

6. MAINTENANCE OVERLAP:

The line between what is considered maintenance of Chanceries and Official Residences and what is considered a modification of the intended interior design is quite blurred. Often maintenance work is requested, approved and completed without the knowledge or input of interior designers. Unfortunately, there have been cases when this work (including re-flooring and painting) has significantly altered the interior design of the public areas of Chanceries and Official Residences.

7. NON-CANADIAN IMAGE:

A number of DFAIT personnel mentioned that Canadian Chanceries and Official Residences project an image that is more European than Canadian. The designs focus on furniture that is very traditional and very British or French. Other individuals challenged the use of traditional Native Artwork as the sole definition of Canada's image -"Canada is more diverse than this!"

8. EXISTING POLICIES:

Some DFAIT personnel acknowledged they were unaware of the existing image policies available to Missions. Others criticized them for being outdated; unavailable (Property Manual is still in draft form); too restrictive to be taken seriously; and inappropriate (ie. more concerned with technical standards than defining and projecting an image).

9. CRITICISMS OF EXTRAVAGANCE:

DFAIT personnel have noted that some of Canada's Chanceries and Official Residences project an image that is quite ostentatious. In today's economic environment this is unwise. The Canadian Press is always ready to criticize the Government with waste, fraud and abuse. Foreign Affairs and International Trade is a favourite target for reports that will do this. For instance, Greg Weston of the Ottawa Citizen wrote a scathing report about DFAIT's purchase of \$21,900 of "unnecessary" teak patio furniture for their Embassy personnel in China. (21 August, 1993; p.A2). After reviewing ten years of news reports on this subject, it must be noted that the record of SRD has not been that bad. However, one should not take anything for granted.

10. LACK OF AN ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURE:

It has proven difficult to enforce existing policies because responsibilities for these policies are not clearly defined or monitored. Headquarters and Mission personnel have argued that they are unaware of their responsibilities; unconcerned with the fulfilment of their responsibilities due to the lack of enforced consequences, or determinable benefits; or, unwilling to jeopardize their careers by challenging the indiscretions of their superiors.