

respect to retirement age for those engaged in fighting roles as compared to those engaged in administrative functions.

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: I see no reason why people who are engaged in administrative functions, provided they are physically fit, should not serve in the armed forces until they are about fifty-five years of age. I think the limit for the operational personnel is of the order of forty-five years of age.

Mr. HARKNESS: Would you say that this is a case for both officers and men, or do you make any distinction in that regard?

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: I think I make a distinction for officers of higher rank, for commanders and above, and I would have thought that the present age of fifty was a reasonable one. I also would have thought that the age of fifty-five was a reasonable age for the captains and more senior officers.

Mr. SMITH: What about sixty, sir?

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: I think in some cases it would be perfectly satisfactory to have rear admirals at the age of sixty. In services as small as ours, of course, it is very disheartening to have people go on that long in their service. The United States Navy has any number of admirals who are over sixty years of age. The Royal Navy has the odd one who is over sixty years of age. Generally speaking, I think in the present day and age, with the vast technological changes, and so on, that it is probably preferable to have people who are taking responsibility for decisions which become involved in technical matters retired at about the age of fifty-five.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, we will not take that out of your time, Mr. Harkness.

Mr. HARKNESS: Would you think it desirable from that point of view to retain in the services for a longer period of time some of the professional personnel who are difficult to obtain and difficult to hold, and I am thinking particularly of medical officers and dental officers. In other words, would you think it desirable to have a further distinction as far as age requirements are concerned for people of that nature?

Rear Admiral RANDYMORE: I think an off-the-cuff answer to that would be that I do not see any reason why people who are not exposed to a fighting environment, such as professional men, should not serve after the age of fifty-five. I do not think for example, that lawyers who work for the armed forces deteriorate too rapidly, and I happen to know there is one in the room, so I...

Mr. HARKNESS: I agree with you. I think that a considerable number of economies would be effected and efficiency would also be improved if certain groups of people along this line had a retirement age which was considerably higher than those engaged in the combat or straight fighting roles.

Rear Admiral LANDYMORE: Mr. Harkness, if I may just amplify my answer a little bit. I think, because service people are career people, that one has to attempt to reach a happy medium between age, economy in operations and allowing a flow of people through the system.

Mr. HARKNESS: By and large, you consider it highly desirable that there be a very great degree of flexibility rather than rigid uniformity in regard to this retirement age matter?