, commendably, are adopting positive policies. But employers that penalize victims must be directed to end such discrimination.

Eighteen States have passed laws providing unemployment insurance to employees who leave their jobs due to domestic violence. This is vital, but it helps victims after they lose their jobs. Three States—only three—California, Maine, and Colorado—target preventing job loss by providing employment leave to domestic violence victims. Maine and Colorado also extend that leave to victims of stalking and sexual assault.

Earlier this year, Maine expanded its law to cover employees whose children are victims. There is an interesting lesson in this, because the Maine State Chamber of Commerce recalled that they had "expressed concerns about" the original bill, but they supported the amendment, because they found the law to be "relatively unburdensome to the workplace," and they heard no complaints or concerns about its implementation.

So we think that there are at least five specific solutions to address the critical issues. The first two—the availability of leave and protection from discrimination—will help a victim keep her job. The third is eligibility for unemployment insurance in the event that nonetheless she must leave her job, perhaps to escape her abuser.

Fourth, she should be protected from discriminatory health insurance coverage, which all too often leaves out victims of violence.

Finally, we think that employers should be encouraged to do the right thing and take appropriate actions, and they could be with tax credits for the cost of anti-violence efforts.

So NOW Legal Defense urges Congress to consider workplace violence protection policies like those that we have talked about, like those that are included in VESSA. This would be an important step forward in dealing comprehensively with the national issue of domestic and sexual violence and a rare opportunity for a real win-win for employees and employers, for our economy, and for our society.

Thank you, Senator.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Rodgers may be found in additional material.]

Senator WELLSTONE. Thank you, Ms. Rodgers.

I wanted to say to you that on the provisions of the legislation that you outline, our strategy is to have—and each of you have been so helpful in this regard—a formal committee hearing, have the testimony, and then—I do not know if in the time we have left this session—but now we can move this to the floor, and we intend to do so maybe next session, but we intend to do it.

I think this is the next real area to go into, along with really paying special attention to children who witness the violence and the impact this has on kids and how to provide help there.

I will start with you, Kathy, if that is okay. When you were going through this nightmare, was there anyplace at all that you felt you could turn, if I could ask such a personal question?

Ms. EVSICH. No. I did not realize that there were agencies where I could go for help. Nobody had pointed that out to me. The only thing I knew was my job, to get the money that I needed to get an apartment and to be able to take my children out of the home.

Senator WELLSTONE. What kinds of things do you think your employers could have done to protect you that they did not do that would have helped you to keep your job?

Ms. EVSICH. I think they could have gotten a restraining order to keep him off the business property. They could have gotten the police involved. The job was only 2 minutes from the police department, and the police are in there constantly, eating. They could have gotten help from the local police department to keep him off the property and prevent him from calling.

Senator WELLSTONE. If I could ask you what prevented them from doing this—was it just their attitude about it—why not, if I can ask?

Ms. EVSICH. I do not think they wanted to become involved; it was my problem, and they did not want to make it their problem.

Senator WELLSTONE. And they viewed it as sort of your own making, too—in other words, it was your problem, and you really were a part of the cause of the problem, or——

Ms. EVSICH. No, I do not think they thought that I was the cause of the problem.

Senator WELLSTONE. They just thought that it was kind of unpleasant and ugly, and they wanted to be away from it. Is that what you are saying?

Ms. EVSICH. Right. They did not want the violence being brought into their workplace.

Senator WELLSTONE. What was the reason the employment agency gave you for denying you your benefits?

Ms. EVSICH. Because I was fired from my job; I was not laid off. And you cannot get unemployment benefits for being fired. I tried to appeal it, but they denied that as well.

Senator WELLSTONE. That is one of the things that Ms. Rodgers is referring to that we would like to cover in the legislation.

For the record, if you do not mind, what do you consider to be the most important lesson that you have learned from your experience that you want to the Senate to be aware of, if you had to just summarize—because you are here to help other people. So what would you say as, "Senator, ultimately, this is the most important thing you all need to know"?

Ms. EVSICH. That workplaces need to know and understand the dynamics of abuse; that the whole aim of an abuser is to make the victim solely dependent upon them so they cannot leave.

Businesses have to realize that a victim is working so that she can get out of the home; she needs that financial insurance, security, whatever you want to call it, to make herself free from her situation. She cannot buy clothes for her children, she cannot buy food for her children, or put a roof over their heads if she does not have the money to do it. Businesses need to understand that, that victims are not working for the pleasure of working.

Senator WELLSTONE. So part of the issue is that all too often on the part of the abuser—and as Dr. Harman said, sometimes it is the other way around, but most of the time, it is women who are on the receiving end of this—part of it is their control of power, but the other thing that you are saying is that if we do not have a way of being economically independent, then we are really unable to leave the home even if we know it is very dangerous for ourselves and our children.

Ms. EVSICH. Right.

Senator WELLSTONE. One thing I want to say to Dr. Harman about Teresa Duran—I have special feelings for people who are very human and show it, and you obviously care deeply about this, and your emotion was very moving—she obviously was not and is not a statistic to you but is someone whom you cared deeply about.

And then, I guess if there is anything that is wonderful about it, it is that you basically decided that in honor of her, you were going to try to put into effect this policy that you talked about within the company, and I think that is wonderful.

Could you describe what it means for the women in your workplace to know they have a place to turn to and what kind of feedback you are getting from actually women and men who work for the company about the policy?

Mr. HARMAN. Senator, if I may, there are three bits of data that seem to me so compelling. More than three women are assassinated in this country every day by husbands and boyfriends. In a 1998 study, more than 30 percent of the women respondents indicated that at some point in their lives, they had in fact been the victims of aggressive, violent behavior by a husband or boyfriend, and over 74 percent of those incidents occurred at the workplace.

