

cures don't come. And as the paper talks about, it is the very cures for things like potentially diabetes and other ailments that are concentrated in our poor population.

So it is functionally the left's policy on something like H.R. 3—because if you think about their pricing mechanism where if a drug costs more than this amount of money, you can't have it. It is once again policy that says, we are going to find a way for you to live with your misery, but we are going to make living with your misery a little cheaper. Then I think the thing that is loving and more compassionate is we are going to find a way to cure it. It really is a different mindset, and that isn't Republican or Democrat. It is just compassion.

But it may not be great politics because the fact of the matter is, if you look at the mechanics within H.R. 3, the Democrats actually make Big Pharma more profitable and bigger and more powerful, and they wipe out the disrupters, the small biologics, the small pharma that is actual chewing away their book of business because they are curing the disease whereas Big Pharma over here is just maintaining it.

It is the classic economic irony of this place acts like a protection racket. We give great speeches about how we are going to do this, and then—wink, wink, nod, nod—what actually is happening is you are locking in someone's oligopoly.

Once again, if you go through the paper, it makes it really clear that the first couple of years there is not much difference because it is what is already in the disruptive pharmaceutical pipeline. And we have done presentations here of 100 new are-under-research and only a few actually succeed. But in about 5 or 6 years you start to see a collapse of those cures. Welcome to Democrat policy once again.

We have come to the floor multiple times with H.R. 3. We have made a number of people very angry by referring to it as the Big Pharma protection act. But the math is the math. And now you still have additional CBO studies that make it clear we are telling the truth. It is what it is.

We have actually made proposals to our brothers and sisters on the left saying, we both are enraged at the price of pharmaceuticals. Believe it or not there are other ways to get there, and one of the most magical things we could do for society are also some of the kickers to make sure there are capital stacks and these other things that are a little geeky, but ways that that investment goes into the cures.

So when you have things like a single-shot cure for hemophilia—I did this presentation back in December. We have a proof of concept of a cure for type 1 diabetes. Starting out, these are going to be really expensive, they are going to be really difficult until we functionally turn it into a biofoundry, and you build the capital stack, the

Tax Code, the incentives to do lots of that. But I can show you in chart after chart, it saves society, it saves taxpayers a fortune in the future.

Remember, last year's CBO math said in 29 years we are \$112 trillion in debt in publicly borrowed money in today's dollars. So that is inflation-adjusted dollars. And we know that number is going to spike once we get the math from this last fiscal year plugged in there. About 75 percent of that spending is just Medicare, that debt is Medicare. The other 25 percent is Social Security.

The most powerful thing you can do for U.S. sovereign debt is disrupt the price of healthcare, and our argument is, the greatest elegance is actually doing it by making people healthier.

There is one other thing I want to throw in my frustration of Democrat policy. My expertise is more Arizona and not the rest of the country. We have seen the debate around here, lots of flowery words, and almost no detail of the reality of what is underlying the piece of legislation.

Our friends on the left will come behind the microphones and say it is a Voting Rights Act. Okay. How is giving a politician six to one—so you give me \$200, and the Treasury is going to multiply it by six times—defending democracy? Or is that, once again, the left being so much smarter than Republicans are on how to try to stay in power?

How about some of the other things that are in the Democrats' H.R. 1 and H.R. 4, their Federal election bill?

My theory is a little different than other folks. It is just a blatant power grab. It is not a power grab for the Federal Government, which it is that, but it is much more than that. It is a power grab by a party that basically is trying to design the election code to fit their fund-raising model, their campaign model.

It does other things. Like down here, my State for functionally 18 years has had voter ID laws. Every dataset out there says you can't find a differential of populations not being able to vote. Matter of fact, I think in my State some of the underlying data is African-American females have the highest participation. It is actually White males, particularly White rural males that have some of the lowest participation and some of my Native Americans. But that doesn't meet the folklore that we get from our brothers and sisters on the left.

Think about this—and this is the circle I want folks who are paying attention to get their heads around—how it works. So the Democrats push a voting rights bill, but it is really about voting mechanics. And what they do is they say, Hey, we are going to have same-day, automatic registration, and then we are going to legalize, industrialize ballot harvesting, and then at the same time we are going to do this they also are allowed to have, if you give them money, they get six to one. So why would you do that?

