

north where Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY is and represents, but we embrace them also.

President Barack Obama lived right at the edge of my district.

Chicago, Illinois, is filled with inclusivity. Carol Moseley Braun was the first African-American woman to be elected to the United States Senate from the State of Illinois. Of course, Barack Obama was also elected to the Senate. Roland Burris was a member of the Senate, and Abraham Lincoln.

I grew up as a fan of Abraham Lincoln because of the role that he and Illinois played in the abolition of slavery. My mother was a great Abraham Lincoln fan, so as a little boy, I knew every story that you could think of about Abraham Lincoln.

The thing that I am most proud of, though, is the inclusivity and the diversification of our State.

Representative LAHOOD has represented and demonstrated what Illinois is all about, and that is bringing all of us together to extol some of the virtues of our great State. I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I thank the gentleman for his action.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman DAVIS for those wonderful words about the State of Illinois, its history, and the city of Chicago and all his advocacy.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as you can see, each of our districts has played a role in not only shaping Illinois' history, but that of the entire Nation and the whole world. Whether it is the business hub of Chicago, the farmers downstate, or the many Main Street businesses in every city, Illinois' influence can be seen every day no matter where you are.

That is why our bicentennial theme of "Born, Built, and Grown" is so appropriate. As 2018 begins and we continue to get closer to our State's birthday on December 3, 2018, bicentennial events all across Illinois will help us recognize the important people and products that our State has to offer. For example, a bicentennial beer has already been judged and selected, hailing from the Hand of Fate Brewing Company in Petersburg, Illinois, within my congressional district.

I encourage everyone to check out the full list of events at illinois200.com. I am sure I will be running into many of my colleagues at several of them throughout the year as they happen across the State.

While Illinois' first 200 years have included both struggle and success, our State should be a point of pride for all of us. I think we heard that tonight. While we have accomplished so much, as my colleagues and I have talked about here tonight, there remains much to be done. Illinois remains on the path of prosperity, and the hard work and determination that the people of Illinois are known for will surely get us there.

Mr. Speaker, I will just close by wishing Illinois a happy early birthday.

We look forward to celebrating over the next year.

I am proud to be born and raised in the State of Illinois and that my wife and I are raising our three boys in Illinois. We hope they stay and prosper in Illinois, and we look forward to this next year of celebration for 200 years of Illinois being in this great Nation.

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

GRADING THE GOP TAX PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was really fun interacting with my colleagues and learning about the great State in which we live and have the opportunity to represent.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to vote on the GOP tax plan, I decided that I would grade the bill and look a little bit at the difference between what has been promised and the reality of what is in the final legislation.

We were told that there would be middle class tax relief and that nobody in the middle class is going to get a tax increase. We have been looking for it, but instead, after 10 years, millions of middle class taxpayers will be paying more, and the majority of the tax cuts will go to the corporations and to the 1 percent.

We were told that it would eliminate tax breaks for the wealthy and that wealthy proponents of the bill will personally take a hit from the GOP tax plan—another failure. This bill and this plan violates every principle and every tenet of economic justice.

The vast majority of the benefits go to the large corporations and the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. All major tax breaks remain and many new ones have been added, including the insidious new 20 percent deduction for so-called passthrough entities like real estate developers and others. Because of the fact that the new language wasn't in the bill passed by the House and Senate, floor amendments to eliminate the provision will not be permitted.

The alternative minimum tax, that safety net designed to thwart clever tax dodgers, is gone. The biological heart of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska is handed over to oil companies for minimal return of Federal tax dollars.

We were told that Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid would be protected, that this was going to be a revenue-neutral tax reform and that the bill would pay for itself—failure again. The trillion-plus dollars in new deficit spending will be blamed on these programs, and pressure to cut them will begin shortly after the new year.

We were told that tax cuts will spur economic growth—again, failure. U.S.

corporate profits are already historically high, but corporations are not making investments in plants, research, and new technology to grow the economy.

