

persons regardless of any contractual relationship that may be alleged to exist between a contractor or subcontractor and such persons.

"(c) The term 'compensation' means any of the payments or fringe benefits described in section 2 of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the longstanding policy of the Congress that the Federal Government shall not be a party to the depressing of labor standards in any area of the Nation.

We accomplish this by providing much-needed labor standards protection for employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing services to or performing maintenance service for Federal agencies.

I suppose every Member who brings a bill to the House likes to claim it is bipartisan; sometimes the term may be stretched rather thin. In this particular instance, I believe this bill meets every test of bipartisanship that may be applied.

It is jointly sponsored by myself and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Each of us has a history of introducing predecessor bills in prior Congresses.

There was no opposition to this bill in committee; in fact it was enthusiastically supported by both sides.

Furthermore this bill is part of the legislative program of this administration. It accepts the great principle adopted by an earlier Congress, under Republican leadership, when the Davis-Bacon Act was written into law.

The committee report contains a full and complete explanation of the bill, as well as the committee amendment.

It might be helpful, however, to develop the rationale for the amendment. ~~provided protection to the employees of service contractors involved a contract~~ for the hauling of mail between Detroit and Port Huron, Mich. Truckdrivers, having been organized, were threatening to strike. A strike was averted when a wage increase to \$1 per hour was agreed to. This wage rate was considerably below the prevailing wage within the area.

The committee could see no sound reason for not protecting local prevailing wages when a contract involved the transportation, handling, or delivery of the mails.

Mr. Speaker, just because the committee report and my remarks both have contained references to the Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts it is not expected that the Secretary of Labor will be bound by past practice worked out for determinations under them. We would expect that he consult with appropriate Government agencies, including the chief procurement agencies and the Civil Service Commission with respect to the procedures.

We make this clear in the report, but it should be further emphasized here.