

Mr. SPRAGUE. I don't think they are as amenable to institutional training as younger people. It has been our experience and I think the experience of the U.S. Employment Service that the most effective way to work with the older person is through intensive counseling; job counseling. If he wants retraining then it should, of course, be available; but usually an older worker does not want to go into any long-term training. He wants to get into a job as soon as possible and what is needed is counseling and direction and assistance in getting a job.

Mr. BELL. You do believe, under certain circumstances, retraining could possibly be at least one of the answers?

Mr. SPRAGUE. There is no question about it.

Mr. BELL. Of course, you hear the old story: you can't teach an old dog new tricks. But I am sure that does not apply to humans. You find many people in their 50's and 60's able to accumulate a lot of knowledge.

Mr. SPRAGUE. Under the Manpower Training and Development Act presently 11 percent of the older people are getting training.

Mr. BELL. The chairman mentioned the question relative to economic factors. You said there are other factors besides economics. When you speak of economic factors you are really talking about the feeling that an older person is not quite as able to move along or be promoted. Industry feels this generally. Isn't that basically an economic situation?

Mr. SPRAGUE. By "economic factors," I mean the real cost, like the added cost of the insurance, workmen's compensation, any additional cost.

Mr. BELL. I understand that.

Mr. SPRAGUE. The other factors, if an employer feels that a person can't be trained or promoted or something like that simply because of his age and it has nothing to do with the facts, I would say it is prejudice or stereotyped thinking.

Mr. BELL. Do you think there is some of that?

Mr. SPRAGUE. Yes, I do.

Mr. BELL. You say the States that are making progress in this area are States like New York, California, and I think you mentioned Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPRAGUE. Massachusetts, Oregon—a lot of States have been doing a fairly good job, a very good job in some cases. We still have all the other States where people are not covered by this kind of protection.

Mr. BELL. Would you like a bill that tightened the situation up so that all States would be more affected or would you prefer a bill that would maintain the different standards of the States you have already mentioned. In other words, should the strength of our bill be less than the requirements of the States like California, New York and Massachusetts?

Mr. SPRAGUE. I think there should be a good, strong Federal bill. It seems to me that this would work in terms of Federal-State relationships in the following manner: That the Federal Government would have jurisdiction over those situations where interstate commerce is a factor and the State would have jurisdiction where it is an intrastate matter. I think it would be wise to have a good Federal statute, as this particular bill does.