

time, this bill will put some buoys in the Atlantic as well.

□ 1315

This will be a first international tsunami warning system using what are called piezometers to measure the depth of the ocean.

The second thing the bill is going to do is the critical link in the chain of warning because buoys aren't enough. We have got to have a way to warn people, to educate people, to have systems in place so that they can evacuate along the coastlines. A little community called LaPush, Washington now has a system where they can move the whole city in about 12 to 15 minutes. We need to have those systems, and this bill is going to do that.

I want to say there is an additional benefit of this bill. False alarms happen as well. And when false alarms happen, we lose millions of dollars when we have false alarms. This whole system will reduce false alarms so that for the first time we can have a credible, meaningful, reliable tsunami detection and warning system in this country. It is overdue. I am glad we are going to have it happen. It is one of the crowning achievements of the great career of Chairman SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, who has done such great work for the environment and for science. We are all going to miss his great leadership.

I want to note a fellow who just left the Speaker's chair, Representative CHARLIE BASS, who hopefully will take credit for this as well for his great environmental stewardship. And it is a good day for America's shorelines to protect us from tsunamis.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. INSLEE for those very kind comments. I want to thank all my colleagues. It has been a great privilege to work with you and for you and for this great institution.

I also want to observe, before we bring this to a close, the great work of the staff on both sides of the aisle who have labored long and hard, almost 2 years on this bill alone. We don't give enough recognition to the staff. Those of us who are more visible, we come before the House and we are recorded on C-SPAN and everybody says they are doing some good deeds. But the real driving force behind so much of what we do is the very able professional staff that we literally are blessed with, both Democrat and Republican.

And this comes from a former staff member, but I came to Capitol Hill 42 years ago as a starry-eyed young staffer. I got 3 years off for good behavior. I was elected county executive back home, and for the past 24 years I have been privileged to serve in my own right as a Member. But in those 42 years, one of the most dramatic changes, and people are asking me this all the time as I am taking leave, what has changed about the House and about Congress, this institution? One of the most dramatic changes that is so often

overlooked is a change for the good, for the positive, the very high degree of professionalism so evident in the staffs of the committees. And I take the Science Committee as a classic example of how it should be done by all. The professionalism, the hard work, dedication on both sides of the aisle.

And we are going into a new chapter. We as Republicans are going from the majority to the minority. The Democrats are going from the minority to the majority. And people are saying, well, what is going to change? Well, I will tell you what is not going to change in the Science Committee. It is the working relationship across that center divide, the professionals who day in and day out prepare us for the debates, the hearings, and for the activities that we are about. That is not going to change. The Democrats will have a few more and the Republicans will have a few less, but I guarantee you this: As the next Congress comes to a close and people are looking back on its performance, I fully expect that the Science Committee once again will be one of the stars in this Chamber.

So with that, let me say to my colleagues on the committee how fortunate I consider myself to have had the privilege of working with and for you over the years, and as I say to all my colleagues in this Chamber, I urge your support for H.R. 1674, as amended. It is a bill that demonstrates that when we work together, we can accomplish so much for so many.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an exchange of letters between the Committees on Science and International Relations in the RECORD.

I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle, who have labored for more than 2 years on this bill. That includes Eric Webster, who has since moved on to NOAA, and David Goldston, Sara Gray, Chad English, and especially Amy Carroll, who has worked tirelessly to keep this bill moving forward.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2006.

Hon. SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing regarding the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on International Relations in H.R. 1674, the Tsunami Warning and Education Act, as proposed for consideration under suspension of the Rules of the House.

The Committee on International Relations recognizes the importance of H.R. 1674 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, I will not stand in the way of floor consideration. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to allow the bill to come to the floor waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations, and that a copy of this letter and your letter in response will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the bill is considered on the House Floor.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2006.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding floor consideration of H.R. 1674, the Tsunami Warning and Education Act, as proposed for consideration under suspension of the Rules of the House. I appreciate your willingness to work with me so that H.R. 1674 can move expeditiously to the floor.