One does not have to be a brain surgeon or a Senator to recognize that that is compelling evidence that something is wrong. And the very fact that so few people are aware of it prompted me in my testimony to speak of it as a "dirty little secret"—well, it is a very large dirty secret.

The response in our company has been surprising. It is a response shared by male and female employees alike. In the first place, and perhaps most meaningful to me, I have time and again been told by employees that they are proud of the company. And they do not personalize it with me; they see it as an expression of a company that cares.

Senator WELLSTONE. And you have heard from as many men as women on this?

Mr. HARMAN. Yes—many more female workers than male workers, not surprisingly; more male managers, supervisors—but male and female alike.

The fact that the company cares is really meaningful to them. That sense that there is a place important in their lives that protects them is, I think, fundamental and a fundamental responsibility of any employer. In my judgment, no employer is free to feel that it is a 9 to 5 engagement. He is part of the community, the company is part of the community, and the concern must extend beyond the workplace, beyond the plant, to the home, to the school, to the kids, to the entire community.

Senator WELLSTONE. Let me ask you this. We have talked about the employees. How about for the company? What has been the impact of this on the company?

Mr. HARMAN. I must put it in context. I think that any company that has no other expression of concern for its employees is likely to find that a program of this sort is a dead end. It must be in the context of an overall commitment, even a cultural point of view that says this is part of a systemic approach to the relationship of the managers to the managed.

If there were time, I could recite for you other expressions of my company's activity in that respect, but I think the fundamental needs to be identified. This, as everything else we do that is respectful of the people who do the work, honors the people who do the work, honors the company. The consequences of it are such that when, 10 years ago, there was a frightful earthquake in North Ridge, CA, where the site of our million-square-foot plant is located—North Ridge was at the very epicenter of the earthquake—our employees came to reassemble that totally destroyed plant, many of them traveling 8 or 10 hours a day, because as you may remember, the roads were destroyed. It is a cultural environment that this must be a piece of. When that exists, employees nurture the company; productivity, contributions to original thinking are rich, and the company and its shareholders are the ultimate beneficiaries.

Senator WELLSTONE. Well, I quite understand why you want to put it in the broader context, but just to stay on the particular the topic of this committee hearing, part of what you are also saying, I gather, Dr. Harman, is that a company that puts into effect a policy as you have is likely to engender high morale among especially the women in the work force to know that they work for such a company. It seems to me from a business point of view to be a positive, I gather.

Mr. HARMAN. It is without any question in my mind.

Senator WELLSTONE. What about other companies and other CEOs? What is your candid assessment? Do colleagues talk about this? Is there awareness of it? Is there much leadership on it, or do we just have a long way to go?

Mr. HARMAN. No, I have little awareness of attention to it, of interest in it, and for that matter even fundamental awareness of it. That is true at virtually every level of the material that I have been speaking about, and that is why I think the context is so critical.

One does not generate the kind of concern and, if you like, the emotional responsiveness that I was guilty of earlier, in a vacuum. This is the consequence of a total point of view about the workplace and about the employees, and unless that is there in other firms, it is not likely that their chief executives or their chairmen are going to be particularly sensitive to this material.

Senator WELLSTONE. Well, sometimes, legislation can help in that respect—although that is not the answer.

Ms. Rodgers, how well do the current laws—I will be going tomorrow to Justin Dart's service and will be thinking about the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Family and Medical Leave Act, and Title VII—how well do they protect victims of domestic violence in the workplace?

Ms. RODGERS. Senator, many of these existing statutes touch on pieces of this problem, but there is none that deals with it comprehensively, which is what would suggest taking a view toward a piece of legislation that says this is a big enough issue that we need to deal with all aspects of it and all of it in one place.

For example, the Americans with Disabilities Act only deals with people who are disabled. Not all victims of violence are disabled and so would not be eligible under that act, plus it does not deal with the issues of unemployment insurance or leave policies.

The Family and Medical Leave Act is similarly limited to people with serious health problems. It does not cover the practical problems of needing time off to go to court or to take care of your children's school situation or something like that that arises out a violent situation. Again, it does not deal with unemployment insurance, either.

Title VII, I think you can make a case, and we have in one situation for a client out in Oregon, that firing the female employee who was innocent rather than the male coworker who was the abuser and causing the problem was sex discrimination where you had the victim and the abuser both working for the same employer.

It would be much better and much more effective if we had a specific statement, a clear statement, that said that discriminating against a woman because of the violence in her life, which has nothing to do with her actions, would get to the heart of this issue and be much more effective.

Senator WELLSTONE. How much would the policies of applying the Family and Medical Leave or unemployment insurance cost the business community?

Ms. RODGERS. We do not have exact numbers on that. The Family and Medical Leave Act does not apply at the moment, but we have three States that do allow such leave, and I think the State of Maine Chamber of Commerce epiphany about this is very powerful. It did not have a huge impact in practice.

I think the other thing that we have to think about in terms of cost is that the time off for this kind of leave, which does not have to be a long period of time, is an investment in an employee. It avoids the cost of hiring a new employee and training a new employee and keeps an employee very loyal to the employer. It is not just a cost—it is an investment in a good work force—not to forget the other ancillary benefits of the way it makes other employees feel, the morale factor that you were just talking about.

Senator WELLSTONE. Let me ask you one final question, because this will probably be a very contentious issue this September, on the whole question of TANF and welfare reform and the notion of work, and then trying to reach a goal of maybe 70 percent of the mothers working outside the home 40 hours a week, or 30 hours a week.

