

safeguards against the use of such a provision as an "out" to escape statutory or contractual responsibilities would have to be provided, and, in all probability, federal legislation would be essential if such measures were to be carried out.

Another suggested approach at the state level might well be for the Legislature to enact a statute prohibiting any inquiry as to a prospective employee's age or date of birth until 30 days subsequent to the commencement of his period of employment. This would break that all but unsurpassable barrier of "company policy" against hiring anyone over a specified age. It would, again, provide a period of time for the older worker to prove his ability to perform regardless of his age and eliminate prejudice as a basis for denying him an opportunity to earn his way. Such a measure would of necessity have to be given backbone by the incorporation of enforceable penalties for violation and the provision for adequate administration, but it bears within it, I would think, the potential of possible amelioration if not ultimate solution to our problem.

These are offered only as suggested ideas to be weighed, measured, analyzed, studied, from all points of view until some measure of tangible workability is found in them or in the directions toward which they point.

We must not forget why we are here. We meet not just to study, in the words of my Assembly Resolution, "how and where employment opportunities for older persons may be improved and expanded throughout the state", but to create from this study, positive programs of effective action to combat this destructive economic and social disease of discrimination in hiring, solely because of age. It is an indefensible practice. It is inconsistent with our American philosophy of life. It must be stopped! Let us here and now resolve that the inalienable rights of the older citizen shall be restored, preserved, and protected.

-----