I agree that your action does not waive, reduce or otherwise affect any jurisdiction your Committee might have over H.R. 1674. As you requested, the exchange of letters between our two committees will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Thank you for your cooperation in moving this important legislation.

Sincerely,

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,
Chairman.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1674, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4510. An act to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept the donation of a bust depicting Sojourner Truth and to display the bust in a suitable location in the Capitol.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6143. An act to amend title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for providing life-saving care for those with HIV/AIDS.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MILTON FRIEDMAN

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1089) honoring the life of Milton Friedman.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1089

Whereas Milton Friedman earned a degree in economics from Rutgers University, and later earned a master's degree from the University of Chicago and a doctorate degree from Columbia University;

Whereas Doctor Milton Friedman is widely regarded as the leader of the Chicago School of economics, and the developer of the theory of monetarism that stresses the central importance of the quantity of money as an instrument of government policy and as a determinant of business cycles and inflation;

Whereas Doctor Friedman's writings and ideas have influenced Presidents, other world leaders, entrepreneurs, and students of economics, and he gave himself generously to public service as an economic adviser to Senator Barry Goldwater's campaign for the presidency in 1964, Richard Nixon's presidential campaign in 1968, the Nixon Administration, Ronald Reagan's 1980 presidential campaign, and the Reagan Administration as a member of President Reagan's Economic Policy Advisory Board;

Whereas Doctor Friedman is a 1976 Nobel Laureate economist and received the John Bates Clark Medal in 1951 honoring the top economists under the age of forty, the Grand Cordon of the First Class Order of the Sacred Treasure by the Japanese government in 1986, the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1988, the National Medal of Science in 1988, and honorary degrees from universities in the United States, Japan, Israel, and Guatemala;

Whereas Doctor Friedman's ideas were the model for the free market reforms undertaken in eastern European countries as they emerged from communist domination in the early 1990s, helping extend the blessings of prosperity to millions who had long been denied them;

Whereas Doctor Friedman was a prolific producer of both scholarly and popular articles, essays, books, and broadcast media, including the books *Capitalism and Freedom* and *Free to Choose*, tri-weekly columns for *Newsweek*, commentaries in the *Wall Street Journal*, and two multi-part Public Broadcasting Service television series;

Whereas Doctor Friedman was one of the world's foremost champions of liberty, not just in economics but in all respects;

Whereas Doctor Friedman will be remembered both as one of the most influential economists in history and as one of the twentieth century's greatest heroes of freedom; and

Whereas Doctor Milton Friedman died on November 16, 2006, in San Francisco, California, at the age of 94 of heart failure: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, on the occasion of the death of Doctor Milton Friedman—

(1) mourns Doctor Friedman's passing and expresses its deepest condolences to his family, including his widow Rose Friedman, who is herself an accomplished economist and was instrumental in co-authoring some of his major works; and

(2) honors Doctor Friedman's lifetime of achievements and recognizes his outstanding contributions to freedom, the study of economics, the United States of America, and the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURRETTE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURRETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURRETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Widely acclaimed as the leader of Chicago's School of Economics, Milton Friedman's achievements in the fields of economic science and public policy were remarkable. He was the recipient of the 1976 Nobel Memorial Prize, the 1988 Presidential Medal of Freedom, and the 1988 National Medal of Science, just to name a few. In the early 1990s, Eastern European countries emerging from communism modeled their new free market economies after his teachings.

He was a champion of individual freedoms as well and wrote extensively on the subject throughout his career. Presidents such as Ronald Reagan called on Dr. Friedman for his expertise and advice, and universities in the United States, Japan, Guatemala, and Israel all awarded him with honorary degrees.

