

turned the paper into a five-days-a-week publication in 1969. Day Publications soon surrendered and sold its newspaper operations to Paddock in 1970.

Paddock constantly pushed expansion, adding weekend editions and weekly papers in Lake County in the 1970s that then went daily in 1984, and in the years since, Paddock oversaw nearly 20 expansions into areas of Lake, DuPage, Kane, McHenry, and Will counties.

□ 1945

Paddock's thoughtfulness is legendary among staff. Bob Frisk, the Daily Herald's veteran assistant managing editor of sports, retells the story of the night he was to be inducted into the media wing of the Illinois Basketball Coaches Hall of Fame in Bloomington. Bob's wife was very ill and could not attend. Frisk was feeling lonely when Stu and Ann Paddock walked into the room. Paddock told Frisk, "We didn't want you to be alone when you were inducted on this big night."

Stu's legacy is rich with similar stories, like funding spirits "not the cheap stuff" for a holiday party to celebrate a job well done in Naperville and coming out to cheer on employees who were playing for the local softball team.

Stu Paddock enjoyed classical music, the Bears and opera. He supported a number of good causes like the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Lyric Opera, Ravinia, Goodman Theatre and the Elgin Symphony Orchestra. Stu was the father of six, five daughters and a son. His wife, Ann, his four children and between them, 23 grandchildren and four great grandchildren.

Stuart R. Paddock, Junior, he served our country, he served our community, he served his employees and served his family with courage, honor, determination and thoughtfulness and will be sorely missed by all.

IN HONOR OF EQUAL PAY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Equal Pay Day. This is a national day of action to promote fair pay. It is disheartening that Equal Pay Day comes only once a year. Mr. Speaker, everyday should be equal pay day.

Even though we have had equal pay laws on the books for nearly 40 years, women still only earn .73 cents to the male dollar nationally. In my home state of Michigan, that figure is even worse, with women earning an average of .67 cents to the male dollar. Not surprisingly, women of color are in the worst position, earning only .64 cents to the male dollar. This, Mr. Speaker, is quite simply a disgrace.

Equal work deserves equal pay. But in today's economy, unfair pay hurts more than just women; it hurts families. When women

are not paid fairly, it lowers the family income. That means there is less money for essentials like groceries, doctors' visits, and clothes for the children. This is not a women's issue, Mr. Speaker, it is a family issue. We protect America's working families by rectifying this wrong.

What can we do? I have two answers for you.

1. We can pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, which was introduced by my good friend from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO. The Paycheck Fairness Act would strengthen existing equal pay and civil rights laws by providing effective remedies to women who are not being paid equal wages for equal work.

2. We can pass the ERA, reintroduced this year by my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY. We have waited too long to provide women with equal standing in the Constitution. The ERA would put some real teeth in our equal pay laws, and guarantee equal pay for equal work.

I would encourage all members who are not currently cosponsors of the ERA to join us. We have 200, but we need more. I would ask my colleagues to truly represent the 50 percent of their constituency that still goes unrecognized in the very document that guarantees our rights and freedoms. Why should women be left behind?

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representatives DELAURO and MALONEY for their much needed leadership on this very important issue.

There is no excuse for disparity in pay between men and women. Mr. Speaker, it is time for action. In honor of Equal Pay Day, I would ask my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of these two important bills. There is no better time than the present. Let's stop ignoring this serious family problem today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR REPEAL OF MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues this evening in calling for the support of Congress to set in concrete the repeal of the marriage tax penalty.

I was honored last year to become president of the Republican freshman class of the 107th Congress. Early last year, our class members came together and made the repeal of the marriage tax penalty our class priority. Fresh from the campaign trail and living in and working in our districts, each of our class members came to Washington with the understanding that one of the major priorities of the American people was to bring an end to this anti-family, anti-marriage tax.

On our third day on the job, our class joined with the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. WELLER) to announce our commitment to the repeal of the marriage tax penalty. We championed this noble cause and were successful in obtaining the eventual repeal of the marriage tax penalty.

