



## Comment on the Commentary of the Day

by

Donald J. Boudreaux  
Chairman, Department of Economics  
George Mason University  
dboudrea@gmu.edu

**Disclaimer: The following "Letters to the Editor" were sent to the respective publications on the dates indicated. Some were printed but many were not. The original articles that are being commented on may or may not be available on the internet and may require registration or subscription to access if they are. Some of the original articles are syndicated and therefore may have appeared in other publications also.**

---

20 November 2005

Editor, The Boston Globe

Dear Editor:

Here's a question for everyone - including Susan Tolbert (Letters, Nov. 20) - who believes that health care will be more affordable if it's universally supplied by taxpayers: Do you also believe that the cost of groceries would fall if we were all taxed to stock grocery shelves in exchange for the privilege of each of us being able to take from supermarkets those items that we 'need'? Do you imagine that grocery shortages wouldn't arise? Do you suppose that we'd all be happier with this 'progressive' arrangement than we are with our current private system for supplying groceries?

If not, why do you fantasize that collectivist provision of health care will work well?

---

19 November 2005

Editor, The Washington Post  
1150 15th St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Editor:

For twenty-five years pundits have warned, as Paul Blustein does today ("U.S. Trade Deficit Hangs in Delicate Imbalance," Nov. 19, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/18/AR2005111802634.html>), that America's economic reckoning is inevitable because we save less than our trading partners.

Perhaps you should focus on the deeper point that globalization makes the trading world, rather than the nation, the relevant economic unit. Why should I care if the savings and investment that create new products for me to buy and research labs in which I and my neighbors work are supplied by Mr. Song of Seoul or by Mr. Jones of Jackson Hole?

---

18 November 2005

Editor, The Boston Globe

Dear Editor:

Rebecca Lubens laments that many workers in Massachusetts

can't afford health insurance (Letters, Nov. 18, [http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial\\_opinion/letters/articles/2005/11/18/infertility\\_services\\_should\\_be\\_covered/](http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial_opinion/letters/articles/2005/11/18/infertility_services_should_be_covered/)) - yet she demands that the legislature require health insurers to include infertility coverage in every policy.

Why should elderly couples, gay couples, and other people with no need for infertility treatments be forced to buy such coverage? It is precisely such thoughtless mandates that artificially raise the cost of health insurance and put it out of reach of many who could otherwise afford it.

---

17 November 2005

The Editor, New York Times  
229 West 43rd St.  
New York, NY 10036

To the Editor:

Philip Teel, president of Northrup Grumman Ship Systems, wants \$2 billion from taxpayers to help repair his gulf-coast shipyards ("The U.S.S. FEMA," Nov. 17).

He laments that hurricane Katrina had impacts "outside of our control."

Apparently Mr. Teel did not know that hurricanes routinely strike the gulf coast and that private insurance is available to cover losses from these storms. Shame on him. Taxpayers ought not rescue Mr. Teel and Northrup Grumman from the results of their gross incompetence.

---

16 November 2005

Editor, The Washington Post  
1150 15th St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Editor:

Endorsing a "Marshall Plan for the third world," Waddell Robey believes that "a very big and worthwhile global effort" is required to raise third-world peoples from poverty (Letters, Nov. 16). Not so. The \$2.3 trillion spent on development aid during the past half-century has done little good for people living in unfree economies.

Wherever property rights are secure and commerce is free, private capital flows in of its own accord, creating prosperity. Wherever this security and freedom are absent, aid dollars at best do nothing - and in too many cases only strengthen the oppressive regimes that deepen people's poverty.

---

14 November 2005

Editor, The Washington Post  
1150 15th St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Editor:

Sebastian Mallaby's figures on income inequality are incomplete ("Class Matters," Nov. 14). For example, while households in the top income quintile do indeed earn significantly more income than do those in the bottom quintile, 24.6 percent of Americans live in highest-quintile households compared to only 14.3 percent who live in lowest-quintile households.

(<http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=68128>)

More fundamentally, a greater influx of low-skilled immigrants biases the data to show greater inequality. But because these people choose to move here, the greater "inequality" that immigration produces in the data is artificial.