Dr. Friedman passed away on November 16 of this year. And for his leadership, achievements, and countless contributions both politically and economically, I hope all Members will join me today in honoring his life and legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on November 16 the world lost one of its preeminent and influential economists and thinkers of our time. Dr. Milton Friedman is most commonly associated with his theories of monetarism, his devotion to the free market that sought to turn the Keynesian economic revolution on its head, and his visions of an international economic system that is free of pegged and fixed exchange rates.

Friedman's top achievement, among many, was his Nobel Prize in Economics, which he was awarded in 1976. And while many of his achievements are well known, some of his lesser known accomplishments make him an intriguing figure. One of the abstractions Friedman developed in his famous work, "Capitalism and Freedom," was the concept of the negative income tax credit, or the modern-day earned income tax credit. This abstraction advances the idea that people who earn less than a certain amount of money should receive money from the government. Friedman also was a key member of the White House Commission on White House Fellows from 1971 to 1973. But most of all, Milton Friedman was devoted to the centrality of freedom in domestic and international affairs.

And although Friedman was born to humble beginnings as a first-generation American, he rose to become the leader of the Chicago School of Economics. The Chicago School is re-

garded around the world as an institution that produces outstanding economic scholarship and rigorous theory. Milton Friedman's name will hold a permanent place in economic debate, and so I am pleased and delighted to be in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURRETTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the author of the resolution, Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on November 16 of this year, America and the world lost not only a brilliant economist but a towering giant of an unbounded vision for freedom. Dr. Friedman was widely recognized worldwide for his economic explanations and philosophies of government and markets. Beyond pure economic analysis, Dr. Friedman promoted liberty and choices in all areas. I am honored to have the opportunity to commemorate his life with this resolution to honor him and have enjoyed collaborating with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

House Resolution 1089 outlines his academic, publishing, and prize-winning accomplishments. I will not relist them here. There is so much to say.

Dr. Friedman's economic prescription advocated we steadily, constantly stabilize the growth of money supply, then more or less just stay out of the way, leaving the economy to the free creative choices of millions of productive individuals, households, and businesses, rather than one micromanaging government. Milton Friedman put individuals, not bureaucrats at best or despots at worst, in the driver's seat.

Essentially we admire him for espousing that economic freedom is necessary for political freedom. And today few would argue that Friedman's ideas went from being seen as radical to now being fully accepted. Most successful countries rely on monetary policy as their chief stabilizing tool. Some shining examples are borne out in Eastern Europe nations that not so long ago dwelled under the Iron Curtain. I think a cartoon that was printed in the *Christian Science Monitor* in 1990 by Danziger sums it up pretty well. It says "Statue of Milton Friedman is erected in Poland in place of Whathisname." And of course it depicts a collapsed Lenin on his face with a lady chortling "Hah!" at the broken statue while other Poles are pulling up a smiling, bespeckled Milton Friedman statue and they have crossed out "Lenin" and carved "Uncle Miltie" on the statue base.

My colleagues, his crowning achievement was establishing with his wife the Milton and Rose D. Friedman Foundation, based in Indianapolis, Indiana, for the purpose of promoting educational choice and reform for parents and their children. School choice continues to be

passionately debated today; yet experiments from the District of Columbia to my own State of Florida, under Governor Jeb Bush's lead, demonstrate great promise in liberating educational opportunities for all. We have done this successfully for colleges since World War II with the Montgomery GI bill. So why should we deny school choice for kindergartners through senior high school students here in America?

And, finally, my colleagues, I cannot end a tribute to Dr. Friedman without also honoring his wife of 68 years. Rose was his classmate, partner economist, fellow radical for freedom, and, I dare-say, the love of his life. I know she and children David and Janet and their grandchildren mourn their beloved Milton but are at peace knowing they contributed to this great man who contributed just so much to the multitudes in this country. For me when I think of the values not only Milton Friedman and his wife promoted, I am moved by this paragraph from the Friedmans' memoirs, "Two Lucky People." Mr. Speaker, this sentiment is bigger than partisan politics. It is more profound than the Washington interest group agenda. It marvelously illustrates optimism for what America could be.

