

Morelle	Rose (NY)
Moulton	Rouda
Mucarsel-Powell	Royal-Allard
Murphy	Ruiz
Nadler	Ruppersberger
Napolitano	Rush
Neal	Ryan
Neguse	Sánchez
Norcross	Barbanes
O'Halleran	Scanlon
Ocasio-Cortez	Schakowsky
Omar	Schiff
Pallone	Schneider
Panetta	Schrirer
Pappas	Scott (VA)
Pascrill	Scott, David
Perlmutter	Serrano
Peters	Sewell (AL)
Peterson	Shalala
Phillips	Sherman
Pingree	Sherrill
Pocan	Sires
Porter	Slotkin
Pressley	Smith (WA)
Price (NC)	Soto
Quigley	Spanberger
Raskin	Speier
Rice (NY)	Stanton
Richmond	Stevens

## NAYS—189

Abraham	Gosar
Aderholt	Granger
Allen	Graves (GA)
Amash	Graves (LA)
Amodei	Graves (MO)
Armstrong	Green (TN)
Arrington	Griffith
Bacon	Grothman
Baird	Guest
Balderson	Guthrie
Banks	Hagedorn
Barr	Harris
Bergman	Hartzler
Biggs	Hern, Kevin
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)
Brady	Higgins (LA)
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)
Brooks (IN)	Holding
Buchanan	Hollingsworth
Buck	Hudson
Bucshon	Huizenga
Budd	Hunter
Burchett	Hurd (TX)
Burgess	Johnson (LA)
Byrne	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Johnson (SD)
Carter (GA)	Jordan
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)
Chabot	Joyce (PA)
Cheney	Katko
Cline	Kelly (MS)
Cloud	Kelly (PA)
Cole	King (IA)
Collins (GA)	King (NY)
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)
Cook	LaMalfa
Crawford	Lamborn
Crenshaw	Latta
Curtis	Lesko
Davidson (OH)	Long
DesJarlais	Loudermilk
Diaz-Balart	Lucas
Duffy	Luetkemeyer
Duncan	Marchant
Dunn	Marshall
Emmer	Massie
Estes	Mast
Ferguson	McCarthy
Fitzpatrick	McCaull
Fleischmann	McClintock
Flores	McHenry
Fortenberry	McKinley
Foxx (NC)	Meadows
Fulcher	Meuser
Gaetz	Miller
Gallagher	Mitchell
Gianforte	Moolenaar
Gibbs	Moohey (WV)
Gohmert	Newhouse
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman
Gooden	Nunes

## NOT VOTING—12

Babin	Comer
Bost	Davis, Rodney

Mullin	Schroder
Payne	Sensenbrenner

Shimkus	Wilson (FL)
---------	-------------

## □ 1039

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FEDERAL CIVILIAN WORKFORCE PAY RAISE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2019

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 790.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 87 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 790.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

## □ 1042

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. SABLÁN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019, along with my fellow colleagues of the local delegation. I pay special thanks to Chairman CONNOLLY and Majority Leader HOYER for their leadership on this very important piece of legislation.

H.R. 790, as amended, would authorize a 2.6 percent pay raise for Federal civilian workers for 2019, the same raise that our military servicemembers are receiving this year.

Historically, Congress has tried to ensure parity in pay increases between Federal civilian employees and military servicemembers. This bill would continue this longstanding tradition.

The bill would provide the pay raise to Federal employees in the competitive and excepted services, blue-collar workers, members of the career Senior

Executive Service, and employees in the scientific and senior-level positions.

The men and women of our civil service deserve this small increase in pay because they have endured so much during the last several years. They were subjected, Mr. Chair, to repeated and unrelenting attacks on their pay and on their benefits.

## □ 1045

They have suffered through pay freezes, hiring freezes, higher pension costs, and furloughs due to sequestration and government shutdowns.

Since 2011, Federal workers have contributed nearly \$200 billion to help reduce our country's deficit and to fund other government programs. These hardworking, dedicated Federal workers include the 800,000 employees who were furloughed or forced to work without pay for 35 days during the longest shutdown in our great Nation's history.

The men and women of our civil service were held hostage to a political dispute over funding for a border wall that the President had stated over and over again would be paid for by Mexico. There is something wrong with this picture.

They include members of the Coast Guard, TSA screeners, Department of Agriculture workers who help farmers and ranchers, FAA air traffic controllers and safety inspectors, FDA food inspectors, the FBI, EPA pollution inspectors, Border Patrol agents, and Secret Service agents.

Given all the hardship Federal employees have experienced, they deserve a modest pay increase to help make up for the years of freezes and negligible increases and to help offset the cost of inflation.

The pay increase also would help the Federal Government compete against the private sector to recruit and retain highly qualified candidates to serve the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his words on the importance of making sure that our Federal workforce is properly compensated. Indeed, this is an important subject.

Mr. Chairman, I guess my question here today is, fundamentally, if it is so important, then why haven't we had a hearing? Why haven't we had a markup? Why the rush to push this bill on the floor?

Not too long ago, my good friend from Maryland, the chairman of the committee, would be on this same floor arguing the same thing: Why are we not having a markup? Why are we not going through regular order?

Mr. Chairman, I remind this body that, less than 30 days ago, there was a vote on the House floor that said we are going to return to regular order; we

Jones
LaHood

are going to make sure that every bill goes through the committee, has a markup, and actually has fair debate.

Yet, here we are, less than 30 days into this new Congress, and we are putting forth a messaging bill that, quite frankly, has not been vetted. The amendment process has not come out of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

I will also say, and this is no laughing matter, I have been one of the few Members on our side of the aisle on this committee who has actively engaged in trying to make sure that our Federal workforce is not only compensated, but properly recognized.

Mr. Chairman, here is my problem. According to Federal workers, over 25 percent of them believe that raises do not happen based on merit, that everyone gets a raise. Indeed, this bill does that. It says, regardless of how you perform, we are going to give everybody the same increase.

Now, that same Federal workforce went even further. One-third of them said that we don't do enough to get rid of poor performers.

What message are we sending to the Federal workforce here today? We are rushing a bill that has not gone through committee. We have not provided meaningful amendments that are actually appropriate. We have a Federal workforce that says they don't get raises based on the merits of their work, on the hard work they put forth. Indeed, they are saying that a third of the employees are getting compensated regardless of their performances.

Now, when we look at that, what message does this body send to the Federal workforce? It says that it doesn't matter what kind of job you do. I think that is a terrible message to send.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, as we look at this bill—and I am sure we will debate the merits of this particular piece of legislation—we have the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY, here, and the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, both Members who I respect greatly. Yet, this rush to put this messaging bill on the floor does nothing but damage the underlying support that many of us on both sides of the aisle have for the Federal workforce.

I strongly object to this particular measure. Let's slow it down. Let's go through the appropriate time to make sure that, indeed, we have a markup, that we have a bill.

The chairman knows full well that Federal workers, not only in and around Washington, D.C., but across the Nation, deserve our full attention, and this deserves a full debate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear that there are many Federal workers who are suffering and who have suffered.

The message that we send to them is that we care about them, and we know that they give their blood, sweat, and tears over and over again. That is one of the messages we send.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the distinguished new chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. I am so proud to call him that.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say, I heard the arguments from my friend from North Carolina, and I know he does care about the Federal employees, but his arguments ring hollow when you support a 35-day shutdown of the Federal Government.

If you believe in regular order, then you never shut down the Federal Government, nor do you advise the President of the United States to shut down the Federal Government, nor do you use shutdowns as a tool to get some policy goal achieved.

That is never acceptable. It shouldn't be acceptable to Washington. It is not acceptable to the American people. It certainly is not acceptable to the 800,000 Federal employees and an equal number of Federal contract employees and small business owners who were affected negatively by this shutdown.

So it is hard to listen to a lecture about regular order in the midst of that wreckage.

That is what we are trying to do here. It is not a messaging bill to embarrass anybody. It is a bill to try to begin to restore the integrity of respect and dignity to the men and women who serve this country. They are called Federal employees. They were innocent victims of political games, as if they were pawns, Mr. Chairman, for a wall. We are just trying to begin the process of making them whole again.

