

HONORING THE LIFE OF
MARGARET MUELLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, tonight one of the first things I will address is to talk a little bit about one of the heroes of Wisconsin's Sixth Congressional District, a woman by the name of Margaret Mueller, who passed away late last year.

One of the things we do in this job is we sometimes try to advise young people on what they should do with their lives. A lot of times those conversations revolve around occupations, and that is perhaps as it should be. I recently attended an event at a local high school where I talked about encouraging children to go into the STEM-related fields and go into an occupation there.

Margaret Mueller was a farmer's wife. When that farmer died, unfortunately, at a relatively young age, she, of course, wound up having to run the farm and ran the farm for a little under 40 years. Of course, being a farmer is one of the most important occupations because they provide us with food, but not only that, one of the most difficult occupations because not only did she have to be a businesswoman, but she had to know how to handle all of the chores that you have to do on a dairy farm. That dairy farm was in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin.

She, as many people were, was a pillar of her church, St. Gregory's of St. Nazianz, Wisconsin. I knew her because she was a pillar of the Republican Party and a delegate to the 2008 convention in Minneapolis.

But the reason I am bringing this up tonight is I always feel when people plan out their lives, they should have certain goals, and I wonder how many of the young people today will succeed in having such a huge impact that Margaret Mueller had on Manitowoc and Sheboygan Counties.

She wound up having 11 children. Six of them were still minors at the time her husband passed away. Not only did she have 11 children, but she left behind 33 grandchildren, 47 great-grandchildren, and 9 great-great-grandchildren. If you add it up, that is right on the button 100 living descendants.

It occurred to me that while she didn't go to college that I know of, the impact her life had on the people of Sheboygan and Manitowoc Counties was greater than virtually every young child has on their community today.

□ 2015

I look at the names of all the grandchildren and great-grandchildren and such in the obituary. I know there are many of them because as I get around my district again and again, people come up to me and say: You know my mom. You know my grandma.

They are all great people. I asked them what they were doing. It seems

that not only did she have 100 descendants, but 100 descendants of people you would be proud to have as your children.

Again, when I think of Margaret Mueller and people like Margaret Mueller, I think very, very few young people today will have the impact on society that she had of raising 100 descendants who get out and about the community, who are good, hard-working, honest citizens of this country. They impart the values that Margaret carried in the church in St. Nazianz and that she instilled on her children. What a legacy.

Margaret, you are so missed.

DOBBS VERSUS JACKSON WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, while we were gone on break, there was leaked a potential opinion in the *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* court case, and I think us politicians are supposed to weigh in on it.

I have been, in the last 25 years as a public official, somebody who has been active in the pro-life cause. I don't remember reading a lot about that cause growing up. In 1973, I think a lot of Americans were caught off guard when abortion was ruled to be, apparently, a constitutional right by then—what I would consider—a very liberal court. At the time, I think the churches and the pro-life movements, which had not really gotten going yet, were surprised and caught off guard. Nevertheless, it is important that right now we decide how America is going to view abortion.

Decisions are going to be made in district attorneys' offices.

Decisions are going to be made in attorney generals' offices.

Decisions are going to be made by women and their partners as to what is right and what is wrong on abortion.

Now, I feel that though this was a court decision, and a properly decided court decision, I think it is somewhat horrific that it took over 49 years between *Roe v. Wade* and the decision that so many of us were waiting for. But that decision is only the first decision. Like I said, there are going to be decisions in State legislatures. There are going to be decisions made in district attorneys' offices, whether they decide to prosecute or not, whether they are going to make public statements that they don't intend to enforce these laws anyway. In Wisconsin, abortion will be made illegal right away, one of the few States that abortion is still legal on the books. There are going to be decisions made by the individuals themselves and their partners.

What determines how people make up their mind? It has been my belief as a pro-life legislator for the last over 25 years, that while there are pro-life organizations which are doing a good job of taking out ads and putting up billboards, and while there are pregnancy counseling centers which are doing a very good job, collectively the clergy in this country have kind of dropped the ball.

This is a very important decision for the last 49 years—I think it is now a little bit below it—but a lot of those years, there have been close to a million abortions a year in the United States.

