

# 'Policy' Sugar-Coating for 'Controls'

**D** ICTIONARIES do not list policy and control as synonyms, but in government there is little distinction. Among those who advocate "national policy" for just about everything, there may be no difference at all in the meaning of the two words.

Politicians have found that it is more palatable to push policies than it is to propose controls, even when they mean exactly the same thing. Often they are accepted because people fallaciously assume that the controls will apply only to someone else.

The phrase "national policy" is used to "sugar coat" bitter control pills. Centralizers just spread "national" and "policy" apart far enough to accommodate the name of whatever is to be controlled and they have a bolus the gullible public will swallow.

For example, national energy policy, national environmental policy, national safety policy, national health policy and national highway policy. You may substitute control for policy every time and not change the intent of sponsors one iota.

An exception is price and wage controls. They actually were called controls. They didn't work in 1972-73, but rumors persist that they will be back in 1975 as the administration pursues its nebulous "national policy" to slow down inflation without slowing down government spending, which causes it.

Once a policy is established, controls sprout, multiply and proliferate. OSHA, the bane of business and industry, started out as a safety policy to protect coal miners from black lung disease. It now has hundreds, perhaps thousands, of pages of regulations and hundreds of inspectors to enforce them. Hardly any business man knows for sure whether he is in compliance, or faces heavy penalties, or may have his business shut down at any time.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is another example of how national policy is converted into ruthless control.

The proposed national energy policy may become an even greater burden on the public if politicians and bureaucrats agree on who shall control and how. They are not fighting over whether to control. That is a stipulated condition.

A national land use policy is another goal of the centralizers. They want a Washington agency to establish guidelines for states and local governments to use in determining what individuals may do with their private property. Influence would be exercised by cutting off subsidies if state agencies fail to regulate according to federal standards.

The "control by policy" procedure is being escalated into world policy making. Almost daily, we read such expressions as world food policy, world energy policy and world environmental policy. This trend conforms to the world Communist goal of having all nations, all resources and all people under one world control.

Where it will end is uncertain, but did you ever notice how closely "national policy" resembles "national police"?