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 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 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.

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 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 reads 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 Ruid, 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.


(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 land exchange under subsection (a)—

(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 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 offer to sell to the District the land exchange under subsection (a) if the land exchange is completed not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and

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

(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 MAKE 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.

I note that the bill was reported by the Committee on Natural Resources
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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 be able to 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 MARK-S' efforts in bringing this bill to the floor. Hopefully, we'll see the 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.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this measure.

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. This bill will exchange the small amount of Federal land on which the Fire District has the autonomy to direct its future, modernize its facilities, build basic amenities like running water and restrooms.

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.

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

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.
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. CARTER 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

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 day, the Department of Defense has taken no steps to award combat benefits to the casual-
ties or even officially recognize the at-
tack 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 terror-
ists. 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.”

The language is not in the American culture and it’s not preceded by discussion by the alleged per-
petrator. 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 no 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 Amer-
ican-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 De-
fense Department, and bless her for it, for classifying the Fort Hood massacre as workplace violence and suggested political correctness in 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 cor-
rectness fails 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 pretend that the incident was not 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 acknowl-
edged 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 Depart-
ments that the folks that are respon-
sible 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 label is supposed 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.

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 encoun-
tered violence—Islamic terrorist violence: “Hasan’s presentations to the DOD on jihad justification.” He would argue with his fellow soldiers about the justification for jihad and 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, advis-
ing our soldiers.

“He purchased and practiced with high-capacity firearms prior to the at-
tack.” He went out and he bought fire-
arms. He bought them at a local gun store. Of the guns that were used in the killings, one of them was a semiauto-
matic weapon with a large magazine capacity. He went out to the firing range and familiarize 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 it 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 trial comes to trial that the evidence will be over-
whelming that it was premeditated.

At the time of the event, Lieutenant General Cone, the III Corps Com-
mander at Fort Hood, told NBC’s “Today” show on the Friday after the shooting that the soldiers who wit-
tnessed the shooting rampage that left 13 people dead reported that the gun-
manshouted, “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 re-
port 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 work-
place violence in every workplace, but