It would seem to me that as a clergyman, one of the problems you would have is you are supposed to think of 52 different speeches to give every year, and it would be hard to cover 52 different topics. If you are a clergyman in an individual parish or church for 5 years, that means you have to come up with over 250 interesting things to say. I think a lot of clergies would be looking for more things to say.

Nevertheless, I would bet in an average year, most clergy, even in churches that are nominally pro-life, manage to go all year without discussing this topic. It is a topic that should be easier to discuss now than it was over 50 years ago. For one thing, we have ultrasounds.

In 1973, when abortions were ruled legal in the United States, we did not have ultrasounds. I am sure everybody listening out there has seen the picture of the ultrasounds. Nowadays, if a woman is going to have a baby, it is relatively normal at three, four months to show everybody the ultrasound. It is so wonderful. You can no longer pretend, as you could in 1973, that that is just a piece of tissue.

Madam Speaker, I have toured abortion clinics as part of my research. When I was in the Wisconsin legislature, I authored a bill that required a 24-hour waiting period. And to my surprise, the local abortion clinics let me go through there. And I discovered going through the abortion clinics that the employees of the clinics made a point of always describing the pre-born baby as—not a fetus, they wouldn't use the word fetus—as tissue. And I always thought that the employees were probably educated to use the word tissue because it made it sound like it wasn't an act that it was, that you weren't ending the life of a little baby. It made it sound like something less than that.

Madam Speaker, we can no longer call it tissue. Nobody would look at a baby three months after conception and call that tissue today. We all know because of an ultrasound that we have a little human being in there. Given that, it should be so easy for the clergy to alert or to instill the appropriate values in their flock as to people who have to make a decision about abortion.

Nevertheless, I do believe that to this point, the American clergy have been pretty wimpy and pretty out to lunch—not all of them, but way too many of them. I think because of the lack of stepping up to the plate on this issue, polls do not show America as appalled with abortion as they should be.

Madam Speaker, the purpose of this speech is to ask any clergy, who happen to be listening at home, or in case you are a parishioner of a church and your clergyman has never broached

this topic, I would think sometime in the next 7 or 8 weeks—because most of you have already had to come up with different speeches, probably in the hundreds, in the course of your career—that you find a way to address this topic.

I should point out that there are individual churches who are bravely already addressing this topic. Churches like the UCC church, the Episcopalian church, have been out in front saying that abortion is not that big of a deal, or they think it is a big deal and it should be allowed. I think the nominally pro-life churches are where the problem rests.

And I think if you go to a church out there, you should ask your clergyman: Are you going to address this topic or are you going to still give the flock something without offending anybody, without scaring anybody, and therefore, not address the issue.

We will now have an opportunity to do something, to reduce the hundreds of thousands of abortions in this State every year but it comes down to what the American people think. The attorney generals that they vote for, are you going to call your district attorney if he refuses to do something?

Like I said, I have been dissatisfied with the clergy, their response over the last 50 years. But we are going to find out now because the ball is in their court as to what they do to influence their flock's view of abortion. And if they do their job, there is going to be a lot less abortions in this country. If they just go and hide, this new decision that everybody is so excited about, is going to have no impact whatsoever.

Sadly, many of us have been waiting for this day for decades, but the result of *Dobbs v. Jackson* is, I think, largely going to be determined by what the churches make of it.

EFFECTS OF VITAMIN D SUPPLEMENTATION ON COVID-19

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, the next topic that I will bring up and that I have talked about at this microphone before, but I still feel has to be mentioned again because the public health professionals of this country continue to drop the ball, is the effect vitamin D can have on your health and whether or not you are going to get COVID.

There was a study done recently by a Dr. Dror in Israel. And you could say that he should have had more people in the study. But according to his study, people who had adequate levels of vitamin D or if you had inadequate levels of vitamin D in your system, you were 11 times more likely to die of COVID and 14 times more likely to be hospitalized.

Now think about that. I have personally known nine people who have died of COVID. I have no idea how much vitamin D they had in their system. Nevertheless, it is relatively easy to increase the vitamin D in your system. It is relatively inexpensive to increase the vitamin D in your system.

