

continue, and freedom of association and expression have been curtailed drastically. Human rights defenders are jailed for life for peacefully calling for reform, while police officers convicted of torturing a prisoner to death are allowed to walk free.

As home to the 5th Fleet and thousands of U.S. servicemembers, the U.S. has an obligation to call on the government of Bahrain to enact meaningful reforms and adhere to its international human rights commitments. In the midst of increasing instability, it is time for the U.S. to hold its ally accountable and consider a contingency plan for a removal of the 5th Fleet.

MARRIAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you this evening. I know many of my colleagues would like to visit about a very, very important topic; and that is the topic of marriage. We are currently in the midst of National Marriage Week, which is a global effort with 16 other countries to promote marriage.

I think we are going to hear tonight, Mr. Speaker, some very important information on how important marriage is to our culture, to our families, to our society and, most importantly, in my mind, to our children.

So first I would like to yield to the Congresswoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) to speak on this topic.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HUELSKAMP for sponsoring this important topic this evening on National Marriage Week.

It is fitting and proper that we would set aside this period of 1 hour to focus on the institution that is the fundamental grounding institution of the United States of America. There are various units of government. We, here, are in the well of the greatest deliberative body that the world has ever known, the House of Representatives. That is at the Federal Government level. We have 50 State governments here in the United States. We have numerous county governments and numerous cities across the United States, but the fundamental institution, the fundamental unit of government is the family unit, and the family unit begins with husband and wife.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't a creation of the Republican Party. Marriage isn't a creation of Western civilization or of the United States of America. Marriage, as an institution, was created by none other than the Creator of mankind itself, a Holy God, the God of the Bible, and it is stated very clearly in the book of Genesis that after God created man and woman, He then created the institution of marriage, and He cre-

ated it for a very simple reason: it is because God had a plan for man in the future, and that was through the propagation of the human race.

So as we are here talking about marriage this evening, my colleagues who will be joining us on this floor, we are here not to condemn anyone. My parents were married and then were divorced and then were remarried again, and that is a story that is repeated not just in America but in families across the world.

We are here not to condemn tonight because even though God creates an institution like marriage, and even though men and women can mess up and not necessarily fulfill what God had hoped for—God says He hates divorce, but it does happen—God is also the god of a second chance, and He gives people that opportunity, once again, to go back into a relationship.

So an institution that is meant for our good, it is one that, in fact, has been for good. It is good for man, good for woman, but most of all, good for the children that come from that union.

My husband and I are thankful that we have been blessed with five biological children. We have been privileged to serve as foster parents to 23 wonderful foster children. But you see, Mr. Speaker, without the umbrella and the protective element of marriage, that is the greatest security blanket that any child could ever know, to know that in their life, there is a mom or there is a dad that is crazy about them.

Many, many women raise children on their own in this country. Many men are raising children on their own. But we know that it is this fundamental institution of marriage that is the bedrock institution of this land, and so we are here tonight, as imperfect and filled with mistakes as we are—again, not condemning. We are here to lift up and support and encourage this wonderful gift given to us by the Creator but given to us for our good and for the building up of this country.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Congresswoman BACHMANN, I appreciate your leadership on so many issues. One of the inspiring parts of your life, to me, is you and your husband's efforts as foster parents. You have stories to share about the many children. Acting as a family, mom and dad to these kids, it sure must have made a difference in their lives.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Well, it really is something, and we had seen another couple in our church that were serving as foster parents. That is really what induced us to take on foster parenting. Our hearts broke when we saw the lives of some of these kids, and we knew we weren't perfect people. We knew we didn't have the perfect marriage, but we thought we could offer something into the lives of these kids.

One thing my husband said is, every child needs to know that at least one person is committed to them and at least one person is crazy about them. It

isn't to take away from the foster children's biological parents. Families go through rough patches. Families have challenges. Marriages have challenges. Nothing is perfect, and we are not standing up here saying any of us are perfect because we aren't, but what we do know is that a perfect God created a pretty good institution, and that is marriage, and that is the one thing that we felt that we could offer to our foster children.

□ 1800

We are an example of two very imperfect people in an imperfect home, but we were able to offer that model of what God had created, and that is bringing man and woman together, because we each, we are two whole people, but when we come together in marriage, we are stronger than two people together. So it is a very unique, three-stranded cord.