I thank the majority leader, Mr. HOYER, for bringing this bill to the floor. The bill would end the current freeze for Federal employees, recommended by President Trump, and provide hardworking civil servants with a 2.6 percent pay increase, matching that for military employees.

On the heels of this largest government shutdown in U.S. history, and the longest, I believe it is appropriate for the House of Representatives to take up this legislation to make a statement in the people's body that we do respect the work of our civil servants and our Federal employees and that we are prepared to provide concrete measures to do that.

During the shutdown, some of these individuals reported to work without knowing when, or if, they would receive their next paycheck, while others were willing to work, but were told they couldn't.

Even though the Federal Government has reopened, most Federal employees

are still waiting to receive that first paycheck. Under statute, Federal employees should have received a 2.1 percent pay increase for 2019. Instead, the recommendation from the White House was zero.

This bill represents a pay increase for Federal employees above that statutory level equal to an additional 0.5 percent over and above the statutory level that would have otherwise been provided.

While the House of Representatives passed appropriations bills that included a 1.9 percent pay increase for Federal employees, the continuing resolution agreed to by the House and Senate did not reverse the President's pay freeze. This bill would.

Historically, Congress has tried to ensure parity in pay between Federal civilian employees and military servicemembers. This bill would continue the tradition of pay parity for which I have advocated since I came to Congress 10 years ago.

A Federal employee pay increase of 2.6 percent is, in my view, further justified, as the distinguished chairman of the committee pointed out, by the hardships just suffered and those suffered over the last 10 years: three pay freezes, hiring freezes, compensation cuts, and benefit cuts. Federal employees are the only group on the planet that actually has contributed nearly \$200 billion to deficit reduction.

In 9 of the last 10 years, Congress has failed to enact an increase in basic pay consistent with the statute. Not true on the military side. That is why we are trying to have pay parity.

In 8 of the last 10 years, basic pay increases trailed increases in the cost of living itself.

I will point out that the legislation in front of us has been endorsed by the American Federation of Government Employees; the National Treasury Employees Union; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers; the Senior Executives Association; the Federal Managers Association; and the Professional Managers Association.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of support from these groups.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF  
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO.

January 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE), which represents more than 700,000 federal and District of Columbia government employees within 70 agencies, I write urging you to support H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019, introduced by Representative Connolly (D-VA), when it comes to the floor this week. This legislation provides federal workers with a FY 2019 pay adjustment of 2.6 percent. This modest adjustment would allow federal employees to make up some of the purchasing power they lost over the last decade and restore the long tradition of parity in the rate of adjustment for civilian and military employees of the United States government.

January 25, 2019 marked the end of our nation's longest government shutdown, and federal employees have been without a pay-check since December 21st. As a result of the funding lapse, many federal employees have fallen behind on their monthly bills and are experiencing serious financial hardship. Although some federal employees make more, among AFGE's own membership, the average take home pay is just \$500 per week after they pay their taxes, health insurance premiums, and mandatory retirement contributions. Many federal employees were struggling to make ends meet before the shutdown, and H.R. 790 would not only help agencies recruit new employees, and retain a workforce battered by the shutdown, compensation cuts enacted in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis, it would also demonstrate that the Congress values the federal workforce's dedication and commitment to serving the American public.

For decades, Congress supported pay adjustment parity between federal and military employees. The civilian workforce not only works alongside the warfighters to keep our nation safe, they are also public servants who have dedicated their lives to providing the American public with invaluable benefits services. Federal employees work across the country securing our borders, keeping travelers safe, providing benefits to the elderly and disabled, caring for our veterans, and keeping our air and water safe and clean. Unfortunately, in recent years pay adjustment parity has not been upheld and federal civilian salaries have continued to lag standards set by private employers. H.R. 790 would help narrow this gap.

As you work to pass legislation to fund the remaining seven appropriations bills, AFGE urges you to support H.R. 790 when it comes to the floor this week, and we strongly urge you to support inclusion of a 2.6 percent federal employee pay adjustment in the final funding measure for FY 2019.

Sincerely,

J. DAVID COX, SR.,  
National President.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY  
EMPLOYEES UNION,  
January 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Treasury Employees Union, which represents over 150,000 federal employees in 33 agencies, I urge you to support H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019, which would provide federal workers a 2.6 percent pay increase for 2019 and ensure pay parity with the military, with whom they frequently work in service to the nation.

At the end of August, the President sent a letter to Congress reiterating the call in his Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Budget Request for a pay freeze for federal workers. If not for the President's decision to implement a pay freeze, the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act (5 USC 5303) indicates that federal employees should receive a 2.1 percent pay raise in January 2019, prior to any amount being provided for locality pay rate increases. This formula is designed to ensure that the gap between federal government and private sector wages does not further deteriorate. According to the most recent Federal Pay Agent Report, the current pay disparity is over 30 percent.

Like all American workers and middle-class taxpayers, federal employees face ever-increasing costs of living, with rising utility, health care and food bills, along with school loan and rent or mortgage obligations. Due to a three-year pay freeze and five subsequent years of below-market pay raises that were lower than the amounts called for under current law, federal employees have

seen their wages fall further behind the private sector, which has adversely impacted them and their families.

Moreover, if the federal government is to have the ability to compete with the private sector in recruiting and retaining a skilled workforce, it is essential that the federal government provide its workers a pay increase. The federal government relies on qualified and professional civil servants that live and work in every state and congressional district across the country to carry out our nation's laws and programs, providing critical services for our nation and the American people.

Now, after suffering through a 35-day shutdown that caused unimaginable hardship for hundreds of thousands of federal workers, their families, and their communities, it is important to ensure that employees are able to afford the increased fees and penalties that they suffered as a result. All federal employees deserve an adequate pay raise and we urge your support for H.R. 790 in appreciation for their service.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,  
National President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,  
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO.

Washington, DC, January 29, 2019.  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), including thousands of federal government employees, I write to strongly support the "Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019," H.R. 790, which would increase federal employee salaries for calendar year 2019 by 2.6 percent. AFSCME urges you to vote for this bill to demonstrate your support for America's dedicated and hardworking federal workers.

A salary increase is necessary because expert analysis demonstrates that when contrasted position by position, federal workers' wages lag below employees in the nonfederal sector—both in the private sector and in state and local governments. In fact, federal employees are significantly underpaid in numerous occupations. Furthermore, since 2010, as a direct result of congressional legislation that reduced pay and benefits, federal employees have had their compensation cut by more than \$180 billion (over 10 years). Congress should take action to reverse these cuts and close this pay gap.

To recruit, hire, and retain a qualified capable federal government workforce, America must pay competitive salaries. This is vital to continue attracting the best and brightest to our public service. Unfortunately, during the last two years, the federal government's hiring freeze and shutdowns have lowered morale, forced many federal employees to cover others' employees' job responsibilities, and reduced the federal government's effectiveness. H.R. 790 would help address these challenges and move us forward.

AFSCME endorses this important legislation and urges you to vote for the "Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019," H.R. 790.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,  
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS,

January 29, 2019.  
DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 90,000 represented members of the Inter-

national Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), we are writing regarding the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019 (HR 790), legislation sponsored by Virginia Congressman Gerry Connolly that is scheduled for full House consideration this week. After the longest government shutdown in the history of the United States, which impacted some 800,000 federal workers and their families, IFPTE is urging you to support pay parity between military and civilian workers by voting in support of this bill.

After three consecutive years of pay freezes, followed by meager across-the-board adjustments, federal workers have seen their incomes decrease by nearly 15% with respect to inflation over the last eight years. Therefore, IFPTE feels it is both fiscally responsible and reflective of the income sacrificed by federal employees to adopt the long-standing practice of pay parity between civilian workers and the military by supporting HR 790 calling for a 2.6% federal pay increase.

As Congress works to negotiate an acceptable solution to pass the remaining FY19 appropriations bills, IFPTE urges that whatever action is taken—whether it be a Continuing Resolution (CR) or a full FY19 Minibus that includes all or some of the seven outstanding spending measures, we believe that quickly approving a 2.6% civilian pay raise is more than reasonable. This number is reflective of pay parity with the military pay raise approved last year as a part of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) and is reflective of the many years of sacrifices made by federal workers, including enduring a senseless 35-day government shutdown.

