

routes to determine what its hiring policy should be if every State in which its aircraft landed had its own set of regulations governing hiring practices relating to older workers. A uniform code is needed throughout the country to avoid confusion and to produce the desired nationwide result.

Admittedly, it will take a great deal of education to convince employers that older workers are in every way as fit as younger workers for most jobs. There is also the consideration that appropriate assistance must be given to older workers in their quest for jobs. They must be informed of the places where they should apply for jobs, and how they should conduct themselves in an employment interview. It has been demonstrated by the States which have embarked upon a successful program to eliminate age discrimination policies and to place older workers in jobs formerly barred to them that counseling and job placement agencies have been the most valuable part of their program.

These employment aids have been included in the proposed national program and may be found in Section 3 of H.R. 8125. This section adds an important dimension to the bill. It provides the machinery for the guidance of older workers and their placement in suitable jobs.

In summary, the proposed legislation found in H.R. 8125 is designed to achieve a two-fold purpose: First, it would end discriminatory hiring practices against older workers, and, secondly, it would aid older workers in finding meaningful and profitable work, work for which years of experience have provided adequate preparation. This legislation would provide older workers the chance to be judged on the basis of their individual performance, and not on their age.

For these reasons, I ask for early favorable consideration of this important legislation.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DENT. At this time we will call upon the Honorable James G. O'Hara, of the State of Michigan, who will present testimony on this legislation. Mr. O'Hara, we welcome you here.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES G. O'HARA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, my thanks for the opportunity to testify on H.R. 4221. The overall impact of this bill has been eloquently and convincingly stated by the Secretary of Labor. I concur fully with his statement, and particularly with the distinction he makes between the two types of age discrimination. The Secretary pointed out that there is discrimination based on misunderstanding, on what I would call well-meaning but mistaken concepts of what a worker can do in his mature years, and there is discrimination which is arbitrary and deliberate.

Both of these kinds of age discrimination are damaging to the worker who suffers from them, and both are hurtful to the economy. Both should be dealt with. But it is to the latter, and to a particularly disgraceful case of the latter, that I want to direct the sub-committee's attention.

In 1965, the Select Subcommittee on Labor conducted several days of hearings on employment problems of older workers. In these hearings, we covered a wide area, but one of the most interesting aspects of the problem was the evidence which was discovered of age discrimination at the incredible age of 32. At the advanced age of 32, we were told, healthy, competent, well-trained Americans were arbitrarily told they were too old to work. The job involved was that of airline stewardess. And the evidence clearly pointed to the fact that the age limit had nothing to do with competence, with ability, with reflexes, with stamina, or with any other bona fide occupational quali-