

At the same time, there are many, some with specialist qualifications, who generally will not have been "rotational" whose problems and attitude will not be much different from those of any other Government Department or from those retiring from private industry.

In any case, Departmental policies must be adapted to encompass the needs of all types of its employees, rotational and non-rotational officers and staff, specialists and non-specialists - and let it not forget the locally employed in missions all over the world as well as Canadian based employees. The policies adopted must be tailored to fit the particular requirements of the Department and not simply follow some pattern adopted by another Department. Nevertheless, this is not to say that what others do, whether private industry or Government Departments, is irrelevant. Such actions based on experience give valuable keys to the options open to accomplish the objective, and there will be some "procedures" that should be common to all Civil Servants.

While there is undoubtedly considerable difference of opinion about the validity of having any compulsory maximum retirement age, it is certainly common practice within our society today; indeed, there is a perceptible trend toward retirement before 65. Despite the fact that it is certainly accepted by those who have studied the problems of "growing old", that it is fallacious to assume that older people cannot learn new skills and that "retirement on the basis of age alone is socially wasteful" (Retirement Handbook), for our immediate problem it has been assumed that a maximum retirement age for all Civil Servants will continue to be the rule and that the same age, 65, will apply to all External Affairs employees, rotational and non-rotational, (be it noted however, that in theory the British have no maximum retirement age for their Civil Servants; employees may be kept on indefinitely on an annual basis after minimum retirement age of 60 - see appendix E for further details).