IFPTE does recognize the acute difficulties facing Congress in these contentious times, but we simply ask that the men and women who work hard every day in the trenches to deliver excellence for the taxpayer not be harmed any more than they already have by the political turmoil in Washington.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,

PAUL SHEARON,  
President.  
MATTHEW BIGGS,  
Secretary-Treasurer/  
Legislative Director.

SENIOR EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION,  
January 29, 2019.

Hon. STENY HOYER,  
Majority Leader,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER HOYER AND REPRESENTATIVE CONNOLLY: On behalf of the Senior Executives Association (SEA)—which represents the interests of career federal executives in the Senior Executive Service (SES), and those in Senior Level (SL), Scientific and Professional (ST), equivalent executive positions, and other senior career leaders—I write to convey our support for H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

For the past decade the federal workforce has been treated as the nation's piggy bank, with nearly \$200 billion in pay and benefits being taken for debt reduction and other purposes. Providing all civilian employees with a 2.6% raise in 2019, especially following the shutdown, is an important step to ensure the government can attract and retain the talent it needs to serve the American public in a competitive labor market. Moreover, reestablishing pay parity with the uniformed services is applauded and welcomed.

This legislation sends a signal that Congress is serious about ensuring the federal

government is an employer of choice. For too long race-to-the-bottom policies related to the federal workforce have become the norm. It is our hope that the silver lining of the shutdown is that the American people now better understand what government does for them every day, how dedicated the professionals who work for them in the government are, and that Congress and the administration will find ways to work together to ensure our federal government has the personnel, tools, and resources necessary to fulfil the duties assigned to it.

SEA is deeply concerned that neglect of federal workforce capabilities in recent years have resulted in an increased risk of government failure, as outlined in a paper we released last week. Strengthening the Senior Executive Service (SES) and civil service and advocating for cultivation of the public service leadership profession are among our top organizational priorities in the 116th Congress. I hope that passage of this legislation is just the beginning of concerted efforts to modernize and strengthen our civil service, to bring data-driven approaches to management and compensation, and much more.

Thank you for your steadfast support of our federal workforce and your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

BILL VALDEZ,  
President,  
Senior Executives Association.

—  
FEDERAL MANAGERS ASSOCIATION,  
Alexandria, VA, January 29, 2019.  
Hon. GERRY CONNOLLY,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONNOLLY: On behalf of the managers and supervisors currently serving our nation in the federal government and whose interests are represented by the Federal Managers Association (FMA), we extend our strongest support for your bill, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019 (H.R. 790). This legislation provides a much-deserved 2.6 percent pay raise for 2019, and addresses the inequity federal employees faced in recent years due to pay freezes and minimal raises.

The federal workforce ensures the safety of our borders, protects the nation's food supply, cares for our elderly and veterans, and serves alongside our military forces. But the minimal increases in pay received do not reflect the duties of these dedicated workers. It is time for the federal workforce to be recognized for their dedication to serving our country at home and abroad, and your legislation does that.

In addition to providing fair wages to federal employees, FMA believes H.R. 790 will help to combat the problem of morale, recruitment, and retention in the federal government, particularly in the aftermath of the partial government shutdown. As the federal government continues to struggle with these issues, your bill is a step towards offering competitive salaries, attracting and keeping the brightest and best to the federal workforce. By calling for wages that fairly compensate the abilities and responsibilities of the federal workforce, you recognize the need to ensure a fully engaged federal workforce that remains dedicated to serving the nation.

Thank you for your continued support of our federal workforce.

Sincerely,

RENEE JOHNSON,  
National President.

PROFESSIONAL MANAGERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, January 29, 2019.

Hon. STENY HOYER,  
Majority Leader,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. GERALD CONNOLLY,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER HOYER AND REPRESENTATIVE CONNOLLY: On behalf of the Professional Managers Association—the non-profit professional association that has, since 1981, represented professional managers, management officials, and non-bargaining unit employees at the Internal Revenue Service (IRS)—I write to endorse H.R. 790 the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

Pay parity between federal civilian employees and members of the military has long been the norm, until recent years in which the federal workforce has been faced with constant attacks that have taken billions in earned pay and benefits out of the pockets of hardworking middle class Americans. The result of abandoning pay parity has been an ever-growing imbalance between the compensation of federal workers and the broader labor market.

In a highly competitive economy in which the types of skills and abilities the government needs are in high demand across the board, this legislation providing a 2.6% pay increase across the board to federal civilian employees can help begin to close the gap. Especially on the heels of the embarrassing 35-day government shutdown, it is important for Congress to ensure the government is a competitive employer with good pay and benefits offerings.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue, and for your steadfast support of our federal workforce.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. BURGER,  
Executive Director,  
Professional Managers Association.

THE CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

MR. CONNOLLY. The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that our Federal civil servants are like any other workforce. More than 900,000 of those Federal employees earn less than \$60,000 a year. They are not rich. They are not living high on the hog. They deserve and need this adjustment, especially after the longest, most reckless shutdown of the government in American history.

MR. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my good friend, the ranking member of the committee, and a champion for the American people.

□ 1100

MR. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his hard work on the committee and in the United States Congress.

There are just a couple of key things to keep in mind. I am against this bill. The average yearly pay for a government worker is \$85,000. CBO did a study. Those with college degrees who work in the Federal Government make 21 percent more than people with college degrees in the private sector; those without a college degree, 53 percent more than those in the private sector.

Think about what this bill says. All of those hardworking taxpayers in the private sector, hey, you are already making less, but now you are going to have more of your tax dollars go to pay people—who are already making more money than you—to get a raise. How is that fair?

Even worse, think about what the Democrats are doing on H.R. 1, their signature legislation. H.R. 1, they are saying to those same people who are already making more money than folks in the private sector, they are saying to those private-sector taxpayers, Hey, guess what? We are not only going to give them a raise, even though they are already making more than you, we are going to give them 6 paid days to work on campaigns, 6 vacation days where they get to work on campaigns. And, oh, by the way, they may be helping the very candidate you are against. Such a deal for the taxpayers.

That is why I am a “no” on this bill. I am thinking about the taxpayers in the 11th District of North Carolina, the Fourth District of Ohio, and all across this country. Tell me how that is fair.

Oh, I forgot. There is one more thing the Democrats want to do. H.R. 1, they want to make election day a paid holiday for Federal employees. This is not where we need to be. This is not the respect taxpayers deserve.

Mr. Chair, I would urge a “no” vote, and I appreciate the good work Congressman MEADOWS is doing on this legislation. Frankly, he is right. We probably should have had a hearing and talked about this. Maybe the Democrats didn't want to talk about the fact that people in the private sector are making less with the same kind of education than those who work for the Federal Government.

MR. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished majority leader.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I am, of course, not shocked that those who wanted to shut down the government and keep it shut had Federal employees making nothing. I am not shocked that they don't want to give Federal employees a cost-of-living adjustment.

Now, I could spend a lot of time responding to my friend from Ohio about the qualifications necessary to run NASA and to work at NASA, or the FBI, or the CDC, or the other agencies that require high levels of skill to work.

I am sure my friend from Ohio has read the government reports from the council that is charged with the responsibility of determining whether we are paying comparable wages who say, no, we are not. As a matter of fact, we are substantially under, if you compare apples to apples, educational requirements, and skills requirements to the private sector, similar requirements.

He doesn't mention that because the averages, they sound just much better.

Now, of course, the average salary on the Washington National's team is a little higher than that. Why, because their skill levels are higher than almost anybody else in the country.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Representative CONNOLLY and Representative WEXTON for their hard work, and I want to thank my friend, the chairman of the committee. Representative CONNOLLY, of course, has been a long-time advocate of the pay and benefits, and retaining, and being able to recruit people who have those kinds of skill levels.

You better be careful; some 30 to 40 percent of our people are getting pretty close or are at retirement age, and they are going to say, you keep shutting them down and not keeping their salary level, unlike our salary, which has deteriorated now for 10 years in terms of its purchasing value. But averages are averages.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. CONNOLLY in particular. He has been an outstanding advocate for many Federal civilian employees living and working in northern Virginia and across the national capital region, and, indeed, around the country.

