which was once home to dozens of thriving mill towns. Now if you drive across that district, my district, from Troy to Cohoes, to Schenectady, to Amsterdam, to Gloversville, you can see the glaring hole that the loss of industry has created. This is a story that resonates all too frequently throughout the United States, from New England to the Midwest, and now even into the South.

My hometown of Amsterdam, New York, was once home to thriving carpet mills that employed thousands of workers. Decades ago General Electric employed more than 40,000 workers in Schenectady, and American Locomotive employed 12,000-plus. But for a few thousand GE employees, manufacturing in Schenectady has disappeared. The glove-making industry once employed 80 percent of the residents of Gloversville, New York, and that industry has also almost completely disappeared.

The decline of manufacturing in Upstate New York occurred before the free trade agreements that were negotiated in the 1990s. But since those agreements have been signed, the decline of manufacturing has accelerated dramatically.

Trade policy, when done right, can benefit countries around the world. My objection, Madam Speaker, is that our current trade agreements place a disproportionate burden on American workers and leave our United States at a significant competitive disadvantage compared to the rest of the world. By negotiating trade agreements that do not have adequate labor standards or environmental provisions, we simply export pollution and poor working standards to other nations. It is indeed hard for a glove-manufacturing company based in my congressional district to compete with another manufacturer located in one of the so-called ''free trade zones'' in Central America, for instance, where employees make cents on the dollar, are offered no benefits, and work in factories that do not have those safety provisions so guaranteed for our American workers.

By inserting basic labor standards into our trade agreements that address worker pay, worker safety, worker benefits, and the length of that workday, American workers will be more competitive. In addition, by strengthening labor provisions in our trade agreements, we can help guarantee that better standard of living for workers in the countries with which we are trading.

Environmental standards are often another significant area that have not been sufficiently addressed by NAFTA, and this oversight is continuing under these NAFTA-like trade agreements coming before us. In the 1970s we collectively agreed that preserving the environment is essential, is necessary to our health and our way of life. The legislation that came out of that period helped to preserve our air and our water by limiting the pollutants that companies could emit into the environment, our environment. By agreeing to free trade agreements that do not include similar provisions to protect the environment, we not only make American manufacturers less competitive, but we export our pollution to developing countries.

Again, the solution to this problem is simple: by including environmental provisions into our trade agreements, we can even the playing field for American workers and reduce the environmental impact of manufacturing in other countries.

I honestly believe that trade can help the American economy. It can help our manufacturers and can help our workers. However, this trade has got to be done right. We cannot keep agreeing to those lopsided trade agreements that leave American workers without jobs because American companies cannot compete with firms located overseas that can pay their workers sweatshop wages and operate in ways that devastate our shared, our shared, environment.

When this body is asked to consider the past administration's NAFTA-style trade agreements in the coming months, I will be forced to add my voice to the millions of American workers who have had enough: enough of exporting American jobs overseas, enough of competing with workers that pay cents on the dollar. And the American people have had enough of free trade and demand a trade model, a fair trade model, that will help our economy recover.

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

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

RIGHT-WING EXTREMISTS

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, recently at a town hall meeting, Dottie from Andrews, Texas, and I won't give her last name, came to me and said that she did not attend a TEA party in the area because she was afraid that the Department of Homeland Security would have agents there taking down names and taking pictures.

Well, Madam Speaker, I rise today to reassure my constituent Dottie from Andrews that while Secretary Napolitano may be guilty of bad judgment bordering on negligence, she does not really consider her to be a domestic terrorist, nor do I believe the Secretary has unleashed the multitude of resources, assets, tools, and weapons of the Department of Homeland Security against her or me.

Dottie, like many individuals across my district and throughout the Nation, was at first surprised and then angered to learn that the Department of Homeland Security's new definition of a right-wing terrorist sounded a lot like her. To quote the recently released Homeland Security memo: ''Many right-wing extremists are antagonistic toward the new Presidential administration and its perceived stance on a range of issues, including immigration and citizenship, the expansion of social programs to minorities, and restrictions on firearms ownership and use.''

In a ham-handed fashion, the memo further defines the Department's view of right-wing extremists to include the great many Americans who believe that gun owners have constitutional rights protected by the second amendment, that our national values are not something to be bartered with for international agreements, that the immigration policy in our Nation is a failure, and that we are mortgaging the future to fund today's spending spree that we can never repay.

It then goes on to single out returning war veterans as individuals who warrant special government attention because they are especially susceptible to these extreme views.

If these are the positions of extremists, Madam Speaker, then I am an extremist. I am extreme in my belief that our Constitution protects law-abiding citizens from being treated like criminals. I am extreme in my belief that our Nation's sovereignty and values are not up for negotiation or debate with international thugs and 21st-century socialists. I am extreme in my belief that the Federal Government is failing the American people every day that we don't control our borders. I am extreme in my belief that we are running unsustainable deficits and selling future generations of Americans into indentured servitude in order to score political points today. And I am extreme in my belief that our veterans deserve our humble gratitude and prayers, not police scrutiny.

Secretary Napolitano's crass misunderstanding of the concerns of conservative Americans is not only embarrassing, but it detracts from her Department's ability to protect America. Her report is riddled with anecdotal evidence and pointlessly broad generalizations. It is a ''well, duh'' listing of long-established facts about racist organizations, anti-government militias, and other fringe radicals.