So I thank you for this opportunity.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. As you know, there are many parts of the country where we are short of foster parents, foster families. If there is one thing you can say to a couple considering that, what would your advice be?

Mrs. BACHMANN. I would say think about it. It is not for everyone. But if you don't think you can do it—we didn't before we were foster parents. We took in one child, a beautiful girl. We took her from a homeless shelter, and we had the experience. It was good. We got a phone call from an agency, would we take another? We thought, okay, we will take another. And then we got a phone call, would we take another? And we took another. We got a phone call, would we take another? At that point, we didn't have enough places around the dining room table, so we blew out a wall and made the dining room bigger. And we just kept taking children into our home.

What we found—it was amazing. What I would say to parents is you will be amazed how your heart can expand. And it is all good, so I just encourage people to consider being foster parents.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Congresswoman BACHMANN, I appreciate your leadership both personally and here in Congress. So thank you for your time this evening.

Next, I would like to yield to a colleague, a freshman from California. I might remind the body that five Justices on our U.S. Supreme Court apparently didn't think California voters should decide some issues of marriage. But Congressman DOUG LAMALFA is becoming a leader here in Congress on that issue. I would like to yield to him and his thoughts on the issue of marriage, families, and protecting our children.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) leading on this very important topic here tonight, especially given that this is, indeed, International Marriage Week culminating on February 14, Valentine's Day. I am also

very pleased that my valentine is actually in town with me here for a few days, and it really, really picks you up because coming from California to the east coast does have its challenges in doing this job and doing it well.

That is really what the institution of marriage is. Your mate is your rock and your support when you are in a role like this, or whatever it is. It doesn't have to be this. It can be any job, or what she is doing at home, when your spouse is at home taking care of family, kids, and all that, you being a rock for them, too.

It is that partnership which is what marriage is. It was perfectly designed by God. It is the part where mankind gets involved where things can get a little messy. And so through prayer, through sticking to it, the institution of marriage is one that is a rock. It is kind of like—what is it?—a Nebraska defense years ago; you bend but you don't break.

That is what that bond of marriage is supposed to be. It is supposed to keep together. Yes, you have some tough days and you have some tough times, whether they are financial or there are things in your life, a stressful job or somebody makes mistakes in their marriage. That bond is what keeps you together. It is sad that in this day and age the sacred institution of marriage has been cheapened so much by you see what is going on in Hollywood, what you see with easy, no-fault divorce, that it makes it where people believe that maybe there is just an easy way out of this.

That is certainly not to say that people shouldn't have an out for a bad, bad marriage, an abusive marriage, but it also needs to be not taken lightly before you enter into it. So a successful blueprint, you will hear time and time again—there are statistics on it—is that if you, in your life, finish school, finish school, whether it is high school, trade school, college, grad school, whatever it is, grow up. Be a little bit mature before you enter this institution, then seek the bonds of marriage, then have kids. If you do it in that order, the percentages, the odds of being successful for you, your spouse, your life, and your kids—you create kids. You bring kids into the world. You have a responsibility, a big one, to help set them on a positive course.

I have heard stats before that kids coming from a marriage, a family with a father and a mother in the same home, have like a 70 percent better chance of being successful, of getting through their life, with getting through school, moving on, being supported to where it goes.

So the institution has so much good going for it. Indeed, it is one created by God and recognized by the Founders and is a cornerstone of this Nation's forming. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it says right above you on the podium there, "In God we trust." This is important trust we have in upholding marriage.

My colleague mentioned that being from California we do some strange

things out there sometimes. But, you know, amazingly, in California, two different propositions in the State of California passed, prop. 22 and then proposition 8, by the people of California, affirming that marriage is, indeed, one man and one woman. If you open the floodgates to other ideas, other concepts, you don't know where it ends. Multiple marriages? Same-sex marriage? There are so many things that are not what the institution is supposed to be about, indeed, an institution created by God, and it is supposed to be held up and respected by men and women.

Indeed, it is an important responsibility. It is a decision you make not lightly because it is a lifetime decision—at least, it is supposed to be. For me and my wife, we just celebrated 25 years this year. We are proud of that statistic, but even more so grateful for the institution and what it means for our kids and the stability this institution brings for them and for a nation, one nation under God.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank you, Congressman.