Let me disclose, I represent 62,000 Federal employees. You are not shocked that I am for Federal employees. But when I was in the State Senate, I represented a minuscule amount of State employees, and I was for paying them comparable wages so that we could hire competent, capable, committed people to serve my constituents.

This shutdown just showed what kind of pain it has caused. Do you think those high-price people were in food lines because they wanted to say: I am in a food line? No, sir. They were there because they were not making enough in the Washington metropolitan area and in other areas around the country, because less than 20 percent of the Federal employees live in this Washington metropolitan area.

The pay freeze President Trump imposed on Federal workers has been detrimental to our ability as a nation to recruit and retain the best and brightest citizens to serve in government.

Now, very frankly, Abe Pollin, a very good friend of mine, owned the Washington Wizards. He never asked me to play center because I have a disability. I am 6-feet tall, not 7-feet tall. That is all. And the people he asked, he had to pay a lot of money to them because he wouldn't get them if he didn't.

The people who were running our space program, or running NIH, they are just not run-of-the-mill people, frankly, like me. They have got extraordinary skills. If we keep shutting them down and we keep not paying them, you are going to have a second-rate government. That is where you are going.

You are going to have another opportunity to say shutdown is stupid. I hope you join us on that because it is stupid. It cost us \$11 billion according

to CBO. After 5 weeks of an unnecessary, costly, and painful shutdown, the American people have been reminded how critical the work our Federal employees perform is to our national security and economic security.

Americans were horrified to learn that many civilian Federal employees live paycheck to paycheck, as they do. Even a single month's delay of income sent many of them to food pantries and in search of emergency loans.

That isn't right. We had, for a long time, an agreement. We do parity for our military personnel. Now we pay our military, who we put at the point of the spear, hazardous duty pay, as we should. But our agreement was we are going to make sure that everybody keeps their pay at pretty much a stable level of purchasing power. That is the key.

Very frankly, some people in this House are not for raising the minimum wage. The minimum wage has eroded 40 percent in purchasing power since 1968. The Federal employee pay will erode in purchasing power if we don't pass this legislation.

Let's not forget that 85 percent of Federal employees live outside the Washington area in some of your districts; even in North Carolina.

Those who work hard to keep our country and its people safe deserve to be paid competitively. This does not bring them to competitive pay with the private sector, I tell my friends.

I am proud to represent, as I said, 62,000 of them. I have met many of them over the years. They are wonderful people dedicated to serving the Nation and the people of our country. They deserve better than to be treated like pawns in political games with shutdowns and pay freezes.

Now, the Senate included 1.9 percent. We included zero over here, of course, not surprising. When you don't respect people, you don't necessarily have to treat them as you would treat an employee in your own firm.

Federal civilian employees, unlike their counterparts in the military, have been asked to contribute \$182 billion over the last 10 years in reduced benefits and pay. \$182 billion they have contributed to try to bring down our debt, which is sort of a drop in the bucket when you give yourself \$1.5 trillion for some of the wealthiest people in America.

You give yourself headroom to create \$1.5 trillion to \$2.5 trillion of additional debt to give some of the wealthiest people in America a huge tax cut, but not 2.6 percent for Federal employees. My no.

That scientist at NASA or the FBI agent who has maybe a college degree, maybe a law degree, who has to figure out what some of the most dangerous people in America and around the world are doing, no, not 2.6 percent for them.

Mr. Chair, we need to make sure pay is keeping pace with the rising cost of living for those who serve this country

in civilian roles, as well as those in military roles. They are no less deserving of our gratitude and fair compensation. This bill would ensure that civilian Federal employees receive the same 2.6 percent that all of you voted for on that side of the aisle for our military personnel.

I honor our military personnel. We should give them that. We should make sure their purchasing power doesn't erode. And by the way, you can talk to military families who also from time to time are in food lines. Is that the right way to treat our people who work for our country and our constituents?

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in supporting this bill. In doing so, we can show the hard-working men and women—unlike we showed them for 35 days—that we do have respect for them; that we do care about their morale; and that we do care about their ability to support themselves and their families. We can show them that we value their contributions and thank them for their important service.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues, at a time of extraordinary trauma among our Federal employees, to show them the gratitude and respect that they have earned and that they deserve.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am glad the Chairman made this admonishment because some of the comments that were just offered actually seemed to be directed at me from a standpoint of respect. I would remind the gentleman from Maryland, both gentlemen from Maryland, that this is one of the individuals who has actually worked in a bipartisan fashion on TPS and a number of things. The majority leader knows that well.

I would also say if we are going to make broad-sweeping statements that impugn the motives of individuals, it needs to start with the previous President of the United States, Barack Obama, because he froze the Federal workforce at zero three different times.

I didn't hear the outrage on this floor, Mr. Chairman, that I am hearing today. It is somehow always one side of the aisle's fault, unless it happens to be their party's President that invokes the freeze.

So I would say, Mr. Chairman, we need to make sure that those broad-brush characterizations are not conveyed here on the House floor.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on the point he just made?

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I respectfully yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman very much because he makes a good point. When President Obama became President, of course, we were in a deep trough as the gentleman remembers.

□ 1115

It was January of 2009, and we sat around the Cabinet table. I was the majority leader then as well, and I said:

Federal employees ought to get no cost-of-living adjustment, Mr. President. The country is in a deep trough. Many people are hurting in this country, and we should not have a COLA adjustment this year.

I supported the second year of not having a COLA adjustment because we were still in a problem. Mr. Chairman, you will not find any record of my standing on this floor saying that we ought to give Federal employees a COLA while so many people in the country were struggling without a job and losing their homes. So I just wanted to tell the gentleman that when a Democrat was President of the United States, I told the Federal unions—all of whom supported me—Look, the country is in trouble.

But we are not in trouble now. The President talks about what a great economy we have and what low unemployment we have. So now is the time to give them that raise.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MEADOWS. I appreciate the gentleman, but I want to make sure, Mr. Chairman, we correct the record because the gentleman is correct in 2009 and 2010. But we gave them raises in 2010. The Federal pay freezes were 2011, '12, and '13 when the same President was saying that everything was going fine. So I want to remind the gentleman that if we are going to look at history, then I think—to use the gentleman's words—let's not use revisionist history.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't support him, however, when he did those zeros in those years when we were doing well.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to direct it to you. The same gentleman who is making the argument here today was not on the House floor talking about how evil the President was and how he should not be doing that. So I just want to make sure we correct the record here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the majority leader. In his comments he said that the shutdown is painful and stupid.

No one wants a shutdown, Mr. Chairman, but I will tell you what is stupid. What is stupid is a southern border that is not secure. I feel for the Federal employees who missed a paycheck. We don't want any family to have to go through that, and I understand that.

But I also understand the pain that some families across this country have suffered, particularly when they lose a loved one because an illegal immigrant is here and took the life of someone they cared deeply about.

This shutdown would have never happened if the Democrats would have voted for what they were for before, what they had already supported. But

no, no, no, they are so focused on stopping the President that they can't get focused on helping the country.

Everybody knows we need a border security wall. All you have to do, Mr. Chairman, is watch the caravan phenomena over the last several months. There is another one forming. Until we understand this and are willing to deal with the problem, we can keep having these debates, but I just wish Democrats would support what they did previously, support money for the border security wall that everybody knows needs to happen. That is the real problem here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Chairman: this is not about a border wall. This is about building people and allowing them to sustain themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who is the very distinguished leader of our caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on behalf of the hardworking Federal employees who serve this Nation in such a tremendous fashion.

I rise today in strong support of this legislation which will provide a modest and well-deserved cost-of-living increase for the Federal workforce.

For 35 days, this administration recklessly shut down the government so it could try to fund a campaign applause line. For 35 days, this administration shut down the government and held hardworking employees hostage using them like bargaining chips from a bankrupt casino. For 35 days, hundreds of thousands of Federal employees were furloughed, putting their well-being in jeopardy.

For 35 days, members of the Coast Guard, air traffic controllers, TSA agents, FBI agents, Border Patrol agents, Secret Service agents, and so many others were forced to work without pay in the wealthiest country in the history of the world. For 35 days, these hardworking Federal employees across the country from north to south to east to west stepped up for us. Now it is time for this Congress to step up for them.

