days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2719 directs the Department of the Interior to ensure public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain, located within the Hanford Reach National Monument in my district.

At 3,600 feet, Rattlesnake Mountain is the highest point in the region and provides unparalleled views for miles around the monument, the Hanford Site, the Columbia River, the Yakima River and the Snake River. Unfortunately, it took the Fish and Wildlife Service 8 years to write a management plan that effectively closed Rattlesnake Mountain to public access, despite the public comments favoring just the opposite.

After I introduced this bill last Congress, the Fish and Wildlife Service, in October of 2010, offered two public tours for selected individuals, and then suddenly reneged on the offer just days before the tours were to occur without any explanation. During a recent committee hearing on the bill, the Interior Department's testimony suggested that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports tours of Rattlesnake Mountain, but very carefully didn't go the extra step of ensuring that the Service would allow public access to the actual summit. Access to the mountain and access to the summit are two entirely different matters.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, the Service has had more than 10 years, and they say it will take several more before they can determine if it will allow the American people to have access to this portion of the monument. That is why this bill is so necessary to guarantee public access by law and to do so in a very timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, I might add the tallest mountain in Washington State is Mount Rainier at 14,410 feet. People have access up to that under certain conditions. This is a mountain that has no trees; it's 3,600 feet. There's no reason why people shouldn't have access.

And to that extent, the legislation is supported by the Tri-Cities Development Council, the Board of Benton County Commissioners in which Rattlesnake Mountain is located, the Tri-Cities Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Tri-Cities Visitor and Convention Bureau, and the Back Country Horsemen of Washington.

The American people deserve to have access to public lands, including Rattlesnake Mountain. I ask that the House pass this reasonable legislation today to help make that possible.

□ 1910

I note that the bill was reported by the Committee on Natural Resources by unanimous consent, and I appreciate the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this measure.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2719, which would require the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide both motorized and non-motorized access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain. This bill would allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to enter into cooperative agreements with the Department of Energy, the State of Washington, local governments, and other interested persons to provide guided tours to the summit of the mountain and to maintain the access road to the summit.

In 2008 the Fish and Wildlife Service completed a management plan for this area and determined that Service-sponsored or led tours and a hiking trail are appropriate and compatible uses of the area. In October, at the hearing on H.R. 2719, the Fish and Wildlife Service supported the bill's intent to provide appropriate public access on Rattlesnake Mountain that gives due consideration to all stakeholders, including the Yakima tribe.

I commend Chairman HASTINGS from Washington for introducing this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2719.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SUGAR LOAF FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2011

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 278) to provide for the exchange of certain land located in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District Land Exchange Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District of Boulder, Colorado.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means—

(A) the parcel of approximately 1.52 acres of land in the National Forest that is generally depicted on the map numbered 1, entitled ''Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange'', and dated November 12, 2009; and

(B) the parcel of approximately 3.56 acres of land in the National Forest that is generally depicted on the map numbered 2, entitled ''Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange'', and dated November 12, 2009.

(3) NATIONAL FOREST.—The term ''National Forest'' means the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forests located in the State of Colorado.

(4) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal land'' means the parcel of approximately 5.17 acres of non-Federal land in unincorporated Boulder County, Colorado, that is generally depicted on the map numbered 3, entitled ''Sugarloaf Fire Protection District Proposed Land Exchange'', and dated November 12, 2009.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this Act, if the District offers to convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the non-Federal land, and the offer is acceptable to the Secretary—

(1) the Secretary shall accept the offer; and

(2) on receipt of acceptable title to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) shall apply to the land exchange authorized under subsection (a), except that—

(1) the Secretary may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent of the value of the Federal land; and

(2) as a condition of the land exchange under subsection (a), the District shall—

(A) pay each cost relating to any land surveys and appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land; and

(B) enter into an agreement with the Secretary that allocates any other administrative costs between the Secretary and the District.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The land exchange under subsection (a) shall be subject to—

(1) valid existing rights; and

(2) any terms and conditions that the Secretary may require.

(d) TIME FOR COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange under subsection (a) shall be completed not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY TO CONDUCT SALE OF FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2), if the land exchange under subsection (a) is not completed by the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may offer to sell to the District the Federal land.

(2) VALUE OF FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary may offer to sell to the District the Federal land for the fair market value of the Federal land.

(f) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall deposit in the fund established under Public Law 90–171 (commonly known as the ''Sisk Act'') (16 U.S.C. 484a) any amount received by the Secretary as the result of—

(A) any cash equalization payment made under subsection (b); and

(B) any sale carried out under subsection (e).

(2) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and until expended, for the acquisition of land or interests in land in the National Forest System.

(g) MANAGEMENT AND STATUS OF ACQUIRED LAND.—The non-Federal land acquired by the Secretary under this section shall be—

(1) added to, and administered as part of, the National Forest; and

(2) managed by the Secretary in accordance with—

(A) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the ''Weeks Law'') (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.); and

(B) any laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest.