" . . . So we close this book full of optimism for the future in the belief that those ideas will prevail and that our children and grandchildren will live in a country that continues to advance rapidly in material and biological well-being and gives its citizens ever wider freedom to follow their own values and tastes so long as they do not interfere with the ability of others to do the same."

Milton Friedman, well done. Rest in peace.

□ 1330

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Illinois permitting me to speak on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate for us to pause and reflect on the many contributions of Milton Friedman. At any point we have great thinkers who challenge conventional wisdom. It is appropriate to honor Prof. Friedman. There are some who credit him as the founder of the Chicago School of Economics. There are others who see that he was a free market paragon. I see him as a symbol of what can be done intellectually if people are thinking about the future of problems and creative about solutions.

Milton Friedman understood that, at core, we had a problem in this country with poor people who were poor. They didn't have enough money. He also had suspicion about the various bureaucratic responses that government has assembled over time. And he had presented a provocative proposal to have a guaranteed annual income, a flat basic

amount that everybody would be entitled to, regardless of what they did or who they were, that would be cheaper and more effective to administer, that would actually deal with the problem of poor people that they didn't have money. It would reduce the interference in their lives and allow them to respond to a lot of the pressures that we typically associate with how families react.

This was something that was actually briefly considered by the Nixon administration, discarded because it was a little radical at the time. The costs were somewhat uncertain, although Friedman was convinced that in the long run it would actually be cheaper.

This was the inspiration for the earned income tax credit, which is probably the single most effective mechanism, in a Reagan era, that Republicans and Democrats could get behind to reduce poverty. It helped people in a cost-effective way, diminishing the disincentives for work, and was something for which Mr. Friedman never really fully received the acclaim that was deserved by him. This has affected millions of lives in ways that people on both sides of the aisle of a variety of different philosophical perspectives could feel comfortable with.

I think there is also a lesson here, Mr. Speaker, because there are many problems that face us on the floor of this House, that don't have to fall in neat little boxes in a philosophical or a partisan way. We are looking for example, Mr. Speaker, at the investment in agriculture in this country, in a way that cries out for reform. We are spending \$23 billion in a year of record-high farm prices.

Now, if my friends on the Republican side and my friends on the Democratic side would think of the teachings and the spirit of Milton Friedman, we could bring people together in a bipartisan way to reform this Depression-era set of programs that is not really an agricultural policy. The "Freedom to Farm" bill is observed in the breach, not its actual implementation. We can design a Friedman approach that would be better for the taxpayer, that would be better for the environment, that would actually help individual family farmers more effectively and more directly.

It is but one example that I think, that I hope we can tackle as we move into a new Congress. Perhaps with a new spirit, with a change in the rules so that people will actually be able to more fully and fairly debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, that we can take things like this that can bring the right and the left, the conservative and the liberal, Republicans and Democrats, together to solve problems in a way that will be better for the American people, and we will be better as an institution.

It is with great respect that I join in support of the resolution in honoring Milton Friedman and his career, and I hope that the next Congress is willing

to embrace the spirit of his creative mind to be able to do some things that actually we can all agree on need to be done.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to join with my colleague, Mr. STEARNS, to bring this resolution to the floor today. Dr. Milton Friedman is surely a man that is worthy of the honor of this House.

You know, it took courage, it took honor, and it really took genius for Dr. Friedman to challenge the prevailing thought and economic theories of his day. His meticulous economic analysis presented in his books and his lectures and his talks convinced leaders here in the United States, and around the world as well, that inflation could be controlled and it could be controlled through careful control of money supply. That is a theory that has been proven true by the policies of our past Fed chairmen over the last several decades.