Over the last 2 years, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent their time working on behalf of the wealthy, the well-off, and the well-connected. That is the only way, Mr. Chairman, that you can explain jamming a reckless tax scam down the throats of the American people where 83 percent of the benefits went to the wealthiest 1 percent.

House Democrats will spend our time fighting for working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, and veterans from all across this country, many of whom, by the way, are part of the Fed-

eral workforce. We are going to continue to stand up for them.

We promised the American people that we would increase pay for everyday Americans. Keeping that promise begins today. Day after day, week after week, and month after month we will continue to do everything possible as we fight hard for the people.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I thank the distinguished chair and this wonderful committee for their great work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CÁRDENAS). The gentleman from North Carolina has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, before I make some statements, I would notify the gentleman from Maryland, my good friend, Mr. CUMMINGS, that I have no additional speakers on this particular topic, so I am prepared to close at any time he would like to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time based on the speakers the gentleman might have.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say this, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday we had our organizational meeting, and I made it clear that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina has been truly a person who has worked very hard in a bipartisan way trying to come up with commonsense resolutions. So in no way do I want the gentleman to feel as if that is not being recognized, and we appreciate it.

It is just that we have a lot of employees who aren't making those very high salaries. They are the ones who are living from paycheck to paycheck.

Mr. Chairman, one of the saddest parts is when they go from paycheck to paycheck it is almost like no check because when they look at their bills, the bills are so much higher than their net pay. All we are trying to do is make sure that they keep up with the cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), who is the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I do agree that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) has tried mightily to work with us on various issues. He is not a bad man, he is just wrong on this one issue, in my opinion.

First of all, I rise in support of this very, very modest cost-of-living increase for Federal workers.

My wife has a habit of reminding me from time to time. She says: When we

first met, you were an ironworker. Then you went to law school and became a lawyer. Then you ran for office and became a politician. You know, it has been one disappointment after another.

But I want to say, as an ironworker I was in a much better position than our Federal workers. When I was an ironworker—and I eventually became president of the union—if my job was unsafe or if the employer refused to pay my workers, as a union president, I would pull my men and women off the job. Under Taft-Hartley 1947, we changed that law for Federal workers, everybody in the Federal Government. We said, ironically, that these jobs are so important that we can't have the government shut down. We can't have the government shut down.

So even though we have a President now in the White House who not only shut the job down, forced the workers to work without pay, and then—that was on the 22nd of December—on the 28th of December he signs an executive order that says no pay increase for all of 2019 for our Federal workers.

I want to point out that the TSA workers—whom we walk by at least twice a week as we come and go from Washington—their base starting salary is \$28,000 a year—\$28,000 a year. I made more money than that when I was an apprentice boy for the ironworkers back in 1972—\$28,000 a year. This would represent a \$27-a-week cost-of-living adjustment for those workers.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LYNCH. In Taft-Hartley we said that as a government we were taking away the right of workers to strike. As an ironworker, I put my tools down if I thought it was unsafe or if somebody cut my pay. We don't allow Federal workers to do that.

I am saying that this President has broken that covenant of treating our workers with respect. I think it is only fair that we consider giving back the right to strike to our Federal workers. Let them stand up for themselves and protest like we give every other human being in our society. Give them the right to protest. Give them the right to strike if we are not going to treat them right.

I think that, unfortunately, we have come to this point. I certainly want to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very modest cost-of-living adjustment on behalf of our Federal workers.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the new chairman of our committee, for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this tiny—I will call it modest—2.6 percent pay raise authorized by H.R. 790 does not begin to make up for the long overdue pay raise our

Federal workers are due. It does not begin to make up for the puny raises—sometimes as low as 1 percent, sometimes no raise at all—that our Federal workers have had to bear, and it certainly does not make up for 35 days of no pay for the longest shutdown in American history.

It is particularly unconscionable to follow the Trump shutdown with a Trump pay freeze. Every Member in this House represents Federal workers. Every Member should be on the floor speaking for them.

For years, Congress recognized pay increase equity between civilian and military personnel. But perhaps with the disparagement of Federal workers by Republicans and Republican Presidents, and perhaps to save money, we no longer even try to bring together these two parts of our workforce. It is hard to justify bifurcation of the civilian from the military workforce today.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. For example, what about the many who work side by side such as the civil servants who guard our borders who are hardly different from the soldiers who do the same thing around the country?

The 2.6 percent pay raise proposed here does not begin to make up for the 32 percent average difference between Federal and private-sector employees who do the same work according to the council that measures this work every year. But for now, after 35 days of no pay, now is the time to try to insinuate some fairness into pay for Federal workers with this modest 2 percent pay raise.

□ 1130

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We hear a lot of discussion today on what is reasonable and small amounts. In fact, the pay raise that they are talking about is about \$5.5 billion a year or \$55 billion over 10. Actually, CBO would probably score it higher than that, closer to \$60 billion over 10 years. Yet this whole shutdown that we are talking about could have been solved with a compromise between zero and \$5.7 billion for a wall.

So it was an extreme amount of money when we are talking about securing families, securing our borders, and protecting our communities. It was a price too high to pay. But now, all of a sudden, it is not too high of a price to pay because it is a small amount of money? I fail to see the logic, Mr. Chairman.

When we are looking at this, if we are really talking about compromises, where was the compromise over the last 35 days? There was zero money for a wall on day one. There was zero money for a wall on day 35. Yet, here

today, we are talking about \$5 billion or \$6 billion as if it were pocket change.

I find that interesting, Mr. Chairman, because, as we look at this particular issue, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle would have the American people think that it is only the Republicans who are totally responsible for everything. Yet we know that history shows that, when there was a Democrat in the White House, indeed, there was a pay freeze 3 different years.

We also know that there were two votes during the economic and financial meltdown in 2008 and 2009 where they gave Federal workers a 3 percent increase while everybody else was out looking for a job. Now, where is the parity in that?

The last question I would have for you, Mr. Chairman, is this: Where is the parity, when we look at our military men and women's faces, when we start talking about 2.6, that they are getting the same amount? They are not getting the same amount. Talk to a chief master sergeant who has been on the job for 15 years. He is getting far less pay than the Federal worker who is getting this same increase when you have over 25 percent of the Federal workforce making over \$100,000 a year.

We hear all these statistics that are low statistics, but let's at least be honest in our debate. When we look at what we have, if this is a small amount of money, I guess I would challenge my colleagues on the opposite side: Let's find a compromise on border security measures.

What amount of money is proper to save families from losing loved ones? I have looked in the faces of angel moms and angel dads, where they have lost their kids. Are we going to just turn our back on them as well?

Perhaps there is a spirit of compromise here where we can work together and find a compromise where there are no more shutdowns. Let's look at passing a bill that freezes congressional pay if there is a shutdown. I am all in. Are all the Democrats in? Let's look at it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we are zeroing in on Federal workers whose average pay is \$60,000. We are zeroing in on folks who are, in many instances, barely making it.

I don't want us to get it twisted. We have a situation where a lot of times we discuss a whole lot of other things but don't necessarily concentrate on the subject matter at hand.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, in our committee, we had a lady who came in and told us that her daughter died. She died because she couldn't get \$333 worth of insulin a month. That happened in America.

What is my point? These dollars mean a lot to these Federal employees.

I am not going to pit our military against our civilian employees. They are all very important. I want them all to be well paid. But right now, we need to concentrate on, again, building people and making a difference in their lives.

Speaking of building people, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON), a cosponsor of this bill.

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague, GERRY CONNOLLY, for his strong leadership on this issue.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 790 and in strong support of a long-overdue cost-of-living increase for Federal civil servants.

Many will remember the President's callous executive order of December 30, right in the middle of the shutdown, freezing Federal workers' salaries while hundreds of thousands of them were furloughed or, worse, working without pay.

Federal employees are not the swamp, as some would have you believe. Federal employees are the people who make sure that Social Security checks are mailed on time each month. They are the scientists researching cures for cancer. They are tour guides in our national parks. They are FBI agents investigating criminal activity. They are the air traffic controllers and TSA agents keeping us safe when we fly.