Dr. Dror used a threshold of 20 nanograms per milliliter, which is not very much. It should be very easy for the average American citizen to take a couple of vitamin D pills a day and greatly decrease your chances of getting COVID.

Like I said, for whatever motivation, the public health establishment does not educate people on that. I have lectured hospital administrators on this. It would seem to me that if a person who is, say, 60 and up, or anybody who has any other preexisting conditions ought to routinely get a vitamin D test when they go to see a doctor. And if they would get that test and it came back at 16 or 17, they should be very alarmed. The doctor should tell them to take vitamin D, and I am sure they would.

I have heard a person involved in the administration of hospitals saying, Well, you can't get patients to do anything anyway. That is preposterous. Of course, we can get patients to take vitamin D. People are scared enough that today they are all—I see right now people wearing masks, despite the fact that there is some evidence that they might not be effective and despite the fact that they don't make you feel that good.

If you take a patient and show them that their vitamin D levels are below 20 nanograms per milliliter, and tell them that they are 11 more times likely to die of COVID than someone with adequate vitamin D, I would think in almost all cases, people will go out and get that vitamin D and get some zinc with it and greatly reduce their chances of dying of COVID.

Some people will say that vitamin D may not be the thing that keeps people healthy. There may just be a correlation there. The same thing is true of things like diabetes or COPD. We would never say, Oh, we are not going to talk about diabetes and the increased chance of COVID because you can't prove it caused the death of COVID. All you are showing is a correlation.

This is not the first study that came down the pike this way. There are studies mentioned by a professor at the University of Chicago; I talk routinely with a professor at California Berkeley. Top-flight people know that vitamin D saves lives. When you look at the over 1 million Americans who have died of COVID, you have to wonder how many would still be alive today if the public health establishment and the doctors of this country were on board in trying to save these lives.

One of the complaints of doctors is that they feel that they will not be reimbursed by the insurance companies or Medicare adequately to cover the cost of the vitamin D test. I know if you get a vitamin D test at home, it costs like 40 bucks. I don't know what it costs a doctor, but let's face it, tons of money flow through the medical institutions today.

If the only reason that we are not educating people about vitamin D is

these hospitals feel they need more money, that is pretty pathetic.

I encourage anyone out there to Google "vitamin D." Learn a little bit more about it. If you are going to a doctor, even if you have to pay for it yourself, make sure you get a vitamin D test and make sure you have an adequate amount of vitamin D in your system.

□ 2030

SOUTHERN BORDER CRISIS

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, my final topic tonight is, one more time, the border.

I was down on the border again about 3 weeks ago. Things that Americans should know: the number of people streaming across the border is very high. In March, it was 153,000 people let in here.

A lot of time, I think when politicians or commentators talk about what is going on at the border, they misstate the statistics because they get the number of people who come here and the number of people who show up at the border and are turned away confused.

But, in March, we were at 153,000; a year ago, we were at 63,000; and 2 years ago, we were at 11,000. We are at a difference between 11,000 people coming in the country and 153,000 people coming in the country.

President Biden's appointees have said they inherited a mess. They did not inherit a mess. They inherited, in March, 11,000 people coming here, and right now, we are at 153,000.

It is not rocket science as to what has to be done. We have to go back to the Migrant Protection Protocols in which people are held in Mexico pending a hearing. If they have to sit in Mexico, they will not show up here in the first place.

Right now, we have a system in which we know that people who show up who are not from Central America or Mexico will be given a court date and allowed in the country. With complete confidence that that is going to happen, they will come here. And the drug cartels, which may be making more money bringing people here than drugs, will make sure that everybody around the world knows that now you can come to the United States.

I mentioned first the Migrant Protection Protocols because if you talk to the Border Patrol, even more than more money, and they certainly need more money, they just need a change in attitude of the Biden administration.

I really feel that we are losing the country south of the border. We cannot continue to take over 150,000 new people a month who are not appropriately vetted.

Of those 153,000, about 60,000 are what they call gotaways, which means they haven't even met with the Border Patrol. They could be criminals who are coming here. They could have criminal backgrounds. They could be bringing in drugs.

