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.

Policing in Northern Ireland is 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 represents the interests of the communities it polices. There are presently over 9,000 members. However, as of October 2003, only 11.6 percent are Catho-

lic while nearly one-half of all residents of Northern Ireland call themselves Catholic.

And the Police Service has also refused to stop using plastic bullets. Patten recommended research into alternatives to these inhumane policing tools and the rapid withdrawal of their use, and the British Government also gave a commitment to replace plastic bullets by the end of 2003. But today plastic bullets continue to be used by the police service.

The people of Northern Ireland do not feel safe and rarely rely on their public police services. Citizens are not calling the Police Service of Northern Ireland when they need assistance. They are afraid that the police will violate their rights rather than protect them in their time of need.

Madam Speaker, I call on Prime Minister Blair and Ahern to fully implement the Good Friday Agreement and immediately institute the Patten Commission recommendations. For a lasting peace to survive in Northern Ireland, the Good Friday Agreement must be given the chance to fully succeed.

Unfortunately, the peace process cannot move forward. A small faction of individuals in Northern Ireland, many who are adamantly opposed to the accords, are holding the future of the peace agreement hostage. They have been successful in influencing the British Government to put the agreement and the power-sharing government on hold and therefore putting the Good Friday Agreement and the fragile peace in a very dangerous position.

Most recently these opponents have convinced outlaw groups to seek the new Belfast Assembly, even though elections were held 4 months ago. These elections, which saw record turnouts, were finally held this past November. However, to date, Prime Minister Blair has refused to reinitiate the Belfast Assembly.

Madam Speaker, as one can easily observe, the peace in Northern Ireland is hanging by a thread. Prime Minister Blair and Irish Prime Minister Bertie Ahern must bring all sides back to the table and reinitiate the Belfast Assembly.

Peace in Northern Ireland is finally within our grasp. The parties involved, who all signed the historic accords 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 Maryland (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 Virginia (Mr. Wynn) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WYNN 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. Dreier) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, in response to questions that recent data on how long a worker has been with a company, employers must notify workers of impending layoffs at least 6 weeks in advance. Under certain circumstances, this notification period must 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 crawled 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 Government analysts are predicting per-

ceptually hung around the 10 percent level. In 2002, it dipped as low as 9.2 percent, but it has since crawled 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 Government analysts are predicting even weaker growth for this year, 2004.

Germany has labor laws that are very similar to France's. Employers must give workers notice of layoffs between 1 and 7 months in advance, depending on how long a worker has been with a company. Employees can challenge any layoff in court and obtain preliminary injunctions, allowing them to remain on the job until their cases are decided. But despite these job preservation regulations, German unemployment, just like in France, is frighteningly high. Since the late 1990s, unemploy-

ment in Germany has hovered just above 8 percent and has steadily grown over the past year. In 2003, it inched up from 9.8 percent to 9.2 percent and continues to climb. Growth is also very weak, hovering below 2 percent for the past several years.

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 must 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 crawled 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 Government analysts are predicting even weaker growth for this year, 2004.

Germany has labor laws that are very similar to France's. Employers must give workers notice of layoffs between 1 and 7 months in advance, depending on how long a worker has been with a company. Employees can challenge any layoff in court and obtain preliminary injunctions, allowing them to remain on the job until their cases are decided. But despite these job preservation regulations, German unemployment, just like in France, is frighteningly high. Since the late 1990s, unemployment in Germany has hovered just above 8 percent and has steadily grown over the past year. In 2003, it inched up from 9.8 percent to 9.2 percent and continues to climb. Growth is also very weak, hovering below 2 percent for the past several years.