We saw during the shutdown how important every dollar of every paycheck is for Federal employees to pay their bills, to pay their rent, to pay their mortgage, to afford childcare, to pay off their student loans, and, yes, even to feed their families.

It is time to give Federal employees the pay raise and the respect they deserve, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me close by saying a sincere word of compliment to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

We have great differences on this piece of legislation, and, indeed, we represent very different districts. It has been said many times that you can disagree without being disagreeable, and I want to compliment the two gentlemen for their vigorous debate today yet where they didn't make personal attacks. I hope that, Mr. Chairman, they have seen the same from me, and I have high respect for both of them.

I also believe that, at times, where perhaps we deescalate the emotions—and I know this is a highly charged, emotional debate, as it should be—we can find common ground.

Mr. Chairman, I commit to the two gentlemen with whom I have had the privilege of working for the last 6 years that I will continue to work hard and

with great resolve to find ways that we can not only recognize and compensate our Federal workers, but we can do so in a manner that is fair and equitable and certainly makes sure that the servants they are is recognized.

Mr. Chairman, I would also say that this particular piece of legislation, hopefully, will provide the fodder for us going back to the committee and going through a markup process to look at how we actually address this, where we actually have hearings and bring in experts, because, Mr. Chairman, we have had the majority leader of the Congress on this House floor citing one particular survey and we have had me here citing the CBO, and those two statistics are at odds. So I think it is important that we hear from real experts and figure out how we do this.

The time is now for us to find a way to work in a bipartisan manner to truly move this country forward. The Federal workforce is an important part of that.

I believe this particular piece of legislation sends a bad message to those Federal workers who believe that pay raises are not based on merit, that they don't identify the poor performers. We have to address that as well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I insert in the RECORD an article from The Washington Post that reports the Federal Salary Council, the official monitor of Federal pay, found that Federal workers make an average of 30 percent less than their private-sector counterparts.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 2018]

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SALARIES LAG BY AVERAGE OF 31 PERCENT, PAY GROUP REPORTS  
(By Eric Yoder)

Federal employee salaries on average lag behind those of the private sector by almost 31 percent, an advisory council said Tuesday, while splitting between union and non-union members on whether to recommend potential changes in the way it arrives at that figure.

The average salary difference of 30.91 percent reported by the Federal Salary Council is somewhat smaller than the 31.86 percent it reported at a special meeting it held April. The figures of prior years were in the 34 to 35 percent range.

Those figures, based on two Labor Department surveys covering some 250 occupations, stand in contrast to assessments of some conservative and libertarian organizations that have concluded that the advantage is about the same or even greater in favor of federal employees.

The Congressional Budget Office last year essentially split the difference. It found an average advantage for federal workers of 3 percent, although within that average it said there is a wide range by educational level: from a 34 percent advantage for federal

workers with a high school education or less to a 24 percent shortfall for those with a professional degree or doctorate.

Under a federal pay law, the "pay gap" as measured by the Salary Council is to be used in setting annual raises varying by locality for federal employees under the General Schedule, the pay system covering most white-collar employees below the executive levels. However, that law never has been followed due to the potential cost of paying such large raises and disagreements over how the figure is calculated.

In an August message to Congress, President Trump said that following the law's formula would result in locality-based raises in January 2019 averaging 25.7 percent plus an across-the-board raise of 2.1 percent, at a cost of \$25 billion. "Federal agency budgets cannot sustain such increases," Trump's said in backing a pay freeze that he originally proposed in a budget plan early this year.

A House-Senate conference underway on a spending bill will decide between a freeze and a Senate provision to pay an average 1.9 percent raise. Unless Congress passes, and Trump signs, a bill specifying a raise, salaries will be frozen by default. If the raise is enacted, it would vary slightly among 44 city areas and what is called the "rest of the U.S." locality everywhere else; employees working in the Washington-Baltimore area would stand to receive one of the larger raises, probably around 2.3 percent.

The long-running controversy over comparing salaries flared at Tuesday's meeting of the Salary Council, a group of federal employee unions and compensation experts whose decisions typically are unanimous.

A "working group" document produced since the April meeting laid out a series of potential changes for consideration by a higher-level body called the President's Pay Agent. Those options included adding more detailed data on salaries by occupation and level of work, taking into account other data such as attrition rates, switching to a "total compensation" approach taking benefits into account, and conducting a very detailed review only once every four or five years—the latter two of which would require a change in law.

Council chairman Ron Sanders, a longtime career federal personnel official who is now a clinical professor at the University of South Florida School of Public Affairs, argued in favor of exploring those options. "I think it's obvious to all of us that the current methodology is problematic," he said.

"That methodology does not tell the whole story," Sanders said. "It's nice to say there's a 30 percent gap. If OMB [the Office of Management and Budget] doesn't believe it, the White House doesn't believe it, the Congress doesn't believe it, what good does it do?"

He pointed to the testimony of officials of federal agencies from several urban and rural areas not now receiving higher city-based locality pay, who told of their difficulties in recruiting and retaining employees despite using special hiring authorities and incentive payments. However, the current process doesn't support specific salary rates for them, he said.

Two other members supported exploring the options: Katja Bullock, associate director of presidential personnel, and Jill Nelson, who leads an advisory committee on pay for blue-collar federal employees.

However, members from federal unions argued against changing the calculations and questioned whether the group even has the authority to raise new options for consideration. "I don't think the methodology is broken," said J. David Cox Sr., president of the American Federation of Government Employees.

"The elephant in the room is the Congress and the president over time not funding the

pay system" as the law intended, said Randy L. Erwin, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees. Anthony M. Reardon, president of the National Treasury Employees Union, expressed concern that including the value of federal benefits "will be used as a justification to reduce those benefits."

The council adjourned without voting on whether to recommend that the Pay Agent consider different approaches. Afterward, Sanders said that in the annual report to that higher-level body to be made by year's end, individual members of the Salary Council could express their own opinions.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, it is so important that we do everything in our power to support our Federal employees, and I want to thank Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. HOYER. They have given their blood and their sweat and their tears for Federal employees: constantly standing up for them, trying to make sure that they are treated fairly and given their due.

Just today, I spoke to two people who were telling me about how Federal employees at NIH basically saved their lives—saved their lives. One told me that the person who saved their life was making about \$65,000. This is a doctor. Come on now. And the other said it was about, maybe, \$70,000 at best.

These are people who could have been doing other things, could have been making a lot of money, but they decided to give their efforts to a greater cause.

Their names will probably never appear on the front page—or any page—of The Washington Post. They won't be on ABC News. They will not have the mansion that they could have gotten, but they have done something that will have fed their souls. They have come to the job with passion, compassion, and the desire to make things better, and they are the ones who have determined that they want to put their fingerprints on the future of generations yet unborn.

Then there are the others, like the TSA workers—you know the ones—earning \$28,000 a year and coming to work, by the way, during the shutdown when they couldn't even afford the gas to get there. What about them?

So we can make example after example after example, but one thing is for sure, and that is that they are working hard and they deserve our utmost support.

Now, if any message is going to be sent today, I pray, Mr. Chair, that that message goes to our Federal employees that we care about them and that they are not unseen, unnoticed, unappreciated, and unapplauded. No.

I hope the message goes out that we are upholding them and we realize that it is just not about them. We realize, when they don't get their raise, their family doesn't get their raise. When they don't get their raise, maybe that little girl they wanted to send to ballet lessons can't get them. We get that.

Or maybe that little vacation that they wanted to take, they can't get that. They are not trying to get to Dis-

ney World. They are just trying to get to the nearest amusement park with some tuna fish and crackers.

□ 1145

Come on now. And that is what this is all about. We can talk about fences all we want.

Right now, we are talking about the building of people and making their lives the best that they can be. We only have one life to live. This is no dress rehearsal, and this is that life.

I applaud the gentleman from North Carolina. I know his heart is right, but right now, I want to concentrate on those folks, the ones like people who live on my block, who get up at 5 in the morning, catch the early bus to get to Social Security and places, and trying to serve the public. I am talking about them.

Mr. Chair, I pray and I ask the Members to vote in favor of this great legislation.

I thank Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HOYER, Ms. WEXTON, and all of our cosponsors, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

Our federal civilian workforce, who continued to work without pay through a record-long 35-day shutdown, deserves to be fairly compensated for their dedication to our country.