The gentleman from California raises some incredibly important points; number one, the personal aspect of marriage; also, the social aspect of marriage, particularly for our children.

I appreciate the efforts of voters in California. I apologize that a few Justices decided to attempt to overrule folks in California on this issue.

Next, I would like to turn towards a gentleman from Texas who has rapidly become a leader on this issue as well, and that is Congressman RANDY WEBER.

RANDY, could you share with us some of your thoughts about marriage and its impact as we celebrate National Marriage Week?

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, TIM HUELSKAMP, for the opportunity to speak out today in support of marriage and also what I am going to call unmarriage, and we will talk a bit more on that later.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, children are the only thing God can use to make adults, so we had better give Him a ready supply.

I would submit to those of us who are following this and listening that marriage has been the strong foundation of our culture and our society. Our government recognizes marriage because of the benefits it extends to our society. A healthy marriage creates stability, and it creates security, Mr. Speaker. A healthy marriage ensures a committed relationship with a mom and a dad to raise, to teach, and to instill values in those children.

A change in attitude towards marriage over the past several decades has been slowly corrupting our marriage culture. But it is important that we continue to recognize the important institution that is marriage and allow the conversation on its public policy interest to continue in the States.

This past week, sadly, Eric Holder, the Attorney General, has once again thwarted the Constitution, thwarted the separation of powers, and thwarted the popular will of the people when he announced that the Department of Justice—and I use the word loosely—would extend recognition of same-sex marriages nationwide, including my beloved Texas that has adopted a constitutional amendment to define marriage as a union between one man and one woman for our specific public-policy interests. We adopted that in Texas by over 76 percent of the vote in 2005.

Last summer, as we know, Congressman, you have already referred to it, the Supreme Court made yet another mistake. The Federal definition of marriage in the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA, was ruled unconstitutional in the *United States v. Windsor* case. As a result of the vagueness contained in that decision, Federal agencies began developing interagency guidance that surpasses the limits set by our very own Constitution, set by the Supreme Court, and set by Congress. While some of those agencies are referring to State law, Mr. Speaker, in determining a couple's marital status based on where the couple resides, called the State of domicile, other Federal agencies are using the State of celebration or where a couple is married when they enforce Federal laws.

This latter practice is unconstitutional. Agencies do not have the authority to create law and, therefore, agencies, which are following "the State of celebration" in determining the recognition of marriage, they undercut State laws and inherently influence the debate within the borders of those States.

That is why I have introduced the State Marriage Defense Act. This act solves that problem. It provides that a marriage will not be recognized by the Federal Government if it is not recognized by the State in which the person lives, aka, the State of domicile. Every American's marital status in the eyes of the Federal Government would be the same as in the eyes of the State where he or she lives. That would simplify the law and do away with the confusion on the part the Federal agencies at least in that one regard.

So again, I have introduced the State Marriage Defense Act of 2014, which simply provides that a relationship will not be recognized as a marriage by the Federal Government if it is not recognized by the State in which that certain person lives. That is it in a nutshell.

My bill, the State Marriage Defense Act of 2014, is a states' rights bill. We in Texas don't want other States telling us—or the Federal Government for that matter—telling us how we should live, and we don't intend to tell them how they should live.

And now about what I call "unmarriage." Federal Government: leave marriage alone and leave it to the individuals who live in, contribute

to, and build families at the local level. Federal Government: divorce yourselves from this notion of dictating to the States. That needs to be an unmarriage.

I have been married to the prettiest gal this side of the Atlantic, TIM, for 37 years, and she is my girlfriend of 39 years. I understand that marriage is a commitment. It is a tremendous institution, and it undergirds our very society. I am glad to participate in National Marriage Week and to stand up and fight for states' rights.

I am RANDY WEBER, and there you have it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congressman WEBER.

I have one follow-up question to try to determine in your mind exactly where do you think our Attorney General and the administration believes they have the authority to determine exactly what a marriage is? Can you explain that to me, Congressman?