(h) REVOCATION OF ORDERS; WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) REVOCATION OF ORDERS.—Any public order withdrawing the Federal land from entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws is revoked to the extent necessary to permit the conveyance of the Federal land to the District.

(2) WITHDRAWAL.—On the date of enactment of this Act, if not already withdrawn or segregated from entry and appropriation under the public land laws (including the mining and mineral leasing laws) and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), the Federal land is withdrawn until the date of the conveyance of the Federal land to the District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 278 will exchange approximately 5 acres of land between the Forest Service and the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District in Colorado. The District has operated two fire stations on Forest Service land since 1967 but has been unable to install septic services or make other improvements to the fire stations since it does not own the land.

This bill would correct this issue by conveying the lands to the District in exchange for an inholding it currently owns within the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest, at no cost to the Federal Government. The Committee on Natural Resources has already favorably reported the House version of this bill, H.R. 643, and if we pass this bill, the bill will go to the President's desk.

With that, I urge adoption of the measure and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since 1967 the Forest Service has issued two special use permits to the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District to own and operate two fire stations on National Forest System land.

The District would like to own the parcels of land on which the fire stations sit in order to build an area for firefighter training and bathroom facilities. The land exchange authorized in this legislation will assist the Fire District in its mission and is in the public interest. I support passage of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman POLIS, sponsored the House companion to this legislation, H.R. 643. I commend Congressman POLIS for his work on this bill and wish to yield him such time as he may consume.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to provide a description and some color for this important bill, which passed this body last session in the 111th Congress without any objection and did not make it through the Senate last session.

Well, I am proud to say that, since that point, Senate bill 278 has cleared the Senate. It's the companion to my bill, H.R. 643. There are some minor changes to comply with House rules that are going to be sent back to the Senate, and we sure hope that, expeditiously, we can get this bill to President Obama's desk because what we're trying to accomplish here is very simple and noncontroversial.

It's the result of a longtime effort, far too long, by the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District in Sugar Loaf, Colorado. This Fire Protection District came to national notice for their heroic efforts in the Fourmile Canyon Fire last year, which, remarkably, while it led to considerable property damage led to no loss of life, thanks in no small part to their heroic efforts.

Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District and the U.S. Forest Service have always worked together very closely since the Fire District was created in 1967. The volunteer first responders at the Sugar Loaf Fire Protection District are the key to both wildland and residential fires in Boulder County, as well as car accidents and health emergencies in the communities and public lands that they so capably serve.

However, until this bill becomes law, they're unable to make any improvements to their facility. They can't even add a much-needed restroom facility so that their volunteers can have the same type of plumbing that we can expect in this day and age.

In its start, again, since 1967, the Fire District's physical home was established in an existing building on U.S. Forest Service land through a special use permit. Three years later a second building was constructed, another special use permit, both in important locations for accessibility on the few main roads that serve this mountainous area.

This bill will exchange the small amount of Federal land on which these facilities exist with private land that's been purchased by the Fire District for this transfer, land that's better suited for the scenic and recreational needs of the public lands. It's a net gain for our Federal Government.

While the U.S. Forest Service and these special use permits have been greatly appreciated over the 40-year history, it's important that the Fire District has the autonomy to direct its future, modernize its facilities, build basic amenities like running water and restrooms. And their location on public land has precluded them from making these modernizations, which we need to better protect both our wildlands and residential areas.

The surrounding communities have grown considerably over the past decades, and these volunteer fire departments and the buildings that serve them have taken on additional responsibilities as community meeting centers, making it even more critical that we update them to facilitate this role.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Chairman HASTINGS' and Ranking Member MARKEY's efforts in bringing this bill to the floor, hopefully seeing this bill through to law soon. This bill's been passed out of both Chambers of Congress now, but just hasn't been able to make it past the finish line within a single Congress in one form, barely running out of time in the Senate last year.

By the House agreeing to take up the Senate bill, I'm confident and thankful that this commonsense bill will finally become law.

Again, I thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY for bringing this bill to the floor. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this measure.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just note to my friend from Colorado, he said that the bill passed the House last year and the Senate didn't act on it. I think it's very good strategy on his part to take the Senate bill. Now we, of course, have to perfect it, but we'll send it back and maybe this will be easier for them to act. I certainly hope so.

With that, I urge passage of the bill.

I advise my friend that I am prepared to yield back if he yields back.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I again urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, S. 278, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1920

BRIAN A. TERRY MEMORIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2668) to designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the ''Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT HOOD SHOOTINGS: WORKPLACE VIOLENCE OR TERRORISM?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, 13 adults and one unborn child were killed and 31 individuals were wounded in a shooting attack at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009. Since that time, the Department of Defense has taken no steps to award combat benefits to the casualties or even officially recognize the attack as a terrorist incident.

