

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 remains unrepresented of 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 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 Ministers Blair and Ahern to fully implement the Good Friday Agreement and immediately institute the Patten Commission's 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 Britain not 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 reinstitute 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 reinstitute the Belfast Assembly.

Peace in Northern Ireland is finally within our grasp. The parties involved, which all signed those historic accords some 6 years ago, must now just 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 Texas (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 Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHAYS 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 Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

□ 1900

CREATING JOBS FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.) 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 growing concern that many of 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 tax 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 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 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 climbed over the past year. In 2003, it inched up from 9 percent to 9.2 percent and continues to climb. Growth is also very weak, hovering below 2 percent for the past several years.

Madam Speaker, American workers deserve better than this. We owe them more than the empty promise that tried and failed tactics will somehow save jobs.

Rather than go the French and German way of stagnation and stifling regulation, I say let us create good jobs right here the American way, by continuing to innovate and grow and produce new opportunities for workers. That has been our recipe for global economic leadership for years; and if we continue to allow Americans to freely invest at home and abroad, we will continue to create more good jobs right here in the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ANOTHER EPISODE IN THE OUTSOURCING OF AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I was so interested to hear the prior gentleman's remarks from California about jobs. He has been one of the primary Members of this institution that has helped to outsource our jobs all over the world, China, India, Mexico; so I am sorry he has left the floor.

But I guess I could say, here we go again, another episode in the outsourcing of American jobs. And this one is especially outrageous, because it involves our U.S. taxpayer dollars.

The Richmond Times Dispatch in Virginia reported yesterday that the big bank, J.P. Morgan Chase and Company, which administers the Bush administration food stamp program for Virginia and 37 other States, has been exporting administrative jobs since 2001. Why would the Bush administration select a big bank anyway to administer the U.S. food stamp program, rather than use not-for-profit institutions like credit unions and other financial intermediaries located across this country?

Today now, the Associated Press reports that food stamp beneficiaries in 43 States already get help with problems such as replacing lost cards by calling toll-free numbers, and these toll-free numbers connect them to companies that have contracts with State governments, and those companies have outsourced the calls to foreign countries.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture says it would consider permitting a State government to hire private contractors to sign up people for food stamps, even though the Federal law says U.S. Government workers should handle the job.

Madam Speaker, this policy by our U.S. Department of Agriculture is not only inappropriate; it is outrageous, particularly when you look at growing food stamp rolls because of unemployment in this country and this administration not extending unemployment benefits to people.

It is also outrageous because of the growing ranks of the unemployed, 9 million unemployed workers in this country. Just in Ohio, 347,000 people without work, and many more having quit looking, so they are not even counted anymore. Why not put unemployed Americans at work at these call centers inside our country, instead of shipping out these service calls, outsourcing the work to other countries like India?

Something is haywire when we allow multinational corporations to take our U.S. taxpayer dollars and give them in the form of government contracts to companies that then outsource the work to foreign workers and foreign countries. It is absolutely indefensible, when so many of our taxpayers cannot find jobs.

It is ironic. American workers who lose their jobs to unfair trade practices might have to talk to somebody overseas in order to get their food stamps.

Think about this one: when we asked the Under Secretary, Mr. Bost, yesterday before our committee whether he would consider working with the Department of Labor to go into these pockets of unemployed people in our country and let them do the call center jobs, he never attempted it, and it did not really seem to appeal to him.

This issue came up during our agriculture meeting yesterday, and as the ranking member I asked USDA officials, since they were not willing to hire Americans, would they be willing to support a ban on outsourcing these U.S. jobs to call centers, primarily in India. The USDA, that we pay for, we pay for their salaries, U.S. taxpayers, we pay the salary of the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, of the gentleman who was testifying before us, they said, no, they would not ban sending the work overseas.

Now, the Republican practice of outsourcing American jobs cannot end one moment too soon.

Madam Speaker, the two articles I wish to place in the RECORD that document what I am saying is an article in the Associated Press by Ira Dreyfuss, and the headline reads: "Private Contractors May Handle Food Stamps," and also an article that was in the Richmond Times-Dispatch. The headline reads: "Food Stamp Calls Routed to India. A Firm That Runs Part of the Virginia Program Outsourced Call Center to India."

Madam Speaker, it would be nice to have some attention in one of the largest programs that this government funds, over \$50 billion a year in various food programs, about two-thirds of that in the food stamp program, and try to help some of our own people earn

some money in this country so they would not have to be on food stamps and they could have good jobs right here in the good old USA.

[From the Times-Dispatch, Mar. 23, 2004]

FOOD-STAMP CALLS ROUTED TO INDIA
FIRM THAT RUNS PART OF THE VIRGINIA
PROGRAM OUTSOURCED CALL CENTER

(By Tyler Whitley)

When food-stamp recipients in Virginia have a question about the program, they get answers from someone in India.

J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., a giant bank-holding company that administers a key part of the program for the social-services departments in Virginia and 37 other states, has outsourced its call center to the Asian nation.

Maurice Jones, commissioner of the Virginia Department of Social Services, estimates that six or seven jobs could be created in Virginia to handle the 10,000 calls a month that are now made to India by Virginia's 195,000 food-stamp recipients.

He said the Warner administration inherited the outsourcing from the Gilmore administration, which signed a contract with another banking giant, Citicorp, in February 2001.

Louis Rossiter, secretary of health and human resources under then-Gov. Jim Gilmore, said the jobs were not being sent abroad when the contract was signed.

Rossiter said Citicorp had a near monopoly on the business at the time the contract was signed.

The decision to send the jobs abroad was not the state's but the contractor's, Citicorp. It subsequently sold the food-stamp electronic-transfer program to J.P. Morgan, Jones said.

Jones said the calls have been going overseas since October 2001. A disgruntled local official complained about the situation recently to The Times-Dispatch.

When the state's five-year contract expires in 2006, Jones said yesterday, he hopes the 38 states can put pressure on the bank to return the call centers to the United States—preferably to Virginia.

Outsourcing, largely ignored until recently, has become a major political target in the 2004 presidential campaign. Although it is not a new phenomenon, Democrats are blaming the shipment of jobs to lower-wage countries abroad for the slow pace of job creation during the economic recovery.

Trevelocity, which provides airfares and travel service over the Internet, recently announced it is closing a call center with about 250 jobs in Diskenson County in Southwest Virginia later this year and sending most of the business to India. It estimated it could save \$10 million from the move.

Richmond-based Circuit City Stores Inc. also has begun outsourcing jobs to India. Its customer-service toll-free line now goes to India.

According to the American Legislative Issue Campaign Exchange, a Wisconsin-based organization, 22 states are considering legislation to prevent job loss because of outsourcing by requiring state and local government contracts to purchase only American goods and services.

The U.S. Senate has voted to do the same on federal contracts. "I'm a firm believer that you ought to take care of your own people first," said Del. Clarence E. "Bud" Phillips, a Democrat who represents Dickenson County.

Phillips said he will introduce legislation next year to bar the state from entering into contracts that ship jobs abroad.

If the jobs are returned to the United States, bank officers have told him that Virginia will have to pay a higher fee for the services, Jones said.