

Now, if those figures were true, and I don't know if they are, I don't want to invent figures and I don't know if they are correct, but if it is true such a figure exists, under my proposal that steel company would claim that \$265 as a complete tax credit so that you would eliminate totally the economic factor.

You would remove the economic factor as a burden on the employer. He would then, of course, put all workers on a parity where only their experience, their ability to do the job, their reliability and other factors would come into play.

It is my judgment once we remove that economic factor we can then quickly move to add age to the civil rights bill which now bars discrimination against hiring people because of sex, race, or national origin.

Is there any merit to this kind of thing?

Mr. ROWAN. We are in favor of this because our job as far as the States are concerned is only half done. In the State of Illinois this bill was passed by one house at the session before the last session but it was blocked in the senate because of the fear it would create a climate unfavorable for new business to come to Illinois.

That did not pass in the previous session but happily did in the last session. States are reluctant to do anything that might make it unfavorable for new business to come in.

If you gave them this kind of reduction it would make our task of getting the laws passed in the other 25 States much easier.

In all justice to employers they should have the benefit of that kind of protection.

As far as the Civil Rights Act is concerned, it was our hope we would be included in there, but when the bill came out covering color, creed, religion, and sex, age was not mentioned. We thought that, after a study was made, age might be added to the bill but then we learned it was the thinking of Congress that it did not want to disturb the civil rights bill and preferred to handle the problem of age discrimination separately.

Now it comes in the form of separate legislation, an act to be administered not by the Equal Opportunities Commission, but by the Secretary of Labor.

We want a bill of this kind whether administered by the Secretary of Labor or by the Commission and we are heartily in favor of this bill. Whether it proves to be a better thing before long to change it to the civil rights bill, all well and good.

But you have the problem that, where you have a long enumeration of different types of discrimination, one type might easily be forgotten. Right now in discrimination you have more complaints on sex discrimination than you have on anything else, even race discrimination. So if the personnel is not adequate that is provided to enforce these laws, the danger exists that age discrimination might be neglected.

Here you have a law dealing only with age discrimination and it does have that one advantage, I think. Another thing, while we are in favor of getting a national law, if we have a national law and can point out that 25 States have them, certainly the other 25 States would drop their opposition and come along because half of their employers would be under an age discrimination statute and half not under one.

We do need State legislation in all States to reach the employer with 25 or less employees.