Well, first off, as in California, the Democrats have built a huge infrastructure. If you run for Congress, you actually take a substantial portion of your campaign money and hire firms that go knock on doors and harvest ballots. It is now a campaign mechanic.

Well, what happens if you hire lots of people to go walk through that massive apartment building or this and that and knock on the door and say, Hey, I will register you right here, let's do your ballot. That is functionally what they are doing in this legislation.

And the beauty of it, it will ultimately be taxpayers who will be financing it because the left, to their credit, has spent about the last 15, 20 years building an online contribution system. And here is the kicker. That online contribution system has trained contributors to the left, contributors to Democrats who say, don't give one person this much money, give 10 people this much. And it is as if it has always been laid out the same, and—wink, wink, nod, nod—one day we are going to set up a public funding system so your \$25 contribution or \$200 contribution gets multiplied six times.

You have got to give the left, the Democrats credit for their, just, audacity. And then to call it a civil rights voting bill when, when you break through its mechanics, it is about power, it is about power and control. That is what this is.

The other beauty is handing the bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C., the functionality of saying they can tell my State of Arizona what is allowed and what isn't allowed.

We have a family saying that goes, money, power, vanity, but most of the time it is about the money. In this case, I have got to give the left credit. They hit all three in the same piece of legislation. It becomes about the money, it becomes about them keeping the power, but reality has almost nothing to do with fairness. It is about the fear that the public understands how much of the left's policies have been crappy to them, their families, this country. The mechanism they are going to try to keep in power is to functionally have us finance their elections and allow them to industrialize the very bad acts that so many of us worry about.

Madam Speaker, I think I feel a little better getting some of that out of my system. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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, there are several issues of importance that I don't feel this body has spent enough time discussing, and unless

they are addressed could result in a great deal of discomfort for a lot of Americans.

The first is the issue concerning sheltered workshops, also known as work centers or community rehabilitation programs.

Perhaps you folks are familiar with them. They are places where people of different abilities frequently work, frequently doing packaging, maybe light manufacturing.

Because of the different abilities that some people have, they have to get what are called 14(c) certificates and may work for less than minimum wage. Disabilities they may have would include things like perhaps spina bifida or similar things that make it a little bit more difficult for them to work.

Nevertheless, throughout my political career I have always enjoyed touring the sheltered workshops in part because the employees that work there are so proud of the work they are doing and so proud of the fact that they are able to earn a paycheck and purchase some of their own clothes, perhaps purchase gifts for their relatives.

Right now these sheltered workshops are under attack in the Build Back Better bill, and that bill may easily pass some time in the next year. I am afraid even the majority of Democrats who voted for the bill are unaware that these sheltered workshops are under attack.

There are two reasons why people want to get rid of sheltered workshops. There are people who feel under no circumstances should somebody make less than minimum wage. This is ignoring the economic reality and ignoring the reality of the type of jobs that are available for these folks.

The second concern they have is they feel that these people are segregated from the rest of society working in a sheltered workshop. That is, of course, not true. There are people of all sorts of abilities in these workshops; and in my opinion, people who work in these workshops frequently work there for 25 or 30 years. And people in management also work there for an extended period of time.

Nevertheless, there is an extreme group which feels that we are taking advantage of people by having them work in the workshop.

I will point out that in addition to the ability to have some of your own economic independence, you develop lifelong friends in these workshops that you wouldn't develop if you were looking for other jobs out in the community.

One of the concerns for people with different abilities is that it is important that they develop friendships other than just their parents or immediate family. It is something that is always of great concern for parents of people in situations like this, and insofar as the sheltered workshops were shut down, you wouldn't have this natural grouping of friends or lifelong co-workers that you are going to be able to interact with.

It is time for the sheltered workshop community to wake up and realize in this bill of thousands of pages the radical group that wants to shut down the sheltered workshops may finally get their dream. And if they get their dream, they will find that some of these folks are going to find jobs in the community, but they are not going to find 35 or 40 hour a week jobs in the community. They may find 3 or 4 hour a week jobs in the community. They will lose the pride that comes with having a full-time job. They will no longer feel they are like their siblings or friends who go to work every day and earn a paycheck. It will be devastating for these folks. Some folks have been working in these sheltered workshops for 25 or 30 years and have years left to go. It is tragic that some people want to take this freedom away from them.