What we need is increased demand, higher wages, returning dislocated workers to the economy, rebuilding aging cities, and rebuilding infrastructure to revitalize communities. The redistribution of income away from low- to high-income households reduces consumption spending, which reduces demand.

The bill will be disastrous to the work of charitable nonprofits, reducing charitable giving by \$13 billion or more, annually, destroying more than 220,000 nonprofit jobs and impairing the ability of nonprofits to address community needs.

Repatriating overseas corporate profit will stimulate the economy; that is what we were told. U.S. multinationals currently have \$752 billion in taxes on the \$2.6 trillion in profits that they are holding offshore. They have already found creative ways to use those dollars here at home without paying taxes. Worse yet, the repatriation provision helps conceal the permanent and growing costs of tax provisions that would lose revenue over the next decade.

What is needed is linking tax breaks to specific targeted investment here at home, such as the new market credit, which, as of the end of fiscal year 2016, had generated \$8 of private investment for every \$1 of Federal funding; created 178 million square feet of manufacturing, office, and retail space; and financed over 5,400 businesses.

We were told that we were going to be able to reduce health costs and health insurance for everybody—failure again. The elimination of the penalty for people who go without health insurance will result in some 13 million Americans losing their health insurance. That includes more than 500,000 Illinois residents.

Healthcare premiums will rise by about 10 percent in most years, and for the lowest income working families, with 10 million children under 17, there will either be no improvement in their child tax credit or a token increase of \$1 to \$75. Low- and modest-income working families, with another 14 million children, will receive a child tax credit increase of more than \$75 but less than the full \$1,000 per child increase that families at higher income levels would receive.

We were told that we were going to be able to file our taxes on a postcard, simplify and reduce the size of the Tax Code. That is not going to happen.

Final grade, corporations and the 1 percent—the wealthiest people in the country—will win, and the rest of society will lose.

For me, Mr. Speaker, that is not an acceptable result. I could never vote for this bill, so count me out. I vote "no."

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed hearing my friend from Illinois first talking about the great State of Illinois. It truly is. We appreciate all the doctors who have been sent down to Texas after we did tort reform and Illinois continues to have significant problems.

We had had problems keeping doctors in Texas until the great State of Illinois ran into greater and greater malpractice lawsuit problems. Texas did tort reform, and we started having doctors coming from places like Illinois to Texas, and we are doing much better.

The problem is, with health insurance, I heard my friend talk about 13 million who won't have insurance, and I think, to be fair there, are so many millions right now who are forced to do the unthinkable.

□ 2045

It is unconstitutional. The Supreme Court simply chose to become political in their decisionmaking rather than constitutional. You could pick nine people off the street at random and probably six or seven out of the nine, after they heard the dispute and read the Constitution, would find contrary to the Supreme Court.

We put so much magic, supposedly, in those black robes. Somehow, they are given more credibility than they ought to be. Thomas Jefferson thought that the judicial system would be the weakest of the three branches, but now it pretty much controls everything.

Under ObamaCare, people are forced to buy a product. For the first time in American history, you can be forced to buy a product. If you didn't, you would be fined, punished, taxed. The Court said, on one hand, it wasn't a tax. Therefore, the Court had jurisdiction. Forty-some pages later, it said it is a tax, so it is constitutional.

In any event, people have been forced to buy a product and they have paid for as cheap a policy as they could get away with, but the deductibles were so high. I have heard this over and over hundreds of times in my own district. They were buying insurance they will never be able to use. The deductibles are so high, they don't have that kind of money.

So what the repeal of the individual mandate is going to mean is that people can still buy the insurance if they want to. They are not going to be penalized if they don't buy it.

But in order for ObamaCare to work, it is stealing from Peter to pay Paul. In other words, young people, for example, were having to buy insurance they would never use because they would have the deductible. But they did the calculation: Do I pay more if I pay for the insurance or do I pay more if I pay the extra income tax? Then they make that decision.

What the repeal of the individual mandate means is that we will help the Supreme Court in their ridiculous ruling and the mental gymnastics that went into not calling it a tax at page 13 or so, and then 40 pages later calling it a tax.