Often unnoticed, this group includes TSA agents who ensure our airports and air travel is safe, the FBI, which actively combats terrorism, and CBP agents, who diligently protect our borders. These heroic employees deserve to see their salary reflect the important and selfless work they do on behalf of the United States.

The civilian federal workforce also includes FDA personnel who ensure the food we eat is safe, National Park rangers who patrol and maintain our beautiful national parks, and IRS employees who work tirelessly to process and distribute tax refunds to Americans all over this country.

Mr. Chair, these federal workers dedicate their lives to serving the American people and this great nation—it is about time we return the favor by ensuring they are fairly compensated for their hard work.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 790, the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019.

On December 28, 2018, one week into the longest government shutdown in history, President Trump added insult to injury by announcing that all federal civilian workers would not receive a pay raise in 2019.

This action continues the years of menial pay raises that federal employees have received.

Federal employees have endured pay freezes, hiring freezes, higher pension contributions, and furloughs as a result of sequestration and government shutdowns, including the longest shutdown in our nation's history.

Texas has over 270,000 federal employees.

Almost 4,000 of those federal employees call my district, Texas 18, home.

It is time that Congress act and shows its appreciation for these and the almost 2 million

other men and women who are federal employees and the services they provide to our great nation.

Denying these federal workers a hard-earned raise is not the way to balance the budget.

Providing these workers with a raise is not an unrealistic burden on the federal budget.

The cost of a pay raise would be approximately \$25 billion.

Trump's tax reform bill cost over 10 times this amount.

It is inappropriate for the President to use these civil servants as a bargaining chip, and it is inappropriate to not recognize their hard work and dedication through a much earned pay raise.

For too long, federal employees have been the victims of attacks being told that "good people don't go into government," that the federal government is full of "waste, fraud, and abuse."

This is categorically false.

Federal employees have contributed nearly \$200 billion to deficit reduction and other government programs over the past several years.

These attacks on federal employees are in addition to the Republican attacks on federal worker pay and benefits that have been happening for years.

We need to help the morale of the federal workforce.

We need to make the federal government competitive with the private sector so that highly qualified candidates are able to serve the American people.

We need to retain the talent that we have.

It is time for Congress to show their support for the men and women who work selflessly and tirelessly for our government with this modest pay raise.

H.R. 790 would authorize a 2.6 percent pay raise for federal civilian workers and established pay parity between them and military service members for 2019, a longstanding Congressional tradition.

Federal workers who would receive this pay raise are employees in the competitive and excepted services; prevailing wage or blue collar workers; members of the career Senior Executive Service; and employees in the scientific and senior level positions.

This modest pay increase, between \$488.41–\$4,041.54 a year, would help offset the cost of inflation and to make up for years of freezes and negligible increases.

I am a strong supporter of the men and women who make up the federal civilian workforce, and I ask my colleagues to show their support to these integral federal employees by joining me in supporting H.R. 790.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act.

Our federal public servants dedicate their lives to serving their fellow Americans.

Today, let's thank them for their dedicated service to our country by providing them and their families an overdue pay raise that they have earned.

The Trump shutdown exposed the all-too-real economic reality for many Americans. Millions live paycheck-to-paycheck, including many of our public servants. They did not choose a life of public service to make it rich, but rather to serve and improve the lives of their fellow citizens.

The shutdown also crystallized the daily impact federal workers have on all our lives. 85 percent of all federal workers live outside of Washington, and their paychecks drive the economies of communities across the U.S.

This increase of 2.6 percent will help federal workers, 1 in 8 of whom make less than \$40,000 a year, make ends meet while stimulating local small businesses across the nation when federal employees spend their earnings.

Mr. Chair, it is unacceptable that their pay has not reflected the increased demands of cost of living for years. It's time we give our hardworking federal employees the pay raise they deserve and earn every day.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-5 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 790

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Civilian Workforce Pay Raise Fairness Act of 2019”.

**SEC. 2. PAY INCREASE FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN 2019.**

(a) STATUTORY PAY SYSTEMS.—For calendar year 2019, the percentage adjustment under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of basic pay under the statutory pay systems (as defined in section 5302 of such title) shall be 2.6 percent.

(b) PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES.—Notwithstanding the wage survey requirements under section 5343(b) of title 5, United States Code, for fiscal year 2019, the rates of basic pay (as in effect on the last day of fiscal year 2018 under section 5343(a) of such title) for prevailing rate employees in each wage area and the rates of basic pay under sections 5348 and 5349 of such title shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

(c) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE CAREER APPOINTEES.—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay for any career position within the Senior Executive Service or the FBI-DEA Senior Executive Service (as that term is defined in section 3151(a) of title 5, United States Code) shall be the rate of pay for any such position on December 31, 2018, increased by 2.6 percent.

(d) SENIOR-LEVEL AND SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS.—For calendar year 2019, the rates of basic pay for any senior-level and scientific and professional position under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code, shall be the rate of pay for any such position on December 31, 2018, increased by 2.6 percent.

(e) EXCEPTED SERVICE.—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay for any position in the excepted service (as that term is defined by section 2103 of title 5, United States Code) shall be the rate of pay for any such position on December 31, 2018, increased by 2.6 percent.

**(f) APPLICATION.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—The adjustments in pay made under this Act shall apply beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS PERMITTED; LIMITS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(A) limit any other increase, including allowances, performance awards, or bonuses,

otherwise permitted under law to any a rate of pay adjusted under this Act; or

(B) waive any provision of law, rule, or regulation, including section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, limiting total aggregate pay.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, is in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-5. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-5.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 2(e) the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(f) SECRET SERVICE EMPLOYEES.—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay of any employee of the United States Secret Service provided under chapter 102 of title 5, United States Code, who did not receive a pay increase by operation of subsections (a) through (e) shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of this amendment, which would guarantee the United States Secret Service receive a 2.6 percent pay increase with the rest of the civilian workforce.

The underlying bill will nullify the President's executive order that froze pay for Federal workers. It is important we include all employees of the Secret Service in that correction.

The Secret Service's most well-known mission is to spend every day protecting the President of the United States. That is why it is unfortunate. First, he froze their pay, and then he didn't pay them for 35 days in the longest government shutdown in history.

I represent a district right outside of Washington, D.C., and a lot of my friends and fellow constituents are Federal workers. I was disheartened to learn in December they would not be receiving a pay increase. They go to work every day to serve our country. They are American workers; they are patriots; they are friends; and they deserve better.

This amendment will ensure that no Secret Service employees are inadvertently left out of a much-needed pay raise. They work every day to protect

the President and the Vice President from harm and protect against crimes of our Nation's financial and banking infrastructure, and they deserve recognition, and they deserve a raise.

I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment suffers some of the same defects as the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, while there are numerous dedicated civil servants in all parts of the Federal Government, offering an additional across-the-board pay raise is simply not good policy. It rewards the bad along with the good.

The United States Secret Service is made up of many brave men and women, very honorable men and women. However, in 2015, the bipartisan report issued jointly by then-Chairman Chaffetz and the new chairman of Oversight and Reform, then-Ranking Member CUMMINGS of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, detailed significant personnel problems. The report describes “an extraordinarily inefficient hiring process which overburdens the USSS with low-quality applications.”

So the men and women of the uniformed division render critical services to our government. Many of them are friends. And, truly, as we see their dedication, they have to sacrifice so much. Whether it is at the Vice President's residence or whether it is on the complex just a few blocks from here, there is no margin for failure with respect to their protective mission, and I acknowledge that.

However, an across-the-board pay increase does exactly that. It rewards the good along with the bad. That is why we have to have, indeed, a merit-based system that truly recognizes the great performers—the vast majority of whom are great performance—but does not recognize and reward those who are not doing it. We need to do that. And for that reason, I would reject this particular amendment and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this is just a clarifying amendment.

The Secret Service has pay authority for certain positions. We want to be sure that none of those positions are inadvertently left out of this underlying bill. In short, the amendment guarantees all Secret Service employees are treated the same—fair and simple.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, to rehash all the reasons, both good and bad, I am willing to work in a bipartisan way with the chairman of both the committee and the subcommittee to try to find ways to address this issue. This amendment does not do that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Maryland for his leadership on this amendment, which I support.