Dr. Friedman was known for his ability to defend his theories, to defend the free market ideas with both clarity and grace as well. He is considered a friend of all the economists of the day, Keynesians and socialist economists as well, but he used their critiques to sharpen his own theories. He was on TV for a while in a television series, *Free to Choose*, and Dr. Friedman introduced his free market concepts to a truly popular audience. He proved himself unafraid to defend himself in the marketplace of general ideas as each segment of this, what was a 10-segment-part program, contained a vigorous debate among politicians of the day, economists and historians as well.

See, Milton Friedman stood, first and foremost, for freedom. He had an earnest belief that a free society is truly a strong society.

So now, fast forward to today. Now, at a time when our freedoms in this country and around the world are under attack, we must defend ourselves from those who would enslave mankind, and we should do so by remembering Dr. Friedman and his intellectual defense of liberty. Remember his long and vibrant life. And we also give our lifelong condolences to his family that he has left behind. He was truly an intellectual giant, and we will all miss him for his abilities and contributions to this world, to this country, and the freedoms that we enjoy today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that I have any additional requests for time. But simply, as a resident of Chicago where Milton Friedman did a great deal of his work, we were always immensely proud of him, and I am very pleased to support this resolution.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a friend, a mentor, and a true hero of American liberty and a champion of liberty and justice for all of humankind. The death of economist and libertarian spokesman, Dr. Milton Friedman, last week silenced a powerful voice in the public debate over the role of individual liberty in our society.

As a young man who first became active in politics while I was in high school in the mid-1960s, one of the very first writers who helped shaped my ideas was Milton Friedman in his classic work, "Capitalism and Freedom." Its powerful message of a respect for individual liberty, private property, and limited government inspired me as a young activist in the Youth for Goldwater at that time, I might add, and then again a couple of years later in Youth for Reagan, and continued to guide me as I became a speech writer for President Ronald Reagan and a Member of the United States Congress.

Dr. Milton Friedman was always a creative and innovative thinker. I might add, he was a decent and wonderful warm-hearted human being as well, a man who openly challenged the underlying premises of stateism and of socialism and of the authoritarian impulses that we have often found in politics. His critiques of government schooling, taxation policies, welfare state policies, Social Security, of agricultural subsidies and the rest, all of these predicted long ago the problems that we are having right now with those very same policies; of what they have brought upon our society, the challenges, the tremendous challenges we face because we used those policies and that model as a solution to uplifting the well-being of our fellow Americans.

Last week Milton Friedman's voice was silenced by death, but as long as his writings are read and his ideas cherished, the principle of individual personal economic liberty will remain strong in the United States and around the world.

And I would submit for the RECORD a statement, an exchange, between Milton Friedman and General Westmoreland over the issue of a volunteer Army and the draft. I would submit that for the RECORD as an example of the clear thinking and principles, I think, of Milton Friedman.

In his testimony before the commission, Mr. Westmoreland said he did not want to command an army of mercenaries. Mr. Friedman interrupted, "General, would you rather command an army of slaves?" Mr. Westmoreland replied, "I don't like to hear our patriotic draftees referred to as slaves." Mr. Friedman then retorted, "I don't like to hear our patriotic volunteers referred to as mercenaries. If they are mercenaries, then I, sir, am a mercenary professor, and you, sir, are a mercenary general; we are served by mercenary physicians, we use a mercenary lawyer, and we get our meat from a mercenary butcher."

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H. Res. 1089, a resolution honoring

Milton Friedman. Milton Friedman was one of America's greatest champions of liberty. Launching a career as a public intellectual at a time when dissenters from the reigning Keynesian paradigm were viewed as the equivalent of members of the Flat Earth Society, Milton Friedman waged an oftentimes lonely intellectual battle on behalf of free markets and individual liberty in the fifties and sixties. As the economic crisis of the seventies caused by high taxes, high spending, and inflation vindicated Friedman's critiques of interventionism, his influence grew—not because he moved to the mainstream but because the mainstream moved toward him. Friedman served as an advisor to Presidents Nixon and Ford and as a member of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors. In 1976, Friedman was awarded the Nobel Prize in economics.