Mr. WEBER of Texas. You know, I wish I could, TIM. Sadly, I think they have gone around the Constitution, gone around the Supreme Court, and gone around the Congress. I would say we have a constitutional crisis on our hands because here is an administration that is out of control, an Attorney General that is out of control, and, sadly for the executive branch, for someone who taught constitutional law, that is a scary notion to me because I can just assure you that I have read the Constitution many times over, and I don't have a clue where they get the authority, other than people have been silent and not stood up against that kind of what I would call "want to be kingship."

So I hope that enough people stand up and say enough is enough, get back to the basics and back to the Constitution. Again, as I said, unmarry this notion that the Federal Government has got to be in on our everyday lives.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you for your leadership. I appreciate your efforts on the State Marriage Defense Act. I am a cosponsor of that, and I encourage my colleagues to take a close look at that. It is not just the issue of marriage; it is the issue of who makes the decisions. As the author of the Kansas Marriage Amendment in 2005, I believe Kansans should decide that and Texans should decide that, not five unelected Justices here in our Nation's capital.

So, thank you, RANDY, for your efforts.

Next, I would like to yield to a Congressman from New Jersey. Congressman SCOTT GARRETT has been a critical leader on many issues of the home, the heart, marriage, family, and fiscal responsibility. It has been my honor to serve with Congressman GARRETT.

I yield the gentleman from New Jersey as much time as he might consume, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1815

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and

for leading this Special Order this evening in recognition of what week we are in, Celebrating Marriage Week, and recognizing the very importance that marriage has to our society.

Our society it can be said is built on four pillars: marriage, family, church, and the government, and today, we are faced with the reality that one of these pillars is crowding out and attempting to change the makeup of the other three. We have seen that some of our government's policies have discouraged traditional family marriage and traditional family structure as well, but I believe our government has an obligation to support policies that support marriage and support the American dream.

One of the most positive influences on a society is a strong family structure. Marriage itself is essential. It is essential to society, and it is essential to our American country and the American Dream. What I say is not ideology; what I say is data-driven. It is verified by the facts that marriage alone stands as a strong social fabric, a stronger economy, and a better future for our children. See, individuals who are part of a marriage household, a married household, are more likely to overcome disadvantaged backgrounds. They are less likely to live in poverty. Married individuals are more likely to earn more money, to save more money, and are less likely to be in debt. See, marriage is not only important for the economic health of our Nation, but it is also important for future generations as well. Children are more likely to succeed not only if they come from a married household, but the chances of prosperity, and this is interesting, are greater even further if they are raised in a community, a neighborhood, if you will, that shares the value of marriage. Children who come from a married household, to give one statistic, are 82 percent less likely to live in poverty and are more likely to gain a college education and succeed in society.

What is most essential to note is it is not only imperative for a child to be raised in a two-parent household, but it is also important for children to be raised, as I said a moment ago, in a community that values marriage and values family. Children who are raised in that sort of community will have higher rates of upward social mobility. I would note, to truly address some of the issues that Congress here tries to address, such as child poverty, we must address the root causes of those problems, and we must then acknowledge a solution to those problems as well.

So if you want to encourage economic growth, reduce poverty and ensure a prosperous Nation for future children, our government must encourage a strong family structure.

I said once before that this is not ideology-driven, this is data-driven. Why do I say that? Well, if you want to try to answer the question of what are the factors that are preventing, for exam-

ple, poor children from getting ahead, for mobility, we have data to support it. There is an important new Harvard study that looks at the best data on mobility in America that just came out recently. The name of that study is "Where is the Land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States." It is a long title, but basically a study that came out of Harvard by economist Raj Chetty, and some of these colleagues over in Berkeley as well.

What they did was to dive down into the numbers, if you will, to see what are the characteristics most likely to predict mobility for lower-income children. This Harvard study asked which factors are the strongest predictors of upward mobility in various situations. In other words, which are the factors you can look to to see what is it that will bring children in poverty situations to a higher level. They went through all of the various factors you might imagine, but of all of the factors most predictive of economic mobility in America, one that clearly stands out above the rest is family structure, meaning what we are talking about here today, marriage.

I will quote from the study, if I may:

The strongest and most robust predictor is the fraction of children with single parent.

In other words, the strongest indicator of where they are going to have a problem with social mobility, in other words the indicator that says what is most likely to suppress or to keep children from being able to rise up and increase their stature in the community, to be able to go to college, get a job and support themselves and be productive in society, in short, live the American Dream, is whether or not they come from single-family households or whether they come from a married situation:

Children of married parents also have higher rates of upper mobility if they live in communities with fewer single parents.

