

through one or more votes for each program, financial control in the Department would become chaotic. Parliamentary approval would be required each time funds had to be transferred between any one of close to a hundred programs.

While the grouping of posts into more broadly defined programs, such as a "Middle East Program" or a "Francophone Program" (in which certain problems and certain objectives were common to all of the posts) would reduce the number of programs involved, it would not overcome the other difficulties inherent in the use of this approach. In addition, it would tend to obscure the fact that at least some of the Department's objectives, and the most effective method of achieving them, can vary significantly - even between countries within one geographical area.

Still another obstacle to the use of program budgeting in the Department in general, and to the designation of countries as programs in particular, is related to the rotational system that the Department has found to be a very necessary part of its staffing arrangements. Not only do Heads of Post have very little control over the calibre of staff assigned to their posts under this system, but, because they themselves rotate every two to three years, many of them are likely to find themselves faced with the necessity of carrying out programs and living within budgets prepared by their predecessors.

Another problem created by the rotational system, which would be accentuated by the use of countries as programs, concerns the difficulty of budgeting for and controlling the salaries and allowances of "Canada based" staff at the posts. Many postings bear little relationship to the approved establishment at a post. In addition, the grade of the individual being posted plus the size and age of his family can have