Milton Friedman's most notable contributions to economic theory were in the area of monetary policy. His 1963 work *A Monetary History of the United States 1857–1960*, coauthored with Anna Schwartz, was among the first works to emphasize the role Federal Reserve policy played in causing the Great Depression. As Friedman said, "The Great Depression, like most other periods of severe unemployment, was produced by government mismanagement rather than by any inherent instability of the private economy."

Friedman's work showed that inflation is not a result of markets but is, as he memorably put it, "always and everywhere a monetary phenomenon." Friedman was the major originator and theoretician of monetarism. Friedman recommended restricting the Federal Reserve's authority to increasing the quantity of money by a fixed yearly amount. While monetarism is far from the ideal free-market monetary system, Milton Friedman deserves credit for focusing the attention of economists on the Federal Reserve's responsibility for inflation.

While he is mainly known for his contributions to economic theory and his advocacy of free markets, Milton Friedman considered his advocacy against the draft, cumulating in his work as a member of President Nixon's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force, his major policy achievement. Milton Friedman's opposition to the draft was in part based on economic principles, but was mainly motivated by his moral commitment to freedom. I ask unanimous consent to insert the attached article, "Milton Friedman: A Tribute," by David R. Henderson, which details Milton Friedman's efforts against the draft, into the record.

Unlike many free market economists who downplay their opposition to government of encroachments on personal liberty in order to appear "respectable," Friedman never hesitated to take controversial stands in favor of liberty. Thus Friedman was one of the most outspoken critics of the federal war on drugs and an early critic of government licensing of professionals. Friedman also never allowed fear of losing access to power stop him from criticizing politicians who betrayed economic liberty. For example, his status as an advisor to President Richard Nixon did not stop him from criticizing Nixon's imposition of wage and price controls.

Milton Friedman's greatest contribution to liberty may have been his work to educate the public about free market economics. Milton Friedman's 1962 work *Capitalism and Free-*

dom, introduced millions of people to the freedom philosophy, and it remains one of the most popular, and influential, pro-freedom books in the world.

In 1980, Milton Friedman collaborated with his wife Rose on a television series, *Free to Choose*. The series, and the accompanying best-selling book, remain among the best introductions to the benefits of economic liberty, and rivals *Capitalism and Freedom* in popularity. One of my favorite moments of the show is when Milton Friedman compares the robust free market economy of Hong Kong with the then stagnant economy of communist China.

On a personal note, I was honored to receive Milton Friedman's endorsement of my congressional campaign in 1996. One particular quote from his endorsement exemplifies how Milton Friedman's commitment to the free market was rooted in a recognition that a society that respects the dignity and worth of every individual is impossible without limited government, private property, and sound money: "We very badly need to have more Representatives in the House who understand in a principled way the importance of property rights and religious freedom for the preservation and extension of human freedom in general . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to Milton Friedman's tireless efforts on behalf of human liberty, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1089.

[From ANTIWAR.COM, Nov. 20, 2006]

MILTON FRIEDMAN: A TRIBUTE

"In the course of his [General Westmoreland's] testimony, he made the statement that he did not want to command an army of mercenaries. I [Milton Friedman] stopped him and said, 'General, would you rather command an army of slaves?' He drew himself up and said, 'I don't like to hear our patriotic volunteers referred to as mercenaries.' But I went on to say, 'If they are mercenaries, then I, sir, am a mercenary professor, and you, sir, are a mercenary general; we are served by mercenary physicians, we use a mercenary lawyer, and we get our meat from a mercenary butcher.' That was the last that we heard from the general about mercenaries."—Milton and Rose Friedman, *Two Lucky People*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998, p. 380.