Why do I say that? Well, again, what this recognizes is it is not just an isolationist situation, it is not just if you alone are married; it depends on whether or not you live in a neighborhood or you live in a community where everyone else around you is married, too. If you do, then you are a fortunate child because you live in a situation where you are more likely to be able to say: My future is good; my future is one where I am going to be able to prosper. My future is one where I will probably be able to move out of my current economic situation and do better.

So those two factors: it is whether you come from single parents or married parents, and also whether you live in a community where people around you are all single or people around you are all married.

So I think it is interesting. It is also interesting that this study comes not from some university that you might think of as being more conservative, but coming from Berkeley and Harvard, I guess we consider the source.

In closing, a lot of research, including some new research from Brookings Institution, shows what has already been shown, the first point, and that is to say if you are married, you have a better chance of rising up the economic ladder. This study now adds the additional feature of the community aspect.

My third point, what we are saying here tonight, is not ideology-driven at all. What I am referring to is a data-driven decision that we can make as Members of Congress. As a recent author pointed out, we just had the President of the United States standing before us saying that we must be a data-driven Congress and a data-driven government, and I agree with him. The data is now out there. The data shows to increase opportunity in America, to increase upward mobility in America, to sustain the American Dream, people of all races and people of all income levels have a far better chance if they come from a married family and a married community as well. So to understand this and have government have an effect on civil society, we must understand these parameters, and I applaud the gentleman for bringing this very important issue to the floor tonight.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the gentleman. You do indicate one study, but clearly what we do have are decades and decades of research, and obviously personal experience as well, on how important marriage is to reducing poverty, reducing crime. The number one single factor is the situation of marriage, and the gentleman from New Jersey has brought some additional issues as far as community.

We sit in this body and hear from the President and others: What can we do for the children? I wonder, it was about a year ago, and we have the President of France in our Nation as we speak, and there were more than 1 million French marching recently to say marriage is important. Were they saying marriage was important for them? Partly, but they were saying it is most important for the children. If you want to help the children, I beseech you, the research is clear. The Congressman has identified a study, and study after study exists, if you want to help reduce poverty, if you want to help self-esteem, let's help encourage marriage.

I appreciate your leadership on this. Next, I yield to a freshman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH). Again, this is National Marriage Week. It is close to Valentine's Day, and I hope you have gotten your Valentine gift for your sweetheart.

Mr. YOH. I thank my colleague, Mr. HUELSKAMP from the great State of Kansas, for holding this Special Order on the sanctity, the institution of marriage. Marriage, as we have heard, is the bedrock, the foundation of a society, and a strong society is necessary for a strong community. Strong communities are needed for strong States, and thus, they form a strong Nation.

We have heard over and over again the different aspects people have brought out.

Sociologists talk about how the family unit, a husband and wife, are the basic building blocks for a strong family, which is essential for strong communities. It has been proven over and over again, the family unit, people will have higher grades, higher economics when they come out of school. We toured several Head Start programs in our district, and I have asked the teachers over and over again: What percentage of the people are at the poverty level? It is 90-95 percent. My next question is: What percentage of the students here are from single-parent households? It is 85-95 percent all the time. That just shows you the importance of marriage.

Marriage is an institution passed down through thousands of years of human history. The three great religions, and others, recognize the importance of a marriage, and it has gone through the test of time and it has been understood to be the union of a man and a woman. It is sanctified by God, and it is interesting to note that children only come from the union of one-half of a DNA strand from a female and one-half of a DNA strand from a father. That is nature's law; that's God's law.

February is the month of lovers with Valentine's Day this coming Friday, February 14. February 14 is also the anniversary of my wife and I. I met her in the fourth grade, my fourth-grade sweetheart, Carolyn. This February 14 marks the 39th anniversary of Carolyn and I, and I am so proud of that fact. Somebody asked me today, What are you most proud of? I said, My marriage to my wife. We believe in a traditional marriage. We tend to stay that way. I just want to say: Thank you, dear. I love you, and happy anniversary.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I thank the Congressman. I appreciate your compelling personal story. It is a story shared by millions of other Americans. It is something of the heart. We mentioned as well, it is not just of the heart and the home; it is for our community and the entire country.