It is really pretty absurd, but it was a political decision. John Roberts was intimidated into believing that, if they struck down this unconstitutional bill, he would be deemed to be Chief Justice over the most political Court. As a result of what he did, he goes down in history as having the most political Court since Dred Scott. It wasn't quite as bad as the Dred Scott decision. That has got to be the worst.

We know from history that sometimes they just get it wrong. We will do the right thing by the American people, and we will repeal the individual mandate. Unfortunately, it is not going to start for a year.

I also heard my friend mention—and I have heard others say—that this bill will end up putting most of the income in the hands of the top 1 percent.

One of the great things about being in Congress is you get to learn so much if you are paying attention.

My friends can go back and look at YouTube and find President Obama, after being in office for a number of years, admitting that, for the first time in American history, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent income earners. It never happened before.

But under the policies that do as President Obama said he was going to do before he got elected—and that is spread the wealth around—every time somebody tries to spread the wealth around—it is a socialist idea, a communist. But when you try to spread the wealth around, it never seems to fail that the richest, most powerful get richer and more powerful.

You can go to the Soviet Union. There were a handful of people making a lot of money, even over there now, under Putin. Of course, Putin gets richer. But there were a handful of people who get rich and most of the people don't. Most of the people bring in about the same amount of income, but they don't have access to the same benefits.

Anyway, we are going to move in a direction away from what President Obama's policies established, and that was, as a fact, 95 percent of the Nation's income is going to the top 1 percent. We want to get away from that.

Reforming the Tax Code and getting away from the punishing days of President Obama's policies will allow the working class to do better for the first time in years. They have been flat-lined or less when adjusted for inflation. It is time they did better.

The tax bill we should take up tomorrow will end up doing that. It will get money into the hands of the working poor, the middle class. We saw the middle class shrink under President Obama; the poor got poorer, the ultrarich got ultraricher, and the middle class shrank.

More people—over 50 million, as I recall—signed up for food stamps. That has already dropped significantly under the policies of the current President. We are hoping that the policies that we will push through together with the President will continue to have that effect. People will do better. There will be more jobs.

With all of the ridicule of lowering the corporate tax, if people will just be realistic and honest about it, corporations don't pay corporate taxes. They have to pass that on as a cost of doing business to their customers, their clients, those who purchase their goods or services. They pass that 35 percent tax on.

I know that before the President got elected, the current President, he had talked about maybe putting a tariff on Chinese goods. The fact is we have been putting on a 35 percent tariff, the highest tariff anybody puts on its own goods and services of all the industrialized nations. It is the biggest.

If we knock that 35 percent down, then it means our goods will be more competitive around the world. It means more jobs. It is going to be a great thing for America. It really is. As much as some people despise the President, like it or not, it is going to help make America great again.

Lower the corporate tax. I wish we could have kept it at 15 percent. Apparently, the powers of the leaders of the House and Senate, by a margin of two-to-one against the President wanting it at 15 percent, but at least we are getting it lowered. That is going to mean more goods can be competitive abroad. It means more jobs here. It means more manufacturing back here.

For those who have got their nose in the air and think we shouldn't have manufacturing in America, you go around the world and see manufacturing in other places and you see it here. It is about as clean a manufacturing company as you can have. This is the best place for those jobs because we do have to breathe the air that China and India pollutes, which we are cleaning up, but not near fast enough because they are polluting it so much.

Fortunately, the President withdrew from the so-called climate accord. The reason all these other countries wanted the United States in is because we were the ones that were going to send checks to all the other countries. We were going to pay guilt money. We have no guilt to pay for.

In fact, this is the country that is helping clean up the air and water, unlike other large nations in the world. They owe us a check, if somebody is going to be owing checks for the amount of pollution. It should mean a better economy.

There is one other thing that severely hurt our country under the past administration.

I am not normally a big fan of Politico's articles, but this is a fascinating one that calls itself: "The Secret Backstory of How Obama Let Hezbollah Off the Hook."