In May 1970, a few days after graduating from the University of Winnipeg with a major in mathematics, I flew to Chicago to look into getting a Ph.D. in economics at the University of Chicago. While there, I went to visit Milton Friedman and he invited me into his office. I had a sense that he had been through this routine before—talking to an idealistic young person showing up and wanting an autograph on his copy of *Capitalism and Freedom* and, beyond that, simply wanting to meet and talk to him. But he didn't treat our meeting as routine; we had a real talk for about 10 minutes. When I told him that I'd initially been attracted to libertarianism by reading Ayn Rand, he told me that while Rand was well worth reading, there were many other people worth reading too, and I shouldn't get stuck on her. He also stated, "Make politics an avocation, not a vocation." Both were good pieces of advice.

The advice didn't stop there. I ended up getting my Ph.D. at UCLA and going to my first academic job as an assistant professor at the University of Rochester's Graduate School of Management. From then on, I wrote Milton a couple of times a year and he always wrote back, sometimes writing in the margins of my letter to comment on my

questions and thoughts. When I contemplated my first major career change—leaving academia to work at a think tank—he advised me strongly against it (I didn't take this advice), referring to himself as my “Dutch uncle.” I had never heard the term before and didn't bother to look it up until writing this piece, but I understood what he meant from the context: a Dutch uncle is someone who gives you tough love, holding you to high standards because of a benevolent regard for your well-being.

But here's the bigger point: with his steady and passionate work to end the military draft, Milton Friedman was the Dutch uncle of every young man in the United States. Or even better, he was like a favorite uncle that they'd never even met. He cared more for them than any president, any general, or any defense secretary has ever cared. How so? Because he wanted every young man to be free to choose whether to join the military or not.

Milton Friedman's work against the draft began in December 1966, when he gave a presentation at a four-day conference at the University of Chicago. Various prominent and less-prominent academics, politicians, and activists had been invited. Papers had been commissioned, and the authors gave summaries, after which the discussion was open to all. Fortunately, the discussion was transcribed. The papers and discussions appear in a book edited by sociologist Sol Tax and titled *The Draft: A Handbook of Facts and Alternatives*. The invitees included two young anti-draft congressmen, Robert Kastenmeier (D-Wisc.) and Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.), and one pro-draft senator, Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.). Also attending were pro-draft anthropologist Margaret Mead and anti-draft economists Milton Friedman and Walter Oi. Friedman gave the general economic and philosophical case for a voluntary military in his presentation, “Why Not a Voluntary Army?” Friedman pointed out that the draft is a tax on young men. He stated:

“When a young man is forced to serve at \$45 a week, including the cost of his keep, of his uniforms, and his dependency allowances, and there are many civilian opportunities available to him at something like \$100 a week, he is paying \$55 a week in an implicit tax. . . . And if you were to add to those taxes in kind, the costs imposed on universities and colleges; of seating, housing, and entertaining young men who would otherwise be doing productive work; if you were to add to that the costs imposed on industry by the fact that they can only offer young men who are in danger of being drafted stopgap jobs, and cannot effectively invest money in training them; if you were to add to that the costs imposed on individuals of a financial kind by their marrying earlier or having children at an earlier stage, and so on; if you were to add all these up, there is no doubt at all in my mind that the cost of a volunteer force, correctly calculated, would be very much smaller than the amount we are now spending in manning our Armed Forces.”