The President and I can disagree on a number of things, but in 2008 there were some words that I think are clearly on the mark in terms of some items we have been discussing today. In his 2008 Father's Day address, the President said:

We know the statistics: that children who grow up without a father are five times more likely to live in poverty and commit crime, nine times more likely to drop out of school, and 20 times more likely to have behavioral problems or run away from home or become teenage parents themselves.

Without the institution of marriage, without particularly the institution of fatherhood, and we are facing a crisis epidemic of fatherlessness in this country, the President and I agree. It has an impact. It has an impact on every child. The lack of marriage and the

lack of stability and the declining awareness of marriage hurts our children and hurts our society.

It reminds me of a story that I believe was in Dr. James Dobson's book on raising up boys, and I do have two boys myself. He noted some years ago executives of a greeting card company decided to do something special for Mother's Day. So in a Federal prison, they set up a table inviting any inmate who desired to send a free card to his mom. The lines were long, and they had to make another trip to the factory to get more cards. Due to the success of the event, they said let's do the same thing on Father's Day, but this time, this time, no one came. Not one prisoner felt the need to send a card to his dad. Many had no idea who their fathers even were or how important it was.

So those who are listening, whether you are fathers or mothers or looking at that, recognize that even though this society, even though Hollywood will tell us it is all about you, it is not. It is all about someone else. It is all about that child. They need a father, they need a mother.

No one can be perfect. I have four kids myself, and I am reminded of that every day, oftentimes by my daughters themselves, but we are not asking for perfection, we are just asking for that time, that time to promote marriage and to spend the time with your spouse.

□ 1830

If you are not married and you have children, look at getting married. That will stabilize and bring many things to your children.

This is National Marriage Week. This is an opportunity here in our Nation not only to talk about marriage, but talk about its impacts, talk about how its loss has hurt our society. I firmly believe that we could spend endless amounts of money up here, and occasionally we do that, but you cannot replace the family, you cannot replace daddy, you cannot replace mommy. We can do our best. We can help our neighbors.

But as we debate the definition of marriage where we have a Court that on the one hand in June says we are going to let the States decide kind of unless you are in California, and then on the other hand there is a Federal definition or a State definition, at the end of the day it is all about how important marriage is. Marriage predates government. We might like to redefine it.

In 1856, the Republican Party had a number of things in their platform. One is very important. They demanded a free Kansas. Being a Kansan, we appreciated that and entered as a free State a few years later.

They also wanted to face numerous other things, including the twin evils of slavery and barbarism. They were talking about the issues of irregular marriage and the issues of traditional

marriage and how important it was and still is to society.

I appreciate many of my colleagues that joined us here tonight. But most importantly, I want to just speak again to moms and dads and spouses. Marriage can be tough, it really is, but God is calling you to do everything you can. It is just not you and your spouse. There is a third person in your marriage. God would like to bless and protect that marriage and give you many fruitful days ahead.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time on the special hour during National Marriage Week. I appreciate folks that are listening—my colleagues. Feel free to tweet out the message to encourage that. We can do many great things up here we think in Washington, D.C., but oftentimes it is that one little thing we can do for our neighbors and for our spouses as we celebrate Valentine's Day this week.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2012, ATTACK ON BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me for 30 minutes to speak on a topic, no matter where I go or what I speak on or if I am being interviewed somewhere, I am not the only one, it is other Members of Congress, too. This isn't a Republican issue. This is a bipartisan issue that Republicans and Democrats, Mr. Speaker, confront wherever we go across the United States. I think that it has to do with the fact that Americans cannot countenance the fact that, when we had people who are serving us in harm's way, it appears that the United States of America, in one of the rarest occasions that anyone can recall, wasn't there for those who were serving us on foreign lines.

What I am speaking of, Mr. Speaker, is the night of September 11, 2012, what is known as "Benghazi." People still say to us, Mr. Speaker—again, Republicans and Democrats alike, because this is clearly a bipartisan issue. They say to us, when will we get the definitive report on Benghazi? When will we get some answers on what happened on that night, September 11, 2012? Because no American citizen should go and serve her country and not be protected by the Nation that sent her there.