Can you spell out for us how domestic violence, and also as it spills off to the workplace, would affect this requirement that women work? In other words, what kinds of protections do you need to have? If you had a situation, to be hypothetical—and you can fill it in—where you were saying, listen, you had better work, and if you are not working, you are sanctioned, and you are off welfare, and yet that woman could not work at that job because of the violence, then it would seem to me, going back to Ms. Evsich's testimony, that in a way what you are doing is you are now putting her in situation where, if she is not going to receive the welfare benefits, she really is going to have to stay with her abuser, whether it be a boyfriend or whatever.

Talk a little bit about how this intersects and what we need to be thinking about to provide protection here.

Ms. RODGERS. Well, the short answer to that is that violence makes women poor and keeps women poor. It throws them into poverty because they lose their job or economic security. It keeps them in that situation because they cannot work. If the TANF reauthorization does not recognize the fact that a woman who is in a violent situation must deal with that situation first and get herself out of it to make herself workable, then it is just going to be the U.S. Government punishing that woman yet again for the crimes of somebody else. That is the U.S. Government punishing children for the crimes of somebody else. I do not think the Government should be in that business.

We did in the original 1996 TANF manage to get the family violence option into the welfare reform. We had hoped it would be mandatory, but it was an option which said that these requirements could be waived for a temporary period to give the woman the kind of help and support she needs so that she can work.

What Senators need to know is that these women want to work. They do not want to stay in this situation forever. But we as a society need to provide some support.

The good news is that some 40-plus States have adopted either the family violence option or something very close to it. It has had some beneficial effects. We think that the States that have not done that should be required to do it.

Senator WELLSTONE. Senator Murray and I wrote that, and we wanted to do it that way and could not, so we are going to have to revisit it.

I want to thank all of you, and I want to tell you— because again, some Senators were here, and I am not making excuses for anybody, but I do not want people to think it is due to lack of interest, and then we had the Judiciary Committee meeting, and a number of people, including the chair, had to be there—it is really important to do this, because we are not going to get this on the floor if we do not go through this committee hearing. So your testimony helps us a lot. I do not want anybody to think it is some

sleepy meeting that is symbolic, and nothing is going to happen. There will be follow-through and follow-up on what you have said.

So I would like to thank all of you very much.

The committee hearing is adjourned.

[Additional material follows.]

# ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF DIANE STUART

Thank you, Senator Kennedy, Senator Gregg, and members of the Committee, for the opportunity to speak with you about the issue of violence against women in the workplace. As the Committee recognizes, this is a critical issue that affects thousands of American women each year. Violence against women in the workplace differs from other types of workplace violence often because of the victim's intimate relationship with the offender. Victims of domestic violence and stalking find little safety from their abusers, even in the workplace. However, if employers take the responsibility to put the appropriate protections in place, the workplace can be a safe place for women who experience these horrifying crimes.

I am Diane Stuart, the Director of the Violence Against Women Office, a component of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) in the U.S. Department of Justice. The Violence Against Women Office administers financial and technical assistance to communities around the country that are creating programs, policies, and practices aimed at ending domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking wherever it may occur. Our mission is to provide federal leadership in developing the nation's capacity to: reduce violence against women; administer justice for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and strengthen services for women victims of violence. The long-term goal of our efforts is to ensure that these crimes are viewed as unacceptable and are no longer tolerated in our society.

The Violence Against Women Office is addressing the issue of violence against women in the workplace in collaboration with other federal agencies. With our colleagues in the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services, as well as with other experts across the country, we have begun examining this issue and how we at the federal level can best provide assistance to employers.

OJP's Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that an average of 1.7 million violent incidents occur in the workplace each year. Eighteen percent of all violent crimes committed in this country occur in the workplace, and 15 percent of all violent crimes against women occur at work. Almost 10 of every 1,000 women in our American workforce have experienced violence in the workplace including incidents of murder, rape, and aggravated assault. Workplace homicide is the third leading cause of job-related deaths, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For women, homicide is the leading cause of death on the job, and 20 percent of those murders were perpetrated by women's partners. Let me give you a few real-life examples:

In Aurora, Colorado, Victor Cordova turned violent after his wife Stephanie left him. Their four-year marriage had a history of domestic violence. He entered the cake store where she worked and shot Stephanie and then turned the gun on himself. The couple had a 2-year-old daughter and a 6-year-old son.

In Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, Pamela Diamond was shot and critically wounded when her husband visited her workplace. She had lived with her abusive husband for 20 years before she decided she had had enough. She moved out and filed a request for a protective order. When her husband, Jimmy Dean Harris, went to the transmission shop where she worked, an argument ensued and her boss stepped in to protect her. The boss was shot and killed and Pamela was critically wounded.

In Grand Junction, Colorado, Sarah Miller Anderson was in the process of leaving her husband Chad. After a violent argument where Chad tried to suffocate her, Sarah filed a temporary restraining order. A few weeks later, Chad showed up briefly at her workplace, the City Market, where she worked as a checker. They spoke briefly and he left. Sarah didn't call the police, but called her father and asked him to come to the store. Before he could get there, Chad returned to the store and gunned down his wife, two bystanders, and himself.

Domestic violence has unique characteristics that differentiate it from other forms of violence in the workplace. Domestic violence is a pattern of assaults and controlling behavior perpetrated by an intimate partner, which can be physical, psychological, and financial.

Domestic violence spills into the workplace because it is an easy place for the abuser to find the victim. In most cases, the abuser is threatened by the fact that the victim is working outside of the home and feels intense jealousy and rage that her attentions are directed elsewhere. For many victims of domestic violence, the workplace may be one of the only places where they are not under the watchful eye of their abuser. It may be the one place where a victim is free to seek assistance without fear of retribution. To their credit, many employers have trained supervisors, employees, and support personnel on the dynamics of domestic violence and stalking and the appropriate responses to violent situations as they enter the workplace. When effective training occurs, coworkers and supervisors are prepared to as-

sist the employee to deal with her abusive and often violent situation as it impacts her work environment.