Reading through the whole Sol Tax volume, with all the papers and transcripts of the discussion, I had the sense that there was a coalescing of views over the four days, as people from various parts of the ideological spectrum found that they had in common a strong antipathy to the draft and found also that the economists made a surprisingly strong economic case. Both Friedman's speech and his various comments at the conference still make compelling reading. One of his best rhetorical flourishes was his criticism of the charge that those who advocate ending the draft are advocating a “mercenary” army. You'll recognize the same kind of argument he used against Westmoreland in the lead quote of this article. Friedman said:

“Now, when anybody starts talking about this [an all-volunteer force] he immediately shifts language. My army is ‘volunteer,’ your army is ‘professional,’ and the enemy's army is ‘mercenary.’ All these three words mean exactly the same thing. I am a volunteer professor, I am a mercenary professor, and I am a professional professor. And all you people around here are mercenary professional people. And I trust you realize that. It's always a puzzle to me why people should think that the term ‘mercenary’ somehow has a negative connotation. I remind you of that wonderful quotation of Adam Smith when he said, ‘You do not owe your daily bread to the benevolence of the baker, but to his proper regard for his own interest.’ And this is much more broadly based. In fact, I think mercenary motives are among the least unattractive that we have.” (p. 366)

In the margin of my 35-year-old, dog-eared copy of the Sol Tax book containing this passage, I wrote one word: “Wow!” This is rhetoric at its best, a tight argument passionately stated. When I read this at about age 18, just a year before meeting Friedman in his office, I felt cared-for. Fortunately, being Canadian, I wasn't vulnerable to the draft. But I had the thought that if I had grown up in United States, I would be so thankful that here was this man, himself well beyond draft age and who could probably figure out how to get his son out of the draft, and yet who cared enough to be out in front on this issue.

Two of Friedman's comments about this conference are worth noting. Writing some 30 years later, Friedman noted that the 74 invited participants “included essentially everyone who had written or spoken at all extensively on either side of the controversy about the draft, as well as a number of students.” (*Two Lucky People*, p. 377.) Friedman's other comment is also worth citing:

“I have attended many conferences. I have never attended any other that had so dramatic an effect on the participants. A straw poll taken at the outset of the conference recorded two-thirds of the participants in favor of the draft; a similar poll at the end, two-thirds opposed. I believe that this conference was the key event that started the ball rolling decisively toward ending the draft.” (p. 378.)

Friedman didn't stop there. He wrote a number of articles in his tri-weekly column in *Newsweek* making the case against the draft. Friedman was one of 15 people chosen for Nixon's Commission on the All-Volunteer Force. By his estimate, five started off being against the draft, five in favor, and five on the fence. By the end, the Commission was able to come out with a 14-0 consensus in favor of ending the draft. Black leader Roy Wilkins, in a Feb. 6, 1970 letter to Nixon, stated he had been unable to attend many of the meetings due to a major illness and, therefore, could not support its specific recommendations; Wilkins did state, however, that he endorsed the idea of moving toward an all-volunteer armed force. (The Report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, New York: Collier Books, 1970; letter from Roy Wilkins.)

It was at one of these meetings that Friedman put Westmoreland on the spot with his comeback about slaves. Knowing that Friedman was persuasive and focused and also a warm human being, I credit him with having swung at least a few of the Commission members in his direction. And although Nixon took his sweet time acting on the recommendations, finally, at the start of his second term, he let the draft expire.

Friedman kibitzed in his *Newsweek* column, never letting up. He once wrote that the draft “is almost the only issue on which I have engaged in any extensive personal lob-

bying with members of the House and Senate.” (Milton Friedman, *An Economist's Protest*, 2nd ed., Glen Ridge, N.J.: Thomas Horton and Daughters, 1975, p. 188.)

And Friedman stuck around as an opponent of the draft when the going got tough. In the late 1970s, high inflation caused a serious drop in real military pay and a consequent increase in difficulty meeting recruiting quotas. Of all the threats to bring back the draft in the last 32 years, the threat in 1979 to 1980 was the most serious. Sen. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) held hearings with the goal of building support for the draft and, at least, registration for a future draft. Hoover economist Martin Anderson organized an important conference on the draft at the Hoover Institution in November 1979 and invited the top proponents and opponents of the draft. (For the papers and transcript of the discussion, see Martin Anderson, ed., *Registration and the Draft: Proceedings of the Hoover-Rochester Conference on the All-Volunteer Force*, Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