While the Patten Commission recommendations did not address all of the policing issues in Northern Ireland, they were a good starting point. Unfortunately, to date, Great Britain has not instituted any of these reforms.

Politicization prevails in Northern Ireland not only an issue of fairness but also of basic human rights. Following the signing of the Good Friday Agreement, the British Government dissolved the Royal Ulster Constabulary and replaced it officially with the Police Service of Northern Ireland. Unfortunately, this new police service is the same old, same old, with a new fancy name. What we really find when we look below the surface of its new name is that the Police Service of Northern Ireland is no more representative or fair than the Royal Ulster Constabulary.

The Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) is responsible for the communities it polices. There are presently over 9,000 members. However, as of October 2003, only 11.6 percent are Catholic while nearly one-half of all residents of Northern Ireland call themselves Catholic.

And the Police Service has refused to reinstitute the Belfast elections, which saw record turnouts, 4 months ago. These elections were held 4 months ago. The Belfast Assembly, even though elections were held some 6 years ago, must now live up to the agreement and allow the people of Northern Ireland to govern themselves freely and fairly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Burgess) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Wynn) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CREATING JOBS FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. Dreier) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, in response to difficult economic conditions that many Americans are finding themselves in, our good jobs are being sent overseas, a number of our colleagues have offered proposals to restrict the practice of offshoring. The idea, I suppose, is that by restricting the ability of Americans to freely invest and compete in the worldwide markets, we can somehow save jobs here at home.

One of these proposals, offered by the senior Senator from Connecticut, was recently adopted in the other body in the form of an amendment to the international corporate reform bill. This proposal would permanently prohibit American companies that off-shore any of their work from ever doing business with the Federal Government. This restriction would also extend State projects that use any Federal dollars.

Another example is the Senate minority leader’s Jobs For Americans Act, which is cosponsored by Senator Kerry and presumed Democratic Presidential nominee JOHN KERRY.

Before off-shoring any work that was previously done in the United States, this legislation would require companies, big and small, to disclose how many jobs would be affected, where those jobs would be going, and why they were being off-shored. Companies would also be required to give employees 3 months’ advance notice, as well as notify all Federal and State agencies responsible for helping laid-off workers.

Now, Madam Speaker, we are all concerned about jobs for Americans. We are very concerned about jobs for Americans. And since these anti-offshoring initiatives are clearly intended to save jobs, I believe we should take a careful, serious look at their potential impact on the health of our economy, an economy that is currently growing, and we just got the news today, at a rate of 4.1 percent, creating hundreds of thousands of new jobs in recent months, and witnessing nearly 1 million new business start-ups every single year.

The good news is that we do not have to try to calculate what would happen if we were to adopt any of these measures. We can benefit from the wisdom of French and German policymakers, who adopted well-meaning job preservation techniques long ago. All we have to do is take a look at their economies and determine if we want similar results.

Let us look at France first. Under French labor law, employers must notify workers of impending layoffs at least 6 weeks in advance. Under certain circumstances, this notification period may be much longer, as much as 9 months in some cases. Other employee rights include a hearing in order to fight the layoff and a substantial severance package.

So with all these regulations and so-called worker protections, France must be a worker’s paradise. French jobs must be eminently secure, right? Well, it is obviously not the case. For years, French unemployment has persistently hung around the 10 percent level. In 2002, it dipped as low as 9.2 percent, but it has since crept back up to 9.5 percent, and it continues to climb. And the French economy overall is not faring much better than French workers are. Last year, GDP growth was a paltry 1.8 percent, and French unemployment has hovered just under 9 percent, but it has continued to climb.

Germany has labor laws that are very similar to France’s. Employers must give workers notice of layoffs at least 1 month in advance. And like France, German law requires that workers give workers a hearing in order to fight the layoff and a substantial severance package. Germany has labor laws that are very similar to France’s. Employers must give workers notice of layoffs at least 1 month in advance. And like France, German law requires that workers give workers a hearing in order to fight the layoff and a substantial severance package.
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