



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.

22 July 2006

Editor, The Wall Street Journal
200 Liberty Street
New York, NY 10281

Dear Editor:

Milton Friedman correctly says that immigration is "good for freedom. In principle, you ought to have completely open immigration" ("The Romance of Economics," July 22). But then he insists that government-provided welfare in America justifies immigration restrictions.

How can this great man who has long championed freedom as a moral imperative allow one unprincipled government intrusion (the welfare state) to excuse another unprincipled intrusion (limits on immigration)? By abandoning his principles when it comes to immigration, Friedman opens himself to the necessity of conceding at least the potential acceptability of further unprincipled government intrusions - such as allowing states with more-generous welfare benefits to close their borders to Americans from states with

less-generous benefits, and criminalizing out-of-wedlock teen pregnancies (because young unwed mothers receive disproportionate amounts of government welfare). What principle will Friedman use to avoid slipping down this immoral slope?

No one that brainless could aim a gun straight much less build a business.

21 July 2006

Editor, The Baltimore Sun

Dear Editor:

Not only does television portray business people as murderous (Clarence Page, "Are TV villains bad for business?" July 21), it also portrays them as bizarrely stupid.

I recall a scene from the 1980s series *Dynasty* in which the character played by Joan Collins attempted a hostile takeover of the corporation (privately!) owned by the character played by John Forsyth. When informed of this nefarious plot against his enterprise, Forsyth sprung into action! He telephoned one of his aides and, explaining that he needs fast cash to fight this takeover, ordered the aide to sell shares of his company.

20 July 2006

Editor, The Wall Street Journal
200 Liberty Street
New York, NY 10281

Dear Editor:

I wish that Judge J. Frederick Motz would have invalidated Maryland's "Fair Share Act," not for being inconsistent with ERISA (which it is), but instead for violating the Constitution's equal-protection clause ("The 'Wal-Mart Tax' Goes Down," July 20). The case for doing so is strong.

Judge Motz himself wrote that Northrup Grumman "successfully lobbied for a provision in the Act that permits employers to exclude, for purposes of calculating the percentage of payroll spent on health care, compensation paid to its employees above the median household income in Maryland." Presto! High-paying Northrup Grumman neatly escapes the Act. The result is legislative discrimination against large firms that provide jobs for many low-skilled workers - which ultimately means discrimination against low-skilled workers.

19 July 2006

The Editor, USA Today

To the Editor:

To improve schooling you say that "Identifying true success means searching for schools that outperform their peers" ("Real estate vs. real education," July 19). This approach is all wrong.

Suppose government owned and operated most newspapers and magazines. Would you be confident that "searching for publications that outperform their peers" is the best way to assure truthful and relevant press coverage? Surely not. You understand that government-run news outlets inevitably are infected by politics and are too protected from competition to respond positively to consumers. So apply the same understanding to government schools - which inevitably are infected by politics and too protected from competition to respond positively to students.

Schools will never achieve their full potential until they are separated from the state.

18 July 2006

Editor, The Washington Times

To the Editor:

Complaining about undocumented immigrants, Lynette Wood spews a barrage of undocumented "facts" (Letters, July 18). But her complaint about "the \$20 billion-plus taken out of our economy and sent to Mexico every year" is downright silly.

Before persons living in Mexico can spend these dollars they must first convert them into pesos. Banks that exchange pesos for these dollars do so only because either they or their customers want dollars. And why does anyone want dollars? Answer: to spend or invest them in America. The \$20 billion remitted annually by Mexicans living in the U.S. to their families south of the border return north as demand for American goods, services, and assets. These dollars are spent in America just as surely as they would be if the Mexicans who earn them while working in the U.S. had never sent any of their dollars to Mexico.

