

"If she does a good job, her age and her marital status are none of the passenger's business."

* * * * *

"How asinine can you get! What difference does age or marriage make so long as they do their job and do it pleasantly? One would think you are running a 'beauty' contest and not about [sic] doing a serious and useful job."

* * * * *

"The age, etc., has nothing to do with the job requirements—to be pleasant and efficient."

* * * * *

"There is need for *maturity*, 'know-how', training for helpful service instead of flirtatious 'cuties'—this means a different age span for developing career personnel with experience, savior faire."

It is not only the Airways Club which has surveyed the traveling public on this subject. On December 23, 1965, the New York Daily News "Inquiring Photographer" asked a sampling of the public the following question:

"Many airlines will not permit stewardesses to remain on the job beyond the age of 35. Does a woman lose her glamor at 35?"

The response? A resounding and unanimous NO! (Exhibit 16) To the extent that the airline age discrimination policies are founded on a contrary assumption they are open to serious question. The public seems emphatically to believe that:

"There is an intriguing quality about women in their mid-thirties and beyond. It is an appeal that enhances their natural beauty."

* * * * *

"There is no woman more attractive than a well groomed woman in her 40's."

* * * * *

"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 hour's duration. I'm satisfied with an efficient, pleasant hostess, not a Miss America." (Exhibit 16)

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. (Exhibit 17) 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 administra-