

you don't quite understand it, but the complexity of this Government affords you the greatest degree of personal dignity, personal opportunity, and greatest freedom.

Would you care to comment on this economic factor and the need to meet it, Mr. Sprague?

Mr. SPRAGUE. You are right to talk about it. We have to consider the economic factor. We can't tell an employer you just have to hire this employee. As you say, this parity has to be so that the worker is judged on his professional qualifications and ability to do the job. I do believe the provisions in this bill should give us the research data we need to deal with these problems.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I might say the chairman of this committee is one of the most forward looking Members of this Congress and it is always good to see the way he anticipates the needs of the country for such legislation.

I am glad to have you testify on this bill and I hope we get it through Congress to close that one gap.

Mr. Dent spoke of another program, the portable pension plan. In my opinion this, too, is inevitable. The equity a worker builds up in a pension plan should be portable so that the third aspect of the aging package, in my judgment, would be to raise the amount of money that older workers, people on social security can earn to supplement their social security benefits. It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee, when presenting to this Congress the social security package, is going to address itself to that problem. I don't know of any family in retirement in America that can live on what they get from social security plus the \$1,500 they can earn.

It seems to me this is the third aspect that we need.

Mr. Chairman, the fourth aspect, you are the expert in this field and you may want to comment on it.

The late Frank Barlene, president of a local union in Chicago, the biggest local workers union, had a program with great promise. He took his retired workers on social security and worked out an agreement with his employers that permitted these people to work 3 or 4 hours a day and they worked up to their \$1,500 and couldn't earn any more.

This afforded these people a steady stream of employment and yet at reduced hours. The employer was really getting their most productive hours the 3 or 4 hours a day they were working. Retirement itself was not quite so harsh. It didn't mean a total and complete break.

You know I started my first year in the military service with the horse cavalry. I learned that you can't take a horse and ride him—I am sure these 4-H'ers can tell me about this—you can't take a horse and ride him 7 hours as we did and then put him in the barn. We used to dismount 3 or 4 miles away from the barn and walk, cool him off, settle him down, and so on.

I think human beings who work hard react similarly. You can't take a man that has maintained a heavy pace for the majority of his life and then at age 65 say the whole world ends for him.

In America we are now feeling a great shortage in the various skills and specialized trades, with manpower becoming at a premium, with the country going into a trillion dollar economy, with the tremendous