Statistics show that stalkers also commit a significant number of violent acts in or around the places where their victims work. A survey by the Justice Department's National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the Department of Health and Human Services, found that the most common activity engaged in by stalkers included standing outside the victims' places of work. The survey also found that stalking victims often go to extraordinary lengths to keep themselves safe, including switching jobs so that stalkers cannot find them. Another issue coming to the forefront is a new and more common form of stalking harassment via e-mail or the Internet, so-called "cyber-stalking."

The survey also examined the economic costs of stalking. Twenty-six percent of the stalking victims interviewed said their victimization caused them to lose time from work. Seven percent said they never returned to work at all in an effort to evade their stalkers. One victim interviewed for the study was even fired from her job because the stalker harassed her at work and disrupted the workplace. She eventually had to declare bankruptcy.

Other studies show employers, as well as victims, suffer real costs as the result of domestic violence in the workplace. A survey by the American Management Association found that companies report that these incidents have a negative impact on employee morale, worker productivity, and service or product delivery. The economic effects of domestic violence alone can be devastating for America's businesses. According to the Bureau of National Affairs, American businesses pay an estimated $3 to $5 billion a year in medical expenses associated with domestic violence.

In response to concerns about workplace violence, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management organized the Interagency Working Group on Violence in the Workplace, which developed comprehensive approaches to analyzing and responding to threats or incidents of violence in the federal workplace. As a result, OPM developed Responding to Domestic Violence: Where Federal Employees Can Find Help, a guidebook for federal employees, as well as a shorter pamphlet that has been made available to all federal employees in the nation.

The guidebook serves as a model to other public employers. Considered one of the best of its kind, it provides concise up-to-date information on domestic violence, with concrete advice for the employee who is a victim, for friends and coworkers, and for their supervisors. It also guides supervisors through an array of management tools that can be used to assist federal employees in abusive relationships. In addition, the handbook includes resources for persons in abusive relationships, instructions for creating a safety plan, and workplace options for increasing safety and support.

To help address violence against women, including workplace violence, at the community level, the National Advisory Council on Violence Against Women, in collaboration with the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services, developed the Web-based Toolkit To End Violence Against Women. The Toolkit discusses promoting safety in the workplace and presents a number of recommendations that business and communities can consider. These recommendations include the development of policies, prevention strategies, referrals to service providers, and awareness of the issue.

The Toolkit also includes recommendations for what sexual assault and domestic violence service providers can do to address violence against women in the workplace. The recommendations include: training for staff on the effects of workplace violence on victims; improved client intake procedures to identify victims of workplace violence; outreach initiatives to improve awareness among the business community; and the development of services for victims of workplace violence in coordination with local businesses, labor organizations, and community groups.

A number of private companies have taken the initiative to create model violence awareness and prevention programs for their employees. Last month I had the opportunity to speak at an FBI Symposium on Workplace Violence where an entire day was devoted to the issue of domestic violence in the workplace. The Symposium was attended by a wide audience, including law enforcement officials, prosecutors, policymakers, victim advocates, and private industry. Several of the presenters represented large corporations. I was amazed and inspired by the creative approaches these companies have taken, not only to create plans for handling violence in the workplace, but also to educate the general public on the issue through publications, community service, and public service announcements. And, many employers have displayed remarkable innovation in the development of their policies and programs related to domestic violence. Through their good work, they are not only setting an example for other employers and creating a work environment where employees can feel safe, they are helping to change the business community's approach towards violence against women.

The Violence Against Women Office is working to further efforts such as this and to enable even small businesses to assist employees threatened by violence. In 2001, the Office provided funding support to the Family Violence Prevention Fund (FVPF) to develop state leadership teams of businesses, victim services, and law enforcement and to create models of multi-disciplinary responses to domestic violence in the workplace. FVPF is a nonprofit victims advocacy group that, for more than 20 years, has been a leading voice on addressing the issue of violence against women in the workplace.

Under the National Corporate Citizenship Initiative on Domestic Violence, FVPF is helping 20 state leadership teams to develop action plans to improve their state's workplace response to domestic violence. The teams are examining issues such as how employers should address employees who perpetrate domestic violence and how to reach out to immigrant and refugee workers who are being abused. FVPF also is helping the state leadership teams to improve workplace responses to domestic violence in their states by convening meetings to highlight promising practices, distributing a model policy on how employers should address the problem of employees who are perpetrating domestic violence, and working with the National

Center for Victims of Crime to develop a protocol on how employers and law enforcement should work together to assist employees threatened by domestic violence.

The Justice Department's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) has also worked with FVPF to address the problem of violence against women in the workplace. OVC funding helped establish the National Workplace Resource Center on Domestic Violence, an FVPF project that serves as a clearinghouse of information on national and local responses to domestic violence as a workplace issue.

OVC also produced an award-winning video, entitled Domestic Violence: The Workplace Responds, that outlines steps workplaces can take to help employees who are in abusive relationships. The OVC video incorporates testimony from survivors of domestic violence, their coworkers and employers, and experts about the impact of domestic violence on the workplace. A companion training package for employers concerned about protecting and supporting victims of domestic violence is also available through the Family Violence Prevention Fund.

In addition, I want to make you aware that through its Administration for Children and Families (ACF), the Department of Health and Human Services is working to address violence against women, including workplace violence. For example, ACF provides funding through the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act to support the Domestic Violence Resource Network (DVRN), which provides critical expertise and leadership for the domestic violence field. Members of the DVRN work in partnership to ensure that domestic violence-related training and technical assistance available throughout the country is complementary, comprehensive, appropriate, and informed by the entire network. The network strengthens existing support systems serving battered women, their children, and other victims of domestic violence.