I should also point out that nobody forces anybody to work in these sheltered workshops. If there were other jobs in the community they or their guardians could take them out and have them work fast food or have them work light retail or have them work in some light manufacturing. But what these people who are trying to get rid of these sheltered workshops are doing is they are taking away the choice that these folks have made for themselves, the choice that makes them feel so happy, makes them feel so good.

So I strongly encourage people who know someone in these workshops to get politically involved before these folks' lives are devastated.

And insofar as we have any of the Democrats paying attention to what I am saying right now, I beg you to go in your district and tour one of the sheltered workshops yourself because they will make you feel so good.

There are very few things in this job that make me feel as good as touring these workshops because you see how happy and productive people can be that on the face of it seem to be dealt a tough hand in life. But they have made what they can of themselves. They are very happy. And I beg the majority party not to take away this right.

The second issue that I would like to talk about a little bit today is with regard to COVID.

One of the frustrating things about the establishment—and I think this goes back even before the Biden administration—is there has not been enough discussion of the correlation of inadequate amounts of Vitamin D and getting severe cases of COVID.

Right now in this country, all Americans should be aiming at having 30 nanograms per milliliter of Vitamin D. People who fail to get that 30 nanograms disproportionately wind up getting COVID and getting COVID severely.

There are other things that make you more likely to get COVID. If you have diabetes, if you are overweight, these are other things that correlate

with getting COVID. And we know that if you lose a little weight, your situation would improve.

Vitamin D or a lack of having 30 nanograms per milliliter of Vitamin D does correlate with problems. Right now in our society, sadly, 96 percent of Black Americans are insufficient to that level, 88 percent of Hispanics, 65 percent of Whites. It is not something that has been talked about anywhere near enough, and it is a question as to why the public health establishment has not done a better job of explaining the correlation between bad Vitamin D outcomes and bad COVID outcomes.

Some people feel it is not something that is talked about enough because there is no money to be made. And, of course, a lot of people are making a lot of money on COVID; but if you solve your Vitamin D levels by just going to the local drugstore and buying 20 or \$40 worth of Vitamin D pills, there is not the possibility of people to make billions of dollars.

Nevertheless, if you are out there, I strongly encourage all Americans to get a hold of Vitamin D. Vitamin C and zinc are good, as well, but today I try one more time to beg my friends back home to go get some Vitamin D, and I beg the medical community who right now does not test for Vitamin D like they should; I am told it is because there is not enough reimbursement in Medicare, and we don't want to lose money on what we are doing, but the medical community ought to be testing everybody for Vitamin D if they come in for their annual checkup. All Americans should be looking to get that level above 30 nanograms per milliliter.

There are other things, as well, that could be done to reduce the high number of deaths from COVID. Fenofibrate is a drug which some Israeli researchers had success with. It is a generic drug, and as a result, it is very reasonable to get a hold of. The same thing is true with hydroxychloroquine. And there are doctors I know who have had success with that. I don't think it is quite as successful with the omicron variant, but it was very successful with the alpha variant. And there is ivermectin, and I have known doctors who have used that, and they have had success curing people there. But for whatever reason, on some of these cheaper alternatives that I think could have saved hundreds of thousands of people, the public health establishment and the medical establishment has not been as outspoken as they should.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE.)

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding on this very important subject. I was unfortunate to catch COVID a couple weeks ago, and I think that the Vitamin D supplements I was taking in addition to Vitamin C, in addition to zinc definitely helped to minimize the length and the severity of the illness.

Madam Speaker, today marks 1 year since Joe Biden was sworn in as President, meaning it has been a year since

Democrats took unified control of the Federal Government.

And at this point there is no denying that Americans are worse off today than they were 12 months ago.

Consumer prices have risen 7 percent since Democrats won congressional majorities and the White House, marking a 40-year high rate of inflation.

