

 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**
AN EXAMPLE OF
SOME PROGRESSIVE'S
THIRST FOR CONTROL!

By Stephen L. Bakke  October 27, 2014



Here's what provoked me:

I hear and read about evidence strongly suggesting that direct consumer involvement in economic transactions leads to more competition and lower costs. This contrasts with the ever more common tendency of some progressives to get involved in all aspects of selection of, and payment for, things like healthcare and social programs. But why?

Here's my response ☺:

An Example of Some Progressive's Thirst for Control!

If you really think about it, there are two basic ways government entitlement expenditures can be paid for: (1) The government makes the expenditure to the provider (e.g. pay the insurance company for medical coverage is just one example); and (2) The individual makes the expenditure and receives reimbursement through a refundable tax credit.

These 2 methods result in at least 2 distinct differences: (1) The "government pays directly" method requires added rules, regulations, and bureaucracies while the "individual pays directly" method operates within an existing agency (IRS), which is already set up to make the refund payments; and (2) With the individual paying directly, spending decisions are kept away from the government. There is documented proof that cost savings are the result of direct consumer decisions and payment.

The current administration prefers the "government pays directly" method because: (1) Big government proponents don't trust individuals to make decisions and (2) Many progressives have a thirst for maintaining and expanding their power and control.

Many progressives love the control, even when it results in higher costs! Which method do you prefer?

I like to be in control, so I try not to move...



HikingArtist