The members of the Network are: the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; the Battered Women's Justice Project; the Resource Center on Child Protection and Custody; The Sacred Circle, a resource center for Indian tribes and tribal organizations; and the Health Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Each of these resource centers creates partnerships with community-based domestic violence programs, state coalitions, federal, state, and local public agencies, and others involved in assisting victims of domestic violence. Each conducts a variety of activities, including: technical assistance, training, policy development, identification of model programs, development of policies and publications, and assistance to federal, state, and tribal agencies. The demand for technical assistance from the resource centers has far exceeded expectations. Calls come from every state and territory and many tribes.

Each resource center is charged with a specific domestic violence subject area. The Health Resource Center on Domestic Violence, which is operated by the Family Violence Prevention Fund, provides training, technical assistance, and information on the issue of violence against women in the workplace. The Health Resource Center reports that 94 percent of corporate security directors rank domestic violence as a high security problem at their company and 71 percent of human resources and security personnel surveyed had an incident of domestic violence occurring on company property. The center provides information on how individuals in a violent relationship can make a safety plan at work and how companies can become involved in the issue of domestic violence in order to insure a safe workplace for their employees.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 requires the Department of Justice to develop a report to Congress on violence against women in the workplace. The Violence Against Women Office is in the process of

writing this report and has engaged FVPF to help it fulfill this mandate. The report will describe the results of a national survey of plans, programs, and practices developed to assist employers and employees on appropriate responses related to victims of domestic violence, stalking, or sexual assault in the workplace. The report also will analyze the effects of these crimes on small, medium, and large businesses, including data on productivity and performance, and will include recommendations to assist employers and employees affected in the workplace by incidents of domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault. As an additional tool for researchers and policy makers, the report will provide Congress with an annotated bibliography of current resources available to assist employers and employees to develop appropriate responses to domestic violence. We hope that this report will make a significant contribution to the understanding of the issue of violence against women in the workplace.

Through these and other initiatives, the Department of Justice is working with its colleagues in the private and public sector to better understand and address the problem of violence against women in the workplace. From our work on this issue, we have learned that it is only through a coordinated, community response that we can be successful in our efforts to end violence against women. Working in partnership with employers, we can help to educate them about the dangers of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking and assist them with establishing effective policies and programs. Employers play a unique and vital role in helping to change attitudes and perceptions regarding violence against women, and we must continue to be supportive in their efforts. Violence against women in the workplace is a criminal justice issue, a health issue, and an economic issue. If we are to make any headway in eliminating its threat, the public and private sectors must work in collaboration. Women's lives depend upon it.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LIZ CLAIBORNE INC.

Liz Claiborne Inc. has been intimately involved in raising funds, generating awareness and educating the public about domestic violence for more than ten years in what is a true commitment to help communities mobilize against this crime.

We do this because we believe we have a responsibility to give back to the people who make us successful—our consumers and our employees. And because preventing domestic violence makes sense from a business perspective—you can't have a healthy business without healthy consumers and healthy employees.

With more than half of the women in America working outside the home, business leaders need to recognize that domestic violence is not just a private family issue. It's a bottom-line issue too. It is proven to raise absenteeism and health care costs, and it drives down productivity, We at Liz Claiborne believe we cannot afford not to be involved.

Unfortunately, not everyone agrees. In 1994, we commissioned Roper Starch Worldwide to probe corporate leaders on their awareness of the domestic violence problem and sense of corporate accountability. The one hundred companies involved were selected at random from the list of the Fortune 1000.

57% of the business leaders polled consider domestic violence a major social problem.

33% say domestic violence affects their balance sheet.

A startling 40% are personally aware of employees in their company who have been affected by domestic violence.

66% agree that a company's financial performance would benefit from addressing the issue among its employees, with nearly half identifying loss of productivity, decreased attendance and rising health care costs as areas where domestic violence drags down bottom line performance.

Yet for all this, only 12% of the 100 senior executives polled say that corporations should play a major role in addressing the issue—even though the majority either sponsored domestic violence awareness and support programs or domestic violence counseling and assistance programs for their employees in need. Regardless of their recognition of and in many cases action on this issue, a striking 96% of those asked still feel domestic violence should be addressed primarily by the family. We are benchmarking the survey this year and arc hoping to see that attitudes have changed.

We could not disagree more. At Liz Claiborne, we seek to create an environment of support for our employees who may need help and to encourage others to speak out and thereby reject relationship abuse.

To accomplish this, we have a multi-faceted internal effort that includes an ongoing Employee Assistance Program (EAP) that provides year-round and around the

clock offsite, confidential assistance in coping with family matters, and drug, alcohol and financial crises.

We promote both our EAP and the rational Domestic Violence hotline numbers throughout the Company via: Inserts in paychecks, Rolodex cards, Posters in rest rooms, E:mail messages, and Articles in the Company newsletter.

We participate in National Domestic Violence Awareness Month by distributing educational materials throughout the Company. We have a Domestic Violence Task Force that includes members of Human Resources, Legal, Security and Corporate Communications. This year we have again partnered with Safe Horizon, a non-profit victim assistance, advocacy and violence prevention organization in New York City, to conduct a policy and protocol training session for our human resources and security departments. It is our goal to repeat and extend these sessions or ones like them for all managers and supervisors so that they can be sensitive to and recognize signs of abuse.

We address domestic violence in our employee handbook so that Liz Claiborne associates can see in print the options that are available to them. Our Domestic Violence policy provides guidance for employees and management to address the occurrence of domestic violence and its effects in the workplace. Our Workplace Violence policy addresses the safety and security of all our employees and defines consequences for violation of the policy, investigation procedures and disciplinary actions.

We educate our employees by disseminating brochures and memos that not only provide information on domestic violence, but more importantly outline the lengths to which our Company will go to help victims feel safe—because we know that as critical as education, is action.

