

ceptions here. We feel the AGC has confused the issue, and we would like to have permission at a later date in the near future to submit a supplemental statement.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I did not hear you. What was your request?

Mr. BORGES. Mr. Chairman, we would like to have permission to submit a supplemental statement at a later date to this committee.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Fine. Without objection; so ordered.

(Information to be supplied follows:)

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF NATIONAL JOINT HEAVY AND HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE REBUTTING THE POSITION OF ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA ON DAVIS-BACON COVERAGE FOR THE ABC HIGHWAY PROGRAM

This National Committee as the representative of the members employed on highway construction of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Laborers' International Union of North America, the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International Association of the United States and Canada, the Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers' International Union of America and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America is appreciative of this opportunity to rebut the statement of the Associated General Contractors of America opposing the extension of the Davis-Bacon Act to the ABC Highway Program.

The first point the AGC makes in its statement is that they originally opposed Davis-Bacon standards being applied to the Inter-state Program. They suggest that the extension of the Davis-Bacon Act to the Inter-state Highway Program in 1956 "was based largely on the argument that 90% of the funds would be Federal and would not lead to a later extension of the Davis-Bacon requirements of the ABC Highway System which, of course, involves 50% of Federal Funds." It is the contention of this Committee that this is not a valid argument since in 1956 no compromise was made by these unions to obtain Davis-Bacon coverage for the Inter-state System and, of course, as we noted in our statement of June 5, 1968, virtually all Federal construction programs extend to the workers employed on these projects the protection of the Davis-Bacon Act. This is true whether the Federal Government is paying the total cost or participating in varying degrees from 90%, as in the case of the Inter-state Program, 30% under the Federal Airport Act, or in some projects of the Federal Housing Administration where no actual Federal Funds are expended but the Federal government merely acts as the guarantor of the loan. This affords construction workers with the necessary protection so that expenditures of their taxes on Federal construction projects do not serve to disrupt locally established wage rates.

We agree that the ABC Program has been a productive one. However, the ABC contends that the progress has been made without "Federal Administration handicaps." This reasoning is misleading as no Federal-Aid Highway projects are awarded by the States without the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads.

The AGC then lists inflation and high hourly wage rates as reasons for opposing Davis-Bacon extension to the ABC Highway Program. Of course, inflation affects every sector of our economy, however, no single group has been hurt worse than the construction worker. "Tight money," limiting private construction, budgetary problems affecting public construction, including two cutbacks in the Federal Highway Program, in the past two years, have made the construction workers' lot a precarious one. The high average hourly rates for construction workers, as noted by the AGC, are misleading. The average full-time worker is employed for approximately 2,000 annually, however, the average Carpenter works less than 1500 hours, the average Laborer works less than 1100 hours and the average Operating Engineer less than 1200 hours, and gentlemen, these figures are for all types of construction, annual hourly rates on highway construction alone would be even less. Again, the AGC's reasoning is confusing for they mention negotiated rates of \$5.37 an hour as an average hourly rate for construction workers. This is not to be confused with the local prevailing wage rate that the Secretary of Labor must predetermine for construction projects under the purview of the Davis-Bacon Act. For example, attached are several copies of wage decisions issued by the Department of