The Secret Service do put themselves on the line, and the studies my friend from North Carolina cited had to do with bad management and bad working conditions that really affect morale and productivity at the Secret Service. The gentleman’s amendment is designed to try to help that situation.

The idea that an across-the-board cost of living increase doesn’t distinguish between productivity and non-productivity, performance or non-performance, would also apply to the military.

My friend has no objection to an across-the-board increase for the military, but apparently on the civilian side, that is different. We are making the opposite argument. We are making the argument that pay parity is the right thing to do, especially after this reckless shutdown.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my friend from Maryland on his amendment, and I support it.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order. I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. FLETCHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-5.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk and ask for its consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 2(e) the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(f) NASA EMPLOYEES.—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay of any employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided under chapter 98 of title 5, United States Code, who did not receive a pay increase by operation of subsections (a) through (e) shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to ensure that the pay raises are equally distributed to all Federal employees at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In the Houston area that I represent, there are more than 3,000 Federal civil servants who do important work at the Johnson Space Center. While most of these employees work under the traditional GS pay scale and would be covered by the base pay scale adjustment, there are certain employees who would not.

NASA, like many technical agencies, can authorize certain pay flexibilities under different chapters of the code to recruit talented individuals. My amendment merely clarifies that these employees are equally deserving of this pay raise.

After the shutdown, it is now more important than ever to work to retain talented civil service employees around our country, especially at NASA.

I would like to thank my colleagues for working with me on this amendment and urge their support to ensure that the hardworking civil servants get the pay raise that they deserve.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to keep my remarks brief as we have got a number of different amendments going through.

I acknowledge the gentlewoman’s tenacity and her willingness to offer this. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, though, this particular across-the-board pay raise, it really shouldn’t apply to the very individuals that she is talking about because they have flexibility already. We know that. I mean, they get different pay raises.

That is not to undermine the wonderful work that they do. I have been privileged to be able to talk to NASA folks from here in Washington, DC, to her home district in the great State of Texas and across this country. Remarkably, they are one of the best run agencies—and I say that under the previous NASA Administrator and under the current NASA Administrator.

So it is not to not acknowledge their good work, but the whole premise of being able to give them a bump, there is already great pushback among some Federal workers about the flexibility of those individuals and the way that they get their pay raises. There are claims of unfairness. So I think that this sends a wrong message.

Mr. Chair, I urge the rejection of this particular amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that the purpose of this amendment isn’t to address the

underlying issues that the gentleman from North Carolina raised, but it is really to just ensure that the language of this amendment may be applied equally and that no one at NASA is left behind because of differences in the way that their compensation structure is currently scheduled. This is a clarifying amendment, and it is just dedicated to the purpose of making sure that these employees may be included and not excluded from this act.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-5.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Insert after section 2(e) the following (and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly):

(f) IRS EMPLOYEES.—For calendar year 2019, the rate of basic pay of any employee of the Internal Revenue Service provided under chapter 95 of title 5, United States Code, who did not receive a pay increase by operation of subsections (a) through (e) shall be increased by 2.6 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 87, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

□ 1200

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to commend the sponsors of this important bill that rewards the talent and commitment of our civilian workforce by granting them a 2.6 percent pay adjustment for 2019.

Mr. Chairman, the shutdown was a stark reminder of how crucial these workers are to protect our air and water, secure our shores, guide air traffic, and ensure that our tax returns are processed on time.

I heard desperate stories from many of these public servants, including workers at the IRS processing center in Andover. One of my constituents who works there wrote the following to me during the shutdown: “Apart from selling everything I own to pay for food, bills, and the mortgage, I honestly don’t know what to do and am truly scared that this may do me in.”

Mr. Chairman, this was an entirely avoidable tragedy that wreaked havoc on thousands of lives; yet he and thousands of others like him dutifully reported to work without any certainty of when or whether they would be paid next. The underlying bill is the least we can do for them and the dedicated

public servants like them. My amendment is a simple clarification that all IRS employees would be eligible for this pay adjustment.

We learned yesterday from legislative counsel that the bill could inadvertently exclude some of these employees hired under special provisions of chapter 95, title 5.

For example, title 5, section 9503 grants IRS special authority to hire employees for critical administrative, technical, and professional positions necessary to carry out the functions of the IRS. However, it is unclear whether such individuals would benefit from H.R. 790's pay adjustment. This amendment simply removes any doubt.

I hope that the amendment can be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I would highlight one thing.

We are going through all these amendments that are clarifying and technical amendments and all of that. That could have all been avoided if we had just had a hearing and had a markup and we had gone through it, and yet here we are today on the House floor trying to make amendments to a bill that, candidly, is missing the mark.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most ridiculous amendments I have ever seen.

Just a few years ago, the IRS targeted people for their political beliefs, systematically, for a sustained period of time, went after conservatives because they didn't like their political beliefs and what they were doing.

Now we are saying to those same people across this country—we had constituents. Congressman MEADOWS had constituents. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts may have constituents. We are now saying to them: Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, you may have been targeted by the IRS, but now we are going to take some of your hard-earned tax money and pay them, give them a pay raise?

Giving people a pay raise who went after people's most fundamental right, your right to speak out against—your First Amendment liberties, that is what this amendment would do.

Also, the chairman knows this. We did an investigation in the Oversight Committee. The IRS had fired people who they then rehired—now think about this—and some of the people they rehired, who had been fired, some of the very people they rehired were people who didn't pay their taxes, and we are now going to give them a pay raise. You have got to be kidding me.

The very agency that systematically went after people, went after our most

fundamental right, our right, under the First Amendment, to speak out against our government, went after people for doing that because they didn't like their political beliefs, set up this elaborate system, this "Be on the Lookout" list, Lois Lerner, and the whole 9 yards, did that, also the same agency that fired people for not paying their taxes and then rehired them, and now the taxpayers have to give them a pay raise. That is what the Democrats want in this amendment.

This is ridiculous. We should reject this, and we should reject, as we talked about before, the whole darn bill.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, and I congratulate her on this amendment.

I can't believe that the distinguished ranking member of our committee would continue to engage in conspiracy theories that have been, in fact, disproved and, worse, would actually paint the entire 41,000 or more workforce of the IRS with one brush. They are all, apparently, out to get us.

You would never know these are hardworking public servants who serve their country nobly and often under very difficult circumstances, because they are hardly the most popular agency in town.

Of course they deserve a pay raise. They were affected by the shutdown. Many of them were called back by the Trump administration to come back without pay because certain industries needed paper being processed. They did it because they are noble public servants and they are patriots, as the distinguished chairman of our committee indicated.

So instead of slandering public servants, we want to honor them.

You are right. We are proud of this amendment, and it is anything but the most ridiculous to come to the floor. It is a very important amendment. I support it.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not painting with a broad brush. Look, I know there are lots of good employees there. All I am saying is an agency that did what the IRS did, that rehired people who had been fired, some of them had been fired for not paying their taxes, an agency that went after people for their political beliefs, I just—call me crazy, but you can go ask your average taxpayer: Do you think that agency that did those things, do you think those people need a pay raise?

My guess is most of the constituents I get the privilege of representing in the Fourth District of Ohio would say: Nope, I am not for that.

That is all I am saying, not painting with a broad brush.

All I know is what this agency did. And it is not a conspiracy theory, and the gentleman from Virginia knows it.

The inspector general did a report and said targeting occurred at the Internal Revenue Service. They went after conservative Tea Party conservative groups, and it happened just as sure I am standing here speaking on the House floor, and the gentleman from Virginia knows that to be the case.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that when we look at sending a message, this sends entirely the wrong message. We need to make sure that we reward Federal workers, but we also hold them accountable. I urge rejection of this particular amendment.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the employees I talked to at the IRS are noble. They are hardworking. They are working with the utmost integrity. They have endured cuts to their agency, at times doing jobs that used to require two, sometimes three people to do.

Again, my amendment merely makes a clarifying change to be certain that all of these employees, all IRS workers, receive the benefit of this well-deserved pay adjustment. I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. FLETCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 790) to provide for a pay increase in 2019 for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.