

offered which I had worked out with the chairman of our subcommittee and had hoped to offer to this legislation. The amendment which I had hoped to propose would have amended the jurisdiction of this bill with respect to the definition (and his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman JAMES O'HARA, in introducing a companion measure to H.R. 10238 because it provides protections to one of the last groups of workers to which no labor standards protections apply.

H.R. 10238 affords these protections to those engaged in laundry and dry-cleaning, custodial, janitorial, and guard service, food and miscellaneous house-keeping services.

The Federal Government has added responsibility in this area because of the legal requirement that contracts be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. Since labor costs are the predominant factor in most service contracts, the odds on making a successful low bid for a contract are heavily stacked in favor of the contractor paying the lowest wage. Contractors who wish to maintain an enlightened wage policy may find it almost impossible to compete for Government service contracts with those who pay wages to their employees at or below the subsistence level. When a Government contract is awarded to a service contractor with low wage standards, the Government is, in effect, subsidizing sub-minimum wages.

The granting of protection under the Fair Labor Standards Act to employees of Federal service contractors is long overdue.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10238, to provide much-needed labor standards protection for employees of contractors furnishing services and maintenance work for Federal agencies. In other words, this is to add so-called Davis-Bacon provisions to require compliance with minimum labor standards where work is financed with Federal funds.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reed] stated, I have long been in-

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10238, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.