

There's more to glamor than mere beauty. It involves a woman's personality. That's why I think the airlines are dead wrong. I travel 50,000 miles a year. Most flights are of no more than three or four hours' duration. I'm satisfied with an efficient, pleasant hostess, not a Miss America.

Directly relevant to the views of passengers concerning age limitations for stewardesses are the observations of Russell Baker in the New York Times on September 5, 1965. In his view, a substantial segment of airline passengers " * * * would prefer to have stewardesses kept off airplanes until they are at least 32." "These are men who are utterly indifferent to women under 32, and in many cases even to women under 35."

Baker says members of this group are "absolutely terrified by women under 27." His conclusion: the airline policy for compulsory retirement of stewardesses at age 32 "is the kind of blunder that results from too much abstract psychological thinking about passenger motivation and too little basic research."

It seems equally necessary to conclude that airline passengers, like the Departments of Defense and Labor, like many foreign and domestic airlines, like the New York State Human Rights Commission, and probably like the FAA as well, agree that age is not a bona fide occupational qualification for the position of flight attendant.

Whether or not the compulsory retirement policy reflects prudent management—and the available evidence tends to indicate that it does not—we urge the Congress to brand it once and for all as "unlawful."

Discrimination against female flight attendants based on age is not a matter which has generally been dealt with in our collective-bargaining relationships with carriers, and none of the agreements between my organization and the air carriers covering some 8,000 flight attendants contain provisions which outlaw such discrimination. Congress has not insisted that protection against racial discrimination be left to private contracts or agreements; it has properly considered the discriminatory abuse of civil rights to be an appropriate public matter for remedial legislation. It should follow the same course here.

Any implication that ground employment is always made available to flight attendants when their flight careers are terminated by the carriers is also misleading. The availability of such substitute employment is subject to the discretion of each individual carrier, and it is far from universally true that such employment is always made available. On one carrier which employs several thousand flight attendants, a flight attendant was recently retired involuntarily by reason of her marriage. Later that carrier stated publicly in an administrative hearing that other employment was not available to her, and that other employment was made available under such circumstances only where "possible," in the carriers words.

We strongly disagree that ground employment, even if the carriers were to make it available at a stated chronological age, would be a solution to this problem. Discrimination would still be present, notwithstanding that carriers, instead of discharging stewardesses, practiced the discrimination by moving them to different jobs, like pawns on a chessboard. Career stewardesses take the same pride, and develop the same intense interest in their special work, as others whom you would protect. They can still demonstrate at ages 32, 37, 45 and thereafter, under every relevant test of occupational qualification, that