Our Security staff, which includes 45 uniformed officers, a six-person in-house security management team, and a six-person proprietary dispatch center, have officers on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There is also a 24-hour confidential hotline number that is listed on the back of every employee's ID card.

We take a number of steps to help employees who are in abusive situations—and those around them—to feel "safe" in the workplace. For example we: Assign special parking spots, Offer escorts to cars or other points of transportation, Educate victims about the resources available to them, Allow time off so associates can seek safety and protection, attend court appearances, arrange for new housing or take care of such matters, and Arrange for flexible hours and short term leaves of absence.

The Company will also assist associates who are perpetrators of abuse in finding appropriate Batterers' Intervention Programs.

But we do not have all the answers. We're still discovering new and better ways to create an environment of support within the Company itself and get our message out to an even broader audience.

From our experience we would say to any corporation, test the waters. Companies large and small can take action. It does not cost much to place a hotline number in a bathroom or break area—but it could make a huge difference in the life of a victim.

Ultimately, we need to work together to create an environment that deems domestic violence unacceptable and intolerable.

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF KATHY RODGERS

### INTRODUCTION

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund has been working for more than thirty years to define and defend women's rights, Our major goals include helping to bring an end to violence against women, and eliminating barriers that deny women economic opportunities. Today's hearing is an opportunity for me to discuss where those two goals intersect, and steps that can be taken to move toward achieving both.

NOW Legal Defense chairs the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, which includes over 2,000 national, state, and local organizations. NOW Legal Defense also provides legal assistance and information to thousands of domestic violence survivors through our "Employment Rights for Survivors of Abuse" project. In that vein, we have also worked with corporations across the country, including Liz Claiborne, American Express, Colgate-Palmolive, Polaroid, and others, to develop best practices for a companies in their efforts to deal with the effects of violence against women in their workplaces. NOW Legal Defense has also authored a popular handbook, "Creating Solutions—Creating Change," which

demonstrates the impact of violence in the lives of working women and provides guidance and solutions to corporations and others who work to address these issues.

NOW Legal Defense is also proud to have participated in the crafting and in leading support for the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, its reauthorization in 2000, and the pending Victims' Economic Security and Safety Act (VESSA, [S. 1249, H.R. 2670]), which will address some of the terribly difficult work situations that survivors of domestic and sexual violence face.

PREVALENCE OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Let me begin by briefly describing the scope of the problem. Since Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act in 1994, domestic and sexual violence has been reduced, but it is still a problem of epidemic proportions. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, "the rate of intimate partner violence against women decreased 21 percent from 1993 to 1998," but intimate partners continue to commit violent crimes at the rate of 937,490 annually against women and 144,620 against men. Another Department of Justice report estimates that 2,800,000 people are victimized by intimate partners annually. Over one million women and over 370,000 men are stalked annually in the United States, and 260,000 to 400,000 people are victims of rape annually.

Twenty-five percent of women surveyed were raped and/or physically assaulted in their lifetime by an intimate partner, compared with eight percent of men. This includes women of all backgrounds: 24.8 percent of white women, 29.1 percent of African-American women, 37.5 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native women, and 15.0 percent of Asian/Pacific Islander women have been raped, physically assaulted or stalked by an intimate partner in their lifetimes. In each year between 1992 and 1996, more than two million U.S. residents were victims of a violent crime in the workplace. About 50,500 individuals, 83 percent of whom are women, were raped or sexually assaulted in the workplace each year during this periods.

VIOLENCE HURTS WOMEN ON THE JOB

Domestic violence is a workplace issue, plain and simple. Violence may enter the workplace when abusers attempt to sabotage their victims ability to work productively by threatening, attacking, stalking, or harassing their victims at work. Between 35 and 56 percent of battered women in three separate studies reported that they were harassed at work by their batterers.

Fortunately, some of this violence is preventable. There are many low- or no-cost changes that an employer can make in the workplace that reduce a batterer's opportunity to harass, threaten or harm an employee during the work day. For example, in order to stop phone harassment, an employer can change an employee's phone extension or route calls through a receptionist. If a batterer has threatened to come to the workplace, registering a copy of the protective order with building security or transferring the employee to another job site or shift may be appropriate. What will work in an individual case will differ based on the nature and seventy of the violence involved and the type of the employee's job and the employer's business.

But, an employer cannot take any steps—to increase safety or to help a good employee keep her job while she is dealing with domestic or sexual violence—unless the employer hears from the employee. The problem is, however; when we suggest that individuals talk to their employers to find a solution to workplace violence, victims' first response is often, "I am afraid to tell my employer, because I might lose my job." This is a very real fear. Between one quarter and one half of domestic violence victims surveyed in three separate studies reported they lost a job due, in part, to domestic violence. Similarly, almost fifty percent of sexual assault survivors lose their jobs or are forced to quit in the aftermath of the crime. More than one quarter of stalking victims report losing time from work due to stalking and seven percent never returned to work. Outside of New York City—the only jurisdiction that explicitly prohibits employment discrimination against victims of domestic violence—we cannot assure an employee that no one can take an adverse job action against her—just for asking for help.

We have learned through our work that all too often employers discriminate against domestic violence victims by firing or disciplining them, simply because they are in an abusive relationship. We have also learned that for many survivors of domestic violence, having a job is a key factor in successfully escaping a violent relationship. A job provides the economic security they need to leave their abusers. Although legislatures and executives across the country have recognized the need to prohibit discrimination against employees because they are victims of domestic or sexual violence, existing laws and policies apply in narrow circumstances only (e.g., only protecting state employees). If Congress prohibits such discrimination, and em-

ployees throughout the country know their employers cannot discriminate against them for disclosing that they are victims of domestic or sexual violence, they are more likely to come forward and talk with their employers about their situations and about how to make the workplace safer for them and their co-workers.

