

# Revolt Depends on Eliminating Rule

**I**F YOUR child eats candy or drinks a pop at school before lunch, the U.S. Department of Agriculture could make a federal case of it.

New regulations specify what foods may be served to school children and when, allegedly for nutritional reasons.

Maybe some children do choose foods they ought not to have, eat too much or eat too often. But is feeding the children a responsibility of the parents or of the federal government?

If regulations are needed, shouldn't they be established by local school boards or officials, rather than by a battery of bureaucrats in Blundersville?

If school children's diets may be specified from Washington, could not the same agency itemize menus for company cafeterias or say how many sandwiches may be put into a lunch box?

Such suppositions may sound ridiculous, but efforts have been going on for years to have a "national food policy" adopted. Federal policy in any area implies federal con-

trol.

Research and dissemination of reliable information about foods or other products might be proper functions of government, but whenever choice is removed, freedom is diminished.

Government produces regulations as diligently as it collects taxes to pay bureaucrats to enforce them.

Recently, the Agriculture Council of America conducted a nationwide telethon "Forum on Regulation" over 25 toll-free phone lines for three days. Asked how they would rate the need for federal regulatory reform, 98 per cent of the respondents said it is "important," while four out of five said regulations have a significant effect on inflation.

As steps are being taken to create a new federal department of education, 75 per cent of those in the FOR survey said they are worse off as a result of present school and education regulations.

Regarding the effect of regulations on how businesses are run and operated, 69 per cent said that they

are "worse off."

The Center for the Study of American Business said recently that regulatory requirements add \$1,500 to \$2,500 to the cost of a typical new house.

Consumers pay an estimated \$550 more for each new car because of federally mandated features. "The price of regulations must be paid whether they are good or bad," said one expert.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been busy since 1972 grinding out regulations for 10,000 to 12,000 product lines over which it has jurisdiction. Usually, they boost retail prices.

Companies that make record-keeping equipment for businesses are booming. One executive said: "We don't have to worry about expanding our market. The government is doing that for us."

The "Tax Revolt" against excessive spending would be more likely to succeed if voters could convince Congress that unnecessary regulations ought to be wiped off the law books first.