Gas prices reached \$3.28 a gallon last month, a 49.6 percent increase from a year ago.

1.7 illegal immigrants were encountered unlawfully crossing the border in FY21, the highest number ever recorded.

Sixteen major U.S. cities set new homicide records this past year.

And just last week, COVID hospitalizations hit a record high.

Thirteen American servicemembers tragically lost their lives, and the Taliban captured Afghanistan as a result of this administration's disastrous withdrawal plan.

Madam Speaker, Democrats are certainly setting records, just not the records that they want to be breaking. Their party has utterly failed the American people.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to address another, perhaps inadvertent, perhaps not so inadvertent, group of provisions in the Build Back Better bill.

As we look across the country, when one compares to where America is today compared to where America was 50 years ago, certainly one area that I think most Americans would think is a step in the wrong direction is the breakdown of the traditional family. However, not all people consider the breakdown in the so-called western prescribed nuclear family structure as a bad thing.

Black Lives Matter, which played such a big role in the elections last November, on their website came out saying we want to disrupt the western prescribed nuclear family structure.

They are not the only ones who don't like the western family. We know Karl Marx felt that as he wanted to work his way towards paradise, we had to get rid of the traditional family.

I don't know whether it is a coincidence or not, but our current welfare system with all of the programs that are part of it, be it the education grants, be it the medical grants, be it the food stamps, be it the low-income housing, are all set not to benefit families in which there are two parents at home to raise the children.

In other words, the United States for years and years has been trying to get rid of the nuclear family. It is like Karl Marx himself were writing the welfare policies.

In the Build Back Better bill, we are going further on down this line. I don't know that this is exactly supposed to be a pay back to Black Lives Matter, but the reconciliation bill will more than double the earned income tax credit marriage penalty. It has provisions for greatly increasing the number

of low-income housing units. And I feel that the way those units are doled out, again, very difficult to get those units if you have a mom and dad at home. But there are people who want to get rid of that sort of family.

I would strongly encourage the majority party, before they push this bill any further, to have a study done on who benefits from these new provisions and who doesn't, and is it one more time a situation which we are bribing people not to have old-fashioned nuclear families.

□ 1600

I am afraid, like I said, right now, this looks like another victory for the hard leftwing of the Democratic Party that embraces the idea that we ought to get rid of the nuclear family. It is not a coincidence. It is in the bill.

In any event, these are things I will leave our audience with as we break for the following week. If you know somebody who works in a sheltered workshop or work center, or know a Congressman, invite them to the sheltered workshops to see what they are in danger of shutting down.

If you know people who do not yet have COVID, remind them to get more vitamin D. If there are any doctors out there—I know sometimes you can't be reimbursed for everything, but you guys make enough money—make sure you begin to do some testing of vitamin D levels so that if people are below 30 nanograms per milliliter, they know it and they know that they should go to the drugstore and begin to get more vitamin D, together with zinc and vitamin C.

Finally, I encourage the majority party, before they do any more with Build Back Better, to have some work done and see whether you really want to go ahead and further steepen the penalty for married couples who have children, which already, like I said, is like the policy of the United States: We don't want to have old-fashioned nuclear families.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1192. An act to impose requirements on the payment of compensation to professional persons employed in voluntary cases commenced under title III of the Puerto Rico Oversight Management and Economic Stability Act (commonly known as "PROMESA").

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 20, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3208. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — TRICARE Program: TRICARE Reserve Select Coverage for Members of the Selected Reserve [Docket ID: DOD-2020-HA-0073] (RIN: 0720-AB79) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3209. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Protection of Privacy and Access to and Amendment of Individual Records under the Privacy Act of 1974; Technical Amendment [Docket ID: DoD-2021-OS-0088] (RIN: 0790-AL42) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3210. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Ogeechee River, Richmond Hill, GA [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0596] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3211. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Potomac River, Between Charles County, MD and King George County, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2021-0745] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3212. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2021-0768] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3213. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; San Juan Bay for Jurakan Triathlon, San Juan, PR [Docket Number: USCG-2021-0775] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3214. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Biscayne Bay Causeway Island Slip, Miami Beach, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2021-0077] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 12, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-3215. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland