

officer-involved abuse. So that new provision—along with the healthcare and housing measures—represent new progress in fighting domestic violence. But frankly, we have got a lot more work to do. I am deeply disappointed that the economic protections I have been fighting for since 1998 were not included in this reauthorization—despite some early progress.

If we are going to break the cycle of violence, we need to address the economic barriers that trap victims in abusive relationships.

We know that financial insecurity is a major factor in ongoing domestic violence. Too often, victims don't have the financial strength to leave a violent relationship. As a result, they are forced to choose between protecting themselves and keeping a roof over their heads. When a victim cannot afford to move out, or cannot afford to pay the rent, or has lost a job because of abuse, that person is trapped, and Congress needs to help free them from that trap.

In this bill, we had an opportunity to help victims. In the Senate version of the bill, I worked to include an unpaid leave provision. It was in the Senate version, but it was dropped by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In my view, that was wrong. It is like leaving someone trapped in a burning building. We should have knocked down the barriers and thrown open the exit doors, but the Senate failed and that will have a real impact on people trapped in abusive relationships.

The protections I sought were reasonable. It would have allowed victims to take up to 10 days of unpaid leave per year to address domestic violence. Over 40 percent of American workers get no paid time off. They cannot use vacation time to address abuse, and missing work puts them in danger of losing their job. My provision would have allowed victims to take unpaid leave to get a protective order, see a doctor, or make a safety plan.

But unfortunately, there was opposition and complaints about jurisdiction, and these protections were stripped from the bill during consideration in the Judiciary Committee.

Once those protections were dropped, I kept fighting. I offered another tool to help victims escape abusive relationships. I asked the managers of the bill to include a provision on unemployment insurance. I asked them to provide victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking with unemployment insurance if they have to leave their job or are fired because of abuse.

We know that a job is often the only way for victims to build up the resources to leave a violent relationship, but abuse and stalking can make it impossible for a victim to keep a job.

Many of my colleagues may recall the story of Yvette Cade, of Maryland. As reported in the Washington Post, Ms. Cade's estranged husband showed up at her job at a wireless phone store,

threw gasoline on her, and lit her on fire. A restraining order against her estranged husband had been dropped shortly before the incident, even though she had indicated he was still threatening her.

Ms. Cade was burned over 60 percent of her body and remains in the hospital.

There are many more cases of abusers who deliberately sabotage a victim's ability to work, placing harassing phone calls, cutting off their transportation, and showing up at the workplace and threatening other employees. When a victim loses a job because of violence, that victim should have access to unemployment compensation benefits.

Some people might claim that it is too expensive to allow victims to access unpaid leave. But I would remind my colleagues that domestic violence imposes costs on a workplace too. When violence follows victims into the workplace, it doesn't just hurt victims—it hurts their employers. It means less productivity and higher insurance costs.

So anyone who says it is too expensive to provide unpaid leave should also remember that domestic violence is expensive to businesses in both lives and dollars. Providing the tools that will allow abused women to escape abusive relationships can help offset billions of dollars in costs that domestic violence imposes on businesses.

Unfortunately, my efforts to include unpaid leave provisions were rejected as well. But I am not giving up. I have been at this since 1998 and I know who I am fighting for. I have been to the shelters in my State, and I have talked with the victims. I have met with their advocates, and I am not giving up on them.

I am going to keep pushing for my SAFE Act, which stands for the Security and Financial Empowerment Act. It contains the protections victims need to break the cycle of violence. I thank Senators LEAHY, CORZINE, DAYTON and DODD for signing on as original cosponsors, and would invite all of my colleagues to sign on as well.

I am going to continue to tell their stories because we need to hear their voices here in the Senate. It is easy to argue about jurisdiction, but that doesn't mean anything to someone who is getting beaten up every night. It is easy to argue about the cost of unpaid leave—but that doesn't mean anything to someone who needs to get a protective order so they can escape a violent relationship.

This Congress has a lot of work to do to help victims, and I will come to this Senate floor as many times as it takes, until we finally give victims the help they need and deserve.

IRAQ

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President I ask that the following editorial which was written by my good friend, former Sen-

ator Fritz Hollings, and published in the Charleston Post and Courier on October 27, 2005, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISLED ABOUT IRAQ, SECURE IT OR LEAVE

A G.I. with his legs blown away in Iraq asks, "Senator, why did we go into Iraq?" Answer: "to secure Israel by democratizing the Mideast." Immediately my over-sensitive Jewish friends withdraw in horror: "There you go, blaming Israel." Not at all. The fact is that Israel opposed the plan. Now, with our unwarranted invasion and al-Jazeera reporting daily on U.S. "atrocities," we are spreading terrorism and have damaged the security of Israel.

