

country and how important the achievement of such objectives were to Canada as compared to the achievement of its objectives in other countries. This assumes, of course, a basic staff complement in each post capable of carrying out the representational and consular activities required of that post. In theory, such an approach would appear to be quite logical. In practice, it would encounter many obstacles.

In the first place, the program budgeting concept requires that program managers be involved in all major decisions affecting their programs and their budgets. Similarly, the concept requires that such managers be held accountable for the degree to which the objectives of their respective programs are achieved, as measured in terms of criteria acceptable to both themselves and their superiors.

Neither of these prerequisites is feasible in the Department of External Affairs. Many potential instruments of foreign policy, such as external aid, immigration, and external trade promotion, are not under the control of the Department, let alone its Heads of Post. While a number of mechanisms are employed to coordinate these activities, it would not be reasonable to hold a Head of Post accountable for the effect they may have on Canada's relations with a given country and thus the achievement of the Department's objectives with respect to that country. Similarly, all major decisions on foreign policy are made in Ottawa, and these can have a major impact on Canada's relations with certain countries, for which a Head of Post could not reasonably be held accountable.

Another practical obstacle to equating countries with programs concerns the sheer number of programs that would result. If the normal practice were followed of funds being appropriated by Parliament