

through three mechanisms: (a) publication and public scrutiny of the Comptroller General's reports, (b) audit of selected evaluation reports, and (c) general parliamentary review of regulatory programs with or without an OCG evaluation report. The first mechanism speaks for itself. The second could appropriately be invoked and effected by the appropriate standing committee. The third calls for use of standing or special committees.

52. The Sub-committee notes that the Auditor General also evaluates regulatory programs and that he will in future be referring his evaluations to the Standing Joint Committee for the Review of Regulations.

53. What matters is not the forum of review, but that it take place in a systematic way and that it provide an opportunity for those who chafe under a burden of regulation they consider unnecessary, intolerable, or ill-administered, to express themselves openly.

54. In every case, evaluations should address the following questions:

- What are the present objectives of the program?
- Are the original objectives still relevant?
- What are the priorities and trade-offs if multiple objectives exist?
- What means are used to achieve the objectives?
- What are the effects, intentional or unintentional, of the program? (This would include economic and non-economic considerations.)
- Should the program continue?
- What other means could be used to achieve the same objectives?
- In what ways can the administration of the program be improved?

55. It should be recognized that the evaluations will raise essentially political issues (i.e., broad-value choices) similar to those which were, or ought to have been, addressed by legislators when the statute underlying each program was enacted. The review of regulatory programs is proper to the role of elected representatives.

56. All OCG evaluation reports should be tabled in Parliament and be referred automatically to the appropriate subject-area standing committees which should also be free to undertake evaluations on their own initiative. The committees should be empowered to hold hearings, receive briefs and commission their own analytical work with respect to the regulatory programs they choose to scrutinize in detail. Upon completion of an evaluation, a standing committee should submit its report to Parliament with recommendations for action.

The following is a summary of the recommendations discussed in this chapter:

- 5.1 Every bill containing an enabling clause should be accompanied by a memorandum setting out precisely why the particular delegated law-making power contained in the clause is sought, and the form the sponsoring Minister sees the delegated law taking.**
- 5.2 Consideration of major proposed regulations by standing committees as to merits, and by the Standing Joint Committee for the Scutiny of Regulations as to legality and propriety, should be encouraged and undertaken. As a necessary sanction, the**