In 1996, incoming Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel commissioned a think-tank headed by Richard Pearle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser. The three submitted the plan "Clean Break": Negotiating with Arafat is futile. Instead, secure Israel by democratizing the Middle East.

First bomb Lebanon. Next invade Syria on the pretext of it possessing weapons of mass destruction. Then replace Saddam with a Hashemite ruler favorable to Israel. Netanyahu rejected "Clean Break."

Determined, Pearle, Feith and Wurmser returned to the United States and joined in the Project for the New American Century with Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld and Scooter Libby, among others. In 1998, the group prevailed on Congress for regime change in Iraq, and the Senate by a voice vote adopted such a resolution. At the time, no senator thought we were endorsing an invasion—just encouraging resistance in Iraq. But when George W. Bush was elected president "Clean Break" hit pay dirt.

The Project for the New American Century crowd took office. Richard Cheney became vice president, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz and Feith took the number first, second and third positions in the Department of Defense. Richard Pearle became chairman of the Defense Advisory Board. "Scooter" Libby and David Wurmser were advising Cheney.

President Bush, days before taking office in 2001, sought a briefing on, of all things, Iraq from then Secretary of Defense William Cohen.

Secretary of Treasury Paul O'Neill tells in "The Price of Loyalty" how he was astonished at the first meeting of the National Security Council. He went to discuss the recession but all talk was about Iraq. The day after 9/11, President Bush turned to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, requesting a plan to invade Iraq even though Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. The administration was determined to invade Iraq.

Jason Leopold and Larisa Alexandrovna in "Raw Story" now report: "Although the CIA documents that Wurmser and his staff pored over showed Iraq as being an immediate threat, Wurmser was dead-set on finding and presenting evidence to Vice President Dick Cheney that suggested as much, even if the veracity of such intelligence was questionable.

"Wurmser helped Cheney's office, particularly "Scooter" Libby, construct a case for war. He met frequently with Cheney, Libby, Feith and Richard Pearle, the former head of the Defense Policy Board, to go over the "evidence" of the threat posed by Saddam Hussein that could then be used by the White House to build public support. Wurmser routinely butted heads with the CIA over the veracity of the intelligence he was providing to Cheney's office."

In short, the invasion of Iraq was not based on intelligence but was contrived. "But Senator why did you vote to go into Iraq?" Answer: I followed the rationale of the White

House for invasion carefully. Having served on the Hoover Commission investigating the intelligence activities of the United States with Gen. Mark Clark, I learned that Israel's intelligence, Mossad, is the best on the Middle East. As an island of democracy in a sea of hostility, Israel has to know what is going on in Baghdad. Israel has no time to call for a summit meeting or to go to the United Nations. Any real threat must be knocked out immediately.

This is why Israel knocked out Iraq's nuclear facility without warning in 1981. Days before we voted, President Bush said, "Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait until the smoking gun is a mushroom cloud." When the commander-in-chief says this, he's got my vote.

I was sure Mossad had found nuclear weapons and we were knocking them out and eliminating Saddam.

Now we're waiting for Iraqis to do what we've never done—secure Iraq; secure the Syrian and Iranian borders immediately; and clean out the Sunni triangle. It would cause casualties but to fight a war you have to fight a war. Either get in or get out.

If we're not going to secure Iraq, then the next best thing is to get Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani to ask us to leave.

Ernest F. Hollings, a Democrat, served as a U.S. senator for South Carolina from 1966 to 2003.

CONGRESSMAN MURTHA

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, one of the reasons I love and respect my wife Teresa Heinz Kerry so very much is because she has always maintained the strength of her convictions. She speaks her mind, and she speaks the truth. I am especially proud of her passionate defense of her fellow Pennsylvanian—the decorated veteran and respected military expert, Representative JACK MURTHA. In a recent essay, Teresa's powerful words spoke of JACK MURTHA's courage and integrity rose above the disparaging and unconscionable words of those who smeared him. As I read what she wrote, I realized why this issue had struck such a chord with her—and why she was able to speak with such incredible clarity—because, as someone who grew up under a dictatorship, Teresa believes deeply in the freedom of every American to speak their mind without fear of condemnation.

The characteristics we all admire in Representative MURTHA—honesty, compassion, strength and patriotism—are the characteristics that make Teresa such an incredible citizen. I am glad she spoke out, and for that reason, I ask that her words be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From CNHI News Service]

(By Teresa Heinz Kerry)

ASSAULT ON MURTHA SHOULD ALARM US ALL

"Because we in Congress are charged with sending our sons and daughters into battle, it is our responsibility, our obligation, to speak out for them. That's why I am speaking out."

U.S. Rep. John Murtha, Nov. 17, "War In Iraq."

U.S. Rep. John Murtha completely changed the public debate in our country by calling

for an immediate redeployment of our troops in Iraq. Whether you agree or disagree with his specific proposal is not the point—but his critics' words demand a response. Murtha speaks with special authority.

