

expressed in quantitative terms and if their performance were rated in a numerical formula. This is clearly impossible in External Affairs. In the strictly financial dimension the system of budgets provides quantitative data, but the definition of objectives and goals, the description of activities and the measurement of performance are likely to remain largely qualitative and judgmental in character. These will condition the planning task but, if anything, make it more necessary. We need to have some kind of plan and budget or all is chaos. The discipline of planning and post-mortem induces common understanding between the various levels of management concerned; it provides a thread of continuity in tasks as incumbent officials are rotated; and it structures the collective wisdom of foreign service professionals in a manner that permits more complete understanding by non-professionals, whether they be Treasury Board officials or members of the Cabinet.

The Program Review is the procedure established by the Government for taking a look at the future plans of the Department and for taking a reading on its past performance. Internally, it will be used by the Department as a vehicle for the formulation of objectives, the assessment of operational plans, and priorities and the review of past performance. Reservations which have been expressed about Program Review in the Department have centred on the usefulness of quantitative goals and of attempts to measure performance in this area. As we have attempted to show above, it is the process that is important, not its quantification, and it is not the intention of the Treasury Board or of the Department to attempt artificially to quantify the unquantifiable.

The terms in which the Department talks about its work are called activities. At the departmental level, this activity breakdown is subject to negotiation with the Treasury Board. The question is not completely resolved at this time but our Estimates for