The need for proactively addressing this issue is clear from the statistics and is directly supported by the experiences we hear from individuals about their own experiences. Let me give you a sampling of these stories.

One woman was fired simply for asking her employer to lock the door the day after she left her batterer. She worked at a small clothing manufacturing facility that was not open to the public, so locking the door would not have disrupted her employer's business. In another case, a woman in Oregon was fired after her batterer smashed her car headlights in the employee parking lot and told their joint employer that he would kill her if she continued to work there. The employer fired her, but retained her batterer despite the fact that he was the one who was violent at work.

One client of our "Employment Rights for Survivors of Abuse" project, from Oregon, was fired after she obtained an order of protection against her batterer who was a co-worker at the same office. In several cases, women had to leave their jobs in order to get themselves and their children safe and, because they were in one of the thirty-two states that do not have laws stating that leaving due to domestic violence is "good cause," they needed assistance to appeal denials of their applications for unemployment insurance.

A woman from California contacted us because her abuser, a co-worker, transferred to her office in order to continue to harass her while at work. When she told her supervisor, he advised her not to talk about the abuse because, he said, it could be slander. He also suggested that she should transfer if she was uncomfortable, because they would not take any action on her behalf to remove her abuser from her work site.

A woman working in New York used her available sick days to take time off to heal from injuries inflicted by her abusive ex-boyfriend. However, upon her return to work; her supervisor began insulting her and teasing her about being a victim of domestic violence in front of the other employees, and then fired her. An employee in New Jersey asked her employer to change her phone extension because her ex-boyfriend was harassing her, The employer denied her request and then fired her.

Studies, as well as our experience at NOW Legal Defense, show that victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking are treated differently than other crime victims. They are subjected to adverse treatment, perhaps in part due to stereotypes about domestic violence and sexual assault. We believe legislation such as VESSA is carefully tailored to respond to a particular and documented need.

Until the current law is improved, women will continue to be forced to decide which is worse: staying silent and putting up with harassment and violence, or speaking up and hoping their employers do not fire them.

ADDRESSING THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN THE WORKPLACE WILL HELP KEEP PEOPLE OFF WELFARE, AND HELP RECIPIENTS GO FROM WELFARE TO WORK

Not surprisingly, the economic devastation following the loss of their jobs has forced many survivors of domestic and sexual violence to rely upon welfare. As many as 70 percent of women on welfare report having been a victim of intimate violence at some point in their adult lives, and as many as 30 percent report abuse within the last year. By addressing the employment needs of victims of domestic violence, Congress will help many survivors keep their jobs, secure their economic independence, and stay off welfare. It's an investment with a big payoff.

Addressing the impact of domestic and sexual violence in the workplace is critical for women who are moving from welfare to work. Historically, women have relied on welfare to bridge the gap when they lose jobs due to domestic violence or leave batterers who contribute to household expenses. Studies confirm that from fourteen percent to thirty-two percent of welfare recipients are being abused by their current partners. It would be a tragedy for a woman to make the transition from welfare into a new job, only to be fired when she speaks to her new employer about domestic violence.

Batterers often take actions intended to prevent their victims from making the transition back into employment. In 1996, NOW Legal Defense surveyed 25 job-training providers in New York City. The providers reported that batterers sabotaged their victims' attempts at economic independence by destroying clothing, in-

flicting visible injuries, reneging on promises to provide child care, or keeping their victims up late at night before critical events like exams and job interviews.

Studies conducted elsewhere confirm these findings. For example, a study of domestic violence victims in Wisconsin who were former or current public assistance recipients revealed a very troubling pattern: one out of three reported that they had lost a job due to the violence. They also reported their batterers engaged in behavior that made it more difficult for them to work. More than half reported their batterers threatened them to the point they were afraid to go to school or work, and others reported their batterer refused child care at the last minute or inflicted physical injuries. Workplace protections for these victims are needed to enable women who have made the transition from welfare to work to build on their achievements instead of being pulled back by abusive partners. Congress should ensure that welfare agencies and welfare-to-work employers support survivors, rather than discriminate against them or otherwise hinder their ability to get and keep permanent jobs.

STATE AND LOCAL POLICYMAKERS THROUGHOUT THE NATION ARE RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF ADDRESSING THE EFFECTS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN THE WORKPLACE

Across the country, there is a growing recognition of the need to combat the effects of domestic and sexual violence on the workplace. States, counties, and cities have enacted laws that provide assistance to some employees who are victims of domestic and sexual violence. But, current laws are still inadequate. To date, only New York City prohibits employers from discriminating against domestic violence victims.

Eighteen states have passed laws providing unemployment insurance to employees who leave their jobs due to domestic violence. Unemployment insurance is vital, but it only addresses the problem after the victim loses her job.

Three states—California, Maine, and Colorado—have recognized the importance of preventing job loss by providing employment leave to domestic violence victims in order to go to court, go to the doctor, or take other steps to address the violence. Maine and Colorado extend the availability of leave to victims of stalking or sexual assault (and a similar amendment to California's leave law has passed the Assembly and is now before the State Senate).

Maine was the first state to pass an employment leave law for victims of domestic and sexual violence. Since 1999, all private and public employers in Maine have been required to grant "reasonable and necessary leave from work" for employees who have been victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking to "[p]repare for and attend court proceedings," "[r]eceive medical treatment," or "[o]btain necessary services to remedy a crisis caused by [the violence]." Earlier this year, the law was expanded to cover employees whose child was a victim. The Maine State Chamber of Commerce wrote to the State legislature to express support for the expansion of the leave law. In that letter the organization stated that when the leave law was originally introduced, "the Maine State Chamber expressed concerns about the bill," but the letter goes on to say:

Despite our original reservations the bill became law and has been in place for the last two years, During this time this organization has heard no complaints or concerns with its implementation. It appears that the bill supporters were correct regarding its application and its impart on the workplace.