His national security credentials are impeccable. His patriotism is unwavering. His influence on national defense is unsurpassed. None in Congress spends as much time as Murtha with the wounded from the Iraq war. His voice on matters of national defense deserves—indeed, commands—great respect. This is why his political opponents think him so dangerous. The orchestrated assault on Murtha should alarm us all. Just when you thought the debate could sink no lower, the politicians committed to staying the course in Iraq turned the fire hoses of smear and intimidation on this icon of national security. Listen to what they said:

They said he had given aid and comfort to the enemy. They accused him of abandoning the troops. And one rookie representative, the most junior member in the House, so lost any decency or sense of decorum that she called Murtha a coward.

I think they smeared the wrong representative. Murtha's history is one of heroism and leadership. He served in the Marine Corps from 1952 to 1955. He served as a Marine Corps drill instructor and a reservist. He re-upped so he could serve in Vietnam. He was wounded twice while serving as a Marine intelligence officer, and then went back into the reserves from 1967 to 1990. He was the first Vietnam veteran elected to the Congress, where he has served with honor and distinction as a bipartisan advocate of national defense ever since.

How bipartisan? When President Reagan wanted to build the MX missile, Murtha broke with his party to fight for what Reagan called the "peacekeeper." Reagan sent him to El Salvador and the Philippines as an election observer and, as an official representative of the United States, to Pakistan to attend President Zia's funeral. When President George H.W. Bush said of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, "this will not stand," Murtha stood with him and voted to use military force to drive Iraq out.

His credentials on national defense are unimpeachable. He has been named Minuteman of the Year by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. He has been honored by the Blinded American Veterans Foundation. He is a winner of the Henry M. Jackson Distinguished Service Award, and an honoree of the Association of the United States Army. When Murtha received the distinguished public service award from the American Legion, he was praised by the national commander as a veteran, supporter of a strong national defense and holder of an outstanding track record on veterans' issues.

That is Jack Murtha's history, and the summer soldiers and the sunshine patriots who attack him cannot rewrite it. That's why they resort instead to the most reprehensible type of personal attacks. We've seen this before. I know and love another Vietnam veteran who served our country with distinction and honor—who suffered the slings and arrows of distortions, half-truths and falsehoods.

Scoundrels who would stifle debate and smear dissenters weaken our democracy and diminish our Nation's ability to make decisions and change course when circumstances demand.

This war is hard—hard to win, hard to support, and for most, hard to figure out. We all want the best for our troops, our country, the Iraqi people and what is best for the Middle East. Much is at stake.

But if we want the best outcome, the best minds we have must be free to express their strongest beliefs and best advice. Murtha has

earned our respect. His right to speak out is an intrinsic component of our democracy. It should be honored—we should hold that right sacred—even if his words deviate from the party line, the president's talking points, or public opinion.

I think Murtha did our country an enormous public service for speaking out as he did, and I support for him for exercising his right. A courageous person is always to be admired.

HUGS NOT BULLETS CAMPAIGN

2006

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to commend an outstanding group of young people in Detroit, MI, for their efforts to reduce gun violence as part of the Neighborhood Service Organization's Youth Initiatives Project. Their dedication to this admirable cause is certainly worthy of our recognition and appreciation.

The Youth Initiatives Project was created in 1999 to address growing community issues including violence and substance abuse in Detroit. For 6 years, students, community organizations, and local police have been involved in a coordinated effort to accomplish the goals of the project. Many of these goals are centered on the need to reduce gun violence.

Hundreds of Detroit teenagers have been involved in the Youth Initiatives Project through activities such as afterschool programs to reduce gun violence, gun buybacks, anti-violence rallies, and gun safety workshops. As part of these activities, the Youth Initiatives Project has been responsible in the last 3 years for handing out more than 5,000 free trigger locks to Detroit gun owners.

The Youth Initiatives Project's "Hugs Not Bullets" campaign for 2005 built upon their overall theme of reducing gun violence, while also putting a specific focus on the use of firearms during the celebration of the New Year's holiday. In addition to hosting a number of public forums and rallies, the Hugs Not Bullets campaign used several 4-foot by 8-foot cards to collect signatures of those who pledge not to engage in gun violence. To date, more than 3,000 Detroiters have signed these cards. These cards serve as a powerful symbol of the community's determination to fight gun violence.

For 2006, the Youth Initiatives Project plans to expand the Hugs Not Bullets campaign into a comprehensive grass roots and media campaign against gun violence. This year, more than 200 Youth Initiatives Project participants will reach out to their peers by visiting community centers, schools, and churches, as well as social clubs and events widely attended by other teenagers. In addition, the Hugs Not Bullets campaign will amplify its antigun violence message through public service announcements and appearances on local television and radio. This is an ambitious next step, which will build upon the previous success of the campaign.