The House and Senate have included two reform measures in the NDAA, which we just passed, while additional attacks have been attempted by similar high-profile radical Islamic terrorists. It is past time for the government to deliver on this act.

Mr. Speaker, here we are almost 3 years later, and there's been a recent report that has come out; and in that report, it references this incident of this slaughter of American troops on Fort Hood soil in Texas. It references that it shall be taken up as part of workplace violence.

The Obama regime calls the Fort Hood shooting ''workplace violence.'' Sure, it's workplace violence: it's where they work and it's violence. But we have a concept of what workplace violence is. And your normal workplace violence is not preceded by a shout by the shooter, ''God is great,'' in the Arabic language. It's not preceded by discussions by the alleged perpetrator. It's alleged because he hasn't been convicted yet. And we, in a free American world, take the position that all are innocent until proven guilty. So we will call him the ''alleged'' shooter.

But there's clear evidence in reports by the Defense Department and by reports by the news media, reports by witnesses on the scene, reports by his fellow soldiers, reports by folks from Walter Reed Hospital where this American-trained, military-trained doctor worked that he had advocated that the American soldier was wrong and that he was contrary, and he spoke and preached Islamic terrorism.

So your normal workplace violence, that's not a part of the factor. Yet this is what happened in this case. Senator COLLINS on Wednesday blasted the Defense Department, and bless her for it, for classifying the Fort Hood massacre as workplace violence and suggested political correctness is being placed above the security of the Nation's Armed Forces at home.

I've been talking about this now since the day after this happened. We can't have a world where political correctness fails to define the criminal act. By its very nature, whether we're talking about military law and the criminal relations in military law, we're just talking about criminal acts in general, we have to be able to define them. Just to make the system work we have to be able to define them.

But more importantly, we owe a duty and a responsibility to the American soldier to call an event what it is and not try to put a smokescreen over it or cloud the issue or in any way worry about the feelings of groups, because the definition is the definition. This man identified himself that he was committing this act in the name of ''God is great'' in Arabic. He acknowledged when questioned that it was part of his mission. He acknowledged that he had dealt with terrorist spokesmen in the past and that the concept came from his interaction with Awlaki and others.

So this guy is an Islamic terrorist. There's no other way you can describe this gentleman.

But now years after the event as he sits in the Bell County Jail in Belton, Texas, we continue to have reports coming down from our Defense Department that the folks that are responsible for our soldiers and responsible for those who died in this incident want to downplay this to be treated as an incident of workplace violence with all the white bread connotation that that has. To me, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

So let's look at some of the evidence we have that connects this to Islamic terrorism, recognizing the November 5, 2009, attack on Fort Hood, Texas, as an act of radical Islamic terrorism and jihad.

□ 1930

Anwar Awlaki connection. Now, Mr. Awlaki is no longer with us. We have taken that boy out. Yet the bottom line is, at the time this happened, they were directly connected.

This man preached, taught, and encouraged violence—Islamic terrorist violence: ''Hasan's presentations to the DOD on jihad justification.'' He would argue with his fellow soldiers about the justification for having jihad against the American military. Mr. Hasan was a member of the United States Army. He was a major. He had been serving in the Medical Corps as a psychiatrist. He was trained with American taxpayer dollars, but he was preaching jihad to soldiers, and there was lots of evidence.

I had a bill, which was included in this recent defense bill that we just passed. It said that this guy was telling people that he'd believed in this kind of thing since medical school. Now he's a major, serving as a psychiatrist, advising our soldiers.

''Hasan purchased and practiced with high-capacity firearms prior to the attack.'' He went out and he bought firearms. He bought them at a local gun store. Of the guns that were used in the killings, one of them was a semiautomatic weapon with a large magazine capacity. He went out to the firing range and familiarized himself with these weapons prior to this incident.

You can't think of this as some guy who goes postal all of a sudden. This guy was planning this whole event. He shouts, ''God is great'' in Arabic, before he starts shooting, but they refer to it in the context of the broader threat of workplace violence. I think there is a very good argument that the evidence shows this was a premeditated act on the part of Major Hasan; and I believe when this case finally gets to trial that the evidence will be overwhelming that it was premeditated.

At the time of the event, Lieutenant General Cone, the III Corps Commander at Fort Hood, told NBC's ''Today'' show on the Friday after the shooting that the soldiers who witnessed the shooting rampage that left 13 people dead reported that the gunman shouted, ''Allahu Akbar''—which means ''God is great''—before opening fire at the Texas post.

The day after, it was being reported that he did this. Yet, in the initial report that came out from the Defense Department, the man's name didn't even appear. The relationship to any Islamic terrorism was not referenced. It was like any major from any outfit just wandered in and started shooting soldiers, like he was having a bad day or something.

Now we get another comment saying that we're going to treat this in the bigger scope of workplace violence. Certainly, we want to prevent workplace violence in every workplace, but