Those who were killed that evening: Ambassador Chris Stevens, the first American ambassador to be killed in 30 years in the line of duty; Sean Smith, who was there that evening with our ambassador; and then also two men who gave their lives trying to protect our ambassador, Glen Doherty and Ty-

rone Woods. They weren't on the scene very long when they finally arrived in Benghazi.

The Senate intelligence report that came out said that perhaps 15 minutes had lapsed by the time they arrived on the scene until they were murdered by a sophisticated mortar fire on the roof of the annex.

Well, let's go back a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Let's take a look of what we know to be true so far.

We have had two reports that have been issued. One is from the Senate Intelligence Committee. I commend every American to go to the Senate Intelligence Committee Web site and download that report, read it for yourself, share it with your friends, share it with your family, and you will be shocked at what you find in these findings.

The media didn't pick it up. The report came out, it is true. It was reported in the media, it is true, that there had been a report, but what the findings said about the lack of management and the lack of accountability coming out of the White House and the State Department, quite literally coming to the very doorstep of the President of the United States and of the Secretary of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is shocking, and shocking is the fact that to this day there have virtually been no firings at the State Department for what happened at Benghazi, despite the fact of the report that was issued by the Senate Intelligence Committee and despite the fact that this week the House Foreign Affairs Committee issued another report after another investigation of what occurred at Benghazi. You see, there was a report, Mr. Speaker, that was issued prior to this one. It was the Benghazi Accountability Review Board.

It is very curious that this Benghazi Accountability Review Board failed to interview the senior-most decision-makers in the Department of State. The facility in Benghazi, the compound where Chris Stevens and Sean Smith lost their lives, that particular compound is managed by the State Department; it is run by the State Department.

I would like to go over some of the findings this evening. In the minutes that we have together, I would like to go over some of the findings that were issued in this report. As I urge my fellow citizens in the United States to go to the Senate Intelligence Committee and read the damning report and the conclusions of that report, I also encourage my fellow citizens to go to the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs and download the report that was just issued this week also on Benghazi. The report is entitled, Mr. Speaker, Benghazi: Where is the State Department Accountability? Majority Staff Report, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee is a Representative

from the State of California, Mr. ED ROYCE. Mr. ED ROYCE said in September of 2013, the State Department cannot have a culture of accountability if no one, literally no one, is held accountable for the mismanagement and poor leadership of the Accountability Review Board it self-identified. In other words, a report which, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, was woefully inadequate in investigating Benghazi, what we will call the ARB, the Accountability Review Board, even that report said there were deficiencies in accountability at the State Department. We know there was woeful inadequacy, and this is something that has to be addressed.

I call on members of the media, Wake up. Take a look at what the American people want to know, and that is answers, answers about what led up to the night of September 11, 2013, in Benghazi. Were there alerts? Were there reports? Did we have any idea that this tragedy was going to occur? Absolutely we do. That is what this report shows from the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

What happened that night? What did the President of the United States do? Why is it that the media has absolutely no curiosity when it comes to where the President of the United States was that evening when the battle ensued? It actually wasn't evening. In Washington, D.C., it was 3:40 in the afternoon.

In the election that occurred in 2008, there were two Democrat candidates. There was Hillary Rodham Clinton and Barack Obama who were vying to become the nominee of the Democrat Party. One particular commercial was aired by Hillary Rodham Clinton. It was famously called "the 3 a.m. commercial," and the question that the ad asked is: Who would be the person that you want to answer the phone at 3 in the morning if a call comes for a tragedy?—inferring a foreign policy tragedy.

Well, the call did come, unfortunately, tragically, but it didn't come at 3 in the morning. It came at 3 in the afternoon. To be precise, Mr. Speaker, that call came in at 3:40 in the afternoon from a desperate security officer in Benghazi inside the U.S. compound who picked up the phone and made a call to the desk that he was to report to. That call immediately was transferred to the appropriate channels. Literally, Mr. Speaker, within minutes of the attack on the compound in Benghazi the President of the United States was informed not only that our American compound was under attack in what can only be called one of the greatest hellholes of the world, but he was also informed that our ambassador went missing and other Americans, as well.

What would a Commander in Chief do? What did our Commander in Chief do? I don't know. As a Member of Congress, I don't know where our Commander in Chief was that night. I don't