It is for this reason we believe it is appropriate to extent [sic] the same leave opportunities for parents of children who are unfortunate enough to be victims of violence.

We believe this bill, like the current law, is appropriate given the difficult times we now live in. While we hope that someday we will be in the position that individuals and families do not need to access leave for these very troublesome situations, we recognize that should they need to do so, such leave is appropriate and relatively unburdensome to the workplace. It is for these reasons we would again reiterate our support for LD 1960.

Notably, each of the state leave laws prohibits employers from discriminating against employees who have requested or taken the domestic violence leave provided in the law.

A few other states have prohibited employers from discriminating against or firing domestic violence victims in certain, narrow circumstances. New York State employees are protected by the State Domestic Violence Policy, which states that agencies must "[e]nsure that personnel policies and procedures do not discriminate against victims of domestic violence and are responsive to the needs of victims of domestic violence." New York State law also prohibits employers from discharging crime victims for taking time off to get an order of protection. Similarly, Rhode Island prohibits employers from discriminating against employees because they have obtained

or sought a civil order of protection. The state of Maryland prohibits state agencies from treating their employees unfairly based solely on their status as victims of domestic violence. These laws, however, are of no use to the battered woman who works for a private employer. Without similar workplace protections, she has no assurance that her employer cannot discharge her or retaliate against her just because she is in an abusive relationship or dares to come forward to ask for a small adjustment in her job structure to prevent harassment by her batterer at work.

NOW Legal Defense urges Congress to consider workplace violence protection policies, such as those included in legislation such as VESSA. This would be an important step forward in dealing comprehensively with domestic and sexual violence and its effects in the workplace.

ADDRESSING DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE IS GOOD BUSINESS

Forward-thinking companies, such as Harmon International under the visionary leadership of my fellow panelist, have realized that addressing the effects of violence against women in their workplaces is simply good business practice. These corporations understand that this issue affects their most important asset—their employees—and so undeniably affects the corporate bottom line. Domestic violence costs employers at least $3 to $5 billion a year in missed days of work and reduced productivity. These figures do not begin to address the costs of additional security, liability, and employee assistance benefits, or the toll violence takes on women's personal economic security.

Legislation assisting victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking to retain their employment will benefit employers as well. Sixty-six percent of senior business executives surveyed said their companies' financial performances would benefit by addressing the issue of domestic violence among their employees. Maine's expansive leave law (which applies to all private and public employers in the state) has been found by the Maine State Chamber of Commerce to be both "appropriate and relatively unburdensome" to businesses. A number of businesses have recently voluntarily adopted policies and procedures to address the issues of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking among their employees. The growing realization that violence suffered outside the workplace affects employee productivity and retention was also reflected in a study showing that 78 percent of human resources professionals and 94 percent of corporate security and safety directors at companies nationwide rank domestic violence as a high security concern.

In addition to costs associated with diminished productivity, businesses often lose valuable employees when those employees are victimized. Losing loyal and experienced employees generates substantial hiring and training costs, which would be largely avoided by addressing the impact of domestic and sexual violence in the workplace.

CONCLUSION

Charlene's story is a fitting conclusion to this testimony. Charlene is married to an abusive man who regularly harasses, threatens, and hits her. One evening, he new into a rage, because she said she was considering leaving him, and beat her particularly brutally. She came into work the next day and explained to her supervisor that her injuries were the result of domestic violence. Her boss brought her to speak with someone in Human Resources who had received training in working with employees who are victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, or stalking. She helped Charlene contact a local domestic violence service provider. The employer gave Charlene the rest of the day off to meet with a counselor and figure out what other steps to take. When she realized she would need several days off to get a restraining order and move into a shelter, Charlene called her boss, who agreed that she could miss two more days of work.

Before returning to work, Charlene and a counselor at the shelter contacted her employer to discuss the safety plan they had developed. The employer agreed to allow Charlene to vary her start and end times by up to one hour. Then, Charlene, the employer, and the counselor agreed that Charlene could be out of the office two afternoons per month to attend group counseling sessions, and she could make up the time on other days.

Was Charlene one of the lucky few who happen to work for an understanding and accommodating employer? No, this story is fictional. The real story is the one we began with. But Charlene's story is possible in the near future.

Congress has the power to bring greater safety and economic security to all victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, as well as to their employers and their coworkers. I urge you to consider and support meaningful workplace protections for victims of such violence.

Availability of leave, protection from discrimination, and eligibility for unemployment insurance can help survivors keep their jobs, maintain their economic independence, and remain safe from future violence. Victims of domestic or sexual violence need to know they can go to court to get an order of protection, seek shelter, or talk to their employers about how to make themselves and their co-workers safe, without fear of losing their jobs.

Some employers are taking a leading role in addressing violence by adopting policies, promoting workplace education, and developing appropriate security and safety plans. While those employers should be supported and encouraged, other employers that penalize or retaliate against employees who have experienced domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking must be directed to end such discrimination.

For a woman to survive violence and move on with her life, she needs more than luck and fortitude: she needs to be able to financially support herself and get the help she needs without fearing the loss of her job. A woman deserves a guarantee that she will not lose her job and therefore her economic security because she needs to go to court, take time to talk to her children's child care center about the issue, or see a physician after she's been attacked. If she must leave her work due to the violence, then unemployment compensation should be available to enable her to get back into the workforce as soon as possible. As a caring society, we cannot allow a woman who has suffered a violent attack to be further victimized by her employer.

[Whereupon, at 11:43 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○