Unfortunately, due to Senate rules, the marriage tax penalty repeal legislation included a sunset provision that would automatically reinstate the marriage tax penalty in the year 2011. What does that say to the American people about this Congress?

Marriage is the bedrock of our society. It is an institution that is to be honored and respected, and it is a bond that should not be put asunder, especially by the tax policies of the Federal Government.

Yet until last year, our tax laws gave married couples a \$1,400 surprise on their tax bill. They saw their taxes go up for no other reason than they said "I do," and the effect of this tax mostly penalized young couples trying to get their feet on the ground and retired couples just trying to keep their feet on the ground.

In the second congressional district of Virginia, which I represent, there are over 56,000 married couples which were subject to the marriage tax penalty. However, if these couples decided to live together, rather than get married, they would not have to pay the tax. That is simply unfair.

The repeal of the marriage tax penalty provides a new level of fairness by preventing the Federal Government from penalizing couples for being married. Now these families are able to keep \$1,400 a year of their hard earned income if they can save for a down payment on a house or a new car, obtain health insurance, pay off student loans, save for their children's education or to pay off debts.

The repeal of the marriage tax penalty passed last year is now helping families all across our Nation to better plan for their future. If they are able to eliminate debt, save for retirement or pay cash for large ticket items, their future discretionary income will grow, helping to also grow our economy.

Between now and 2011, it is certain that many of these couples' income will increase from raises or from taking new jobs. Also, they will be able to better handle their day-to-day expenses and any emergencies that may come along, but in 2011, that comfort level provided by tax relief is set to disappear for these families. On that day, the penalty for being married will surprise them once again.

I cannot stand by and allow that to happen to the 56,000 families that I represent. Unfortunately, there are those in this body and the other body that do not support making the repeal of the marriage tax penalty permanent. They will argue that we must work to ensure that Social Security is intact for future and present retirees. I could not agree more. Social Security is important for all Americans, and we should make sure that it stays protected for

all Americans. However, I believe we can save Social Security and provide meaningful tax reform at the same time.

If we restrain the growth of government and the growth of discretionary spending, we can achieve both, and the economic benefits from tax relief will help generate greater revenues as our economy continues to pull out of the now ended recession.

Therefore, the repeal of the marriage tax penalty should be made permanent this year. Let us show the American people that this Congress is determined to support legislation that helps strengthen families and thus our communities and economy.

When the tax permanency legislation comes to the House floor, I hope that we will send a strong message in support of American families by voting in favor of repealing this marriage tax penalty once and for all.

MAKING PERMANENT THE BUSH TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, this week we have an important vote in the House of Representatives, and my good friend from Virginia, the leader of the freshman class, our new Members, spoke so eloquently on this issue that is before us, and a group of us plan to kind of expound on this issue that is going to be before us this week.

As President Bush noted this past weekend, the tax cut that the President led, initiated and our Congress passed and was signed into law in June expires in less than 10 years, and tonight we felt it was important to talk about the impact of a temporary tax cut because this week, on Thursday morning, the House of Representatives will begin debate on legislation which will make permanent what has become known as the Bush tax cut.

Let us review a little bit of history here. Over the last 7 years that we have had a Republican majority in the Congress, we have been working to balance the budget and also to lower taxes for working families. Unfortunately the previous administration, the Clinton-Gore administration, vetoed time and time again our effort to lower taxes for working Americans.

Fortunately, the voters of our Nation this past year and a half ago in November of the year 2000 elected a President who feels the same way the majority of this House does, that is, the taxes are too high, families are struggling, and of course, we need to find ways to bring fairness to the Tax Code.

I was very proud of the President's leadership because he noted in January of last year, and January 2000 when he became President, that the economy was in a downturn. The President in-

herited a weakening economy and he says we have got this huge surplus, all this extra tax revenue that the Federal Government is collecting because taxes are too high and we are not spending it all, thanks to the fiscal responsibility of this House. So why do we not take a portion of that surplus, that extra tax revenue, and give it back to working families? Provide an across-the-board tax cut that helps every working family, bring about tax fairness by eliminating the marriage tax penalty, wiping out the death tax, increasing opportunities for retirement savings and saving for a college education?