Any memo that relates the members of these fringe organizations with individuals who hold conservative political beliefs will serve only to confuse law enforcement personnel and alarm the public. Where there are public safety concerns, these should be communicated in a precise and meaningful manner; otherwise, the administration should stop antagonizing and profiling its innocent citizens.

In its rush to placate The New York Times editorial board and MoveOn.org,

the Obama administration is continuing to show itself to be tone deaf on the issues that matter most to Americans and illiterate in basic conservative principles. The administration's actions are rightly a cause for concern for me and my constituents. While the Democrats have earned the right to pursue their agenda, no American citizen lost their right to question that agenda.

I should not be here on the floor today making reassurances to the people in my district, but the language of this administration has consistently been dismissive of principled opposition to its policies and now it appears as though it is openly hostile to it.

In the future I urge the administration to pick its words more carefully and remember that it governs all of America, not simply those who agree with it. I urge Secretary Napolitano to issue an official clarification of the administration's position on right-wing extremism and to publish a memo that addresses her concerns about the rise of hate groups and anti-government militias in a manner that will both be of service to law enforcement and refrains from painting half of America as extremists.

While I firmly believe that this memo represents nothing more than a colossal screw-up on the part of our President and the Secretary, my final reassurance to Dottie is that if I am wrong and the government ever decides to come after her for her views, then they're going to have to come after me also.

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

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

□ 1615

BEAUTIFY CNMI AND FRIENDS OF THE MONUMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, last week President Obama signed into law the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, which encourages Americans to engage in public service and volunteerism.

I was proud to cosponsor the Serve America Act. But I am even prouder to recognize today two nonprofit corporate organizations in the Northern Mariana Islands that already exemplify the spirit of cooperation and community service the act will encourage. These organizations are Beautify CNMI! and The Friends of the Monument.

Beautify CNMI! is a coalition of concerned citizens, private groups and government entities united to enhance the natural beauty of the Northern Mariana Islands and to foster pride of place in residents and visitors alike. In their own words, Beautify CNMI! figured the only way to get people to take ownership in our islands was if the government, the private sector, and the community worked together and pooled our resources.

Created in 2006, Beautify CNMI! has spent the last 3 years picking up litter, planting trees and painting over graffiti in our communities. They have also restored historic areas such as a World War II-era jail and a lighthouse built at the turn of the last century.

Beautify CNMI! also honors individuals and groups who are considered environmental leaders. And the organization supports other community initiatives, such as promoting responsible pet care and working with at-risk youth groups.

The Friday before Earth Day this year, Beautify CNMI! coordinated an island-wide cleanup on the island of Saipan with the participation of over 4,100 volunteers, the largest cleanup endeavor ever in the Northern Mariana Islands. I had the pleasure of joining this cleanup during my last work period.

The second group I would like to recognize is The Friends of the Monument. The Friends of the Monument was formed to help promote the ideal of creating a national marine monument in the waters surrounding the three northernmost islands of the Northern Mariana Islands and the Mariana Trench, the deepest known place in the world's known oceans, and they were successful. President Bush designated the area as a national marine monument on January 6 of this year.

The monument designation was controversial in the Northern Mariana Islands, but whatever one's stance in the controversy, there is no argument that The Friends of the Monument is the model for what a dedicated group of volunteers can accomplish.

The Friends of the Monument engaged in countless hours of outreach and education activities to teach the community about the idea of the monument. They created and distributed leaflets, held meetings and conducted classroom presentations.

These activities gave the public an opportunity to learn about the proposed monument, to ask questions and to express concerns. Ultimately, The Friends of the Monument were successful in their efforts. These efforts are commendable, no matter what one's view of the monument itself, because they demonstrate what can be done by dedicated members of the public and encourage others in the community to participate in issues that affect them.

The Friends of the Monument were featured on NBC Nightly News during green week. They also were recently recognized by the Environmental Protection Agency with an environmental award.

I am glad to highlight their efforts here today, and I am very proud to acknowledge their accomplishments.

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

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

ALL PEOPLE ARE EQUAL

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, yesterday the House passed the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, H.R. 1913.

The bill reminds me of a passage from George Orwell's book, ''Animal Farm,'' where he wrote, ''All animals are equal. Some animals are more equal than others.''

Under this legislation, all people are equal. Some people are more equal than others. This bill attempts to create a new class of people with a new category of punishment that is determined by the thoughts and words, as well as other actions. It's based on the premise of a hate crime, a hate crime.

If one assumes there is hate crimes, isn't it logical to assume that there is just the opposite, love crimes?

Well, the concept of love crimes doesn't hold, and neither should the concept of a special class of citizens created by hate crimes. But it is true that crimes are committed. And if you are a victim of crime, whether it is motivated by hate, greed, envy or whatever the driving force is, you, as a victim, deserve equal justice under the law.

Equal justice under the law is an old and very well accepted concept in America. Where we are a Nation of equals, a Nation of men and women who bow to no man, to no king, we should expect equal treatment under the law, equal justice.

This legislation places into the judicial system and into the hands of a jury the determination of the thoughts of the criminal and the responsibility to determine were these actions different if the victim has a certain sexual orientation?

However, the term sexual orientation is not defined. This is very vague. But the term gender identity is defined as actual or perceived gender-related characteristics, perceived. This is also very vague.

In fact, the whole legislation is so vague that a minister today, reading aloud the book of Corinthians from the New Testament, could be prosecuted because it could be perceived as inciting violence. Whatever happened to free speech in the first amendment?

The amendments could have been offered to clarify some of the passages