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

The question is on the motion offered by the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

FORT HOOD SHOOTINGS: WORKPLACE VIOLENCE OR TERRORISM?

The Speaker pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2068) to designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 2316 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the “Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station.”

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, 13 adults and one unborn child 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 incident being 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.” It’s not in the American language. It’s not preceded by discussion 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.

In the reports by the Defense Department and by reports from the 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 that he had dealt with terrorist spokesmen in the past and that the concept came from his interactions 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’s being shoved down our throats. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

So let’s take a 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 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 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. He had been preaching 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 he 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 starts this 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...