The President was successful. President Bush's leadership, with the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and Committee on Ways and Means chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), this House led the effort to lower taxes, and in June of this past year, the President signed into law what has become known as the Bush tax cut. Unfortunately, because of the arcane rules of the Congress, the tax cut was temporary, which meant it had to expire in the year 2011.

When we think about that, when it expires, it is going to mean a big tax increase on millions of working families across this country. That is really what this vote is about on Thursday is whether or not we continue to keep taxes lower for working families, whether or not we continue to have tax fairness or do we bring back an unfair Tax Code that punishes married couples and takes away the family farm and family businesses and makes it harder to save for retirement or a college education, essentially imposing a tax increase on working Americans. That is what this vote is going to be this week.

I would note that one of the arguments the President made when he talked about the need to cut taxes is that the President stated that we need to get the economy moving again, and if workers have a little extra spending money in their pockets, they are going to be able to meet the family needs, go to the grocery store, make some improvements to their home, fix the car, maybe have a family vacation the first time ever.

The President said that if his tax cut was signed into law, the economy would get better, and frankly, it was working. Economists tell us that by Labor Day of this past year, Labor Day 2001, the economy was on the rebound and the Bush tax cut was the primary reason that the economy was on the upswing. Of course, every one of us knows what occurred on September 11 and the terrible tragedy of that attack on our Nation and its economic impact with almost 1 million Americans having lost their jobs.

Well, the Bush tax cut is continuing to work and the economy is beginning, according to economists, to get on the rebound again, and tonight we want to talk about what was in the Bush tax cut.

I would note, as I stated earlier, that the Bush tax cut did a number of good things to help working families. Provided for marginal rate reductions, reducing the tax rate for every American who pays taxes, creating a whole new tax rate structure. In fact, we created a new lower tax rate for the lowest income Americans, lowering their taxes from 15 percent to 10 percent, helping low income taxpayers.

We also, of course, repealed the death tax, a tax which has historically taken a majority of the family business away from families who inherit the family business from the founder and that has caused so many businesses to go out of business, and some of my colleagues are going to talk about that.

We doubled the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000, helping families with children better afford their children's needs.

We increased retirement savings, increasing the amount one can contribute to their IRA from \$2,000 to \$5,000, what one can contribute to their 401(k) from \$10,500 to \$15,000, and for working moms and empty nesters, we allowed those over 50 to make up missed contributions to their IRA and 401(k), essentially what we call catch-up contributions.

We helped families save for education, increasing education savings accounts from \$500 to \$2,000 a year, and allowing families to use that for expenses for elementary and secondary education, as well as for college.

Those are good things. Also, because many families were stepping forward and volunteering to adopt children and give children a loving home, we increased the adoption tax credit to \$10,000 for children with special needs, and of course, for those with nonspecial needs, we have it at \$5,000, and we also increased the income level of families that can qualify from \$75,000 to \$150,000, and we also prevented the alternative minimum tax from interfering or taking away this tax relief for working families.

Of course, part of the debate of who benefits from tax relief is who gets it, and there is always some who say, oh, we cannot cut taxes because those who pay taxes will get it. We should not help those who pay taxes because apparently they are rich. Well, let me note who it is that benefited from the Bush tax cut.

Under the President's tax plan that was signed into law and this Congress supported on and that we are going to make permanent or vote to make permanent this week, over 100 million individuals and families pay lower taxes. Forty-three million married couples see their taxes reduced on average by more than \$1,700 a year. Thirty-eight million families with children will receive an average tax cut of almost \$1,500. Eleven million single moms with children will be able to keep on average \$77 more to care for their children. Thirteen million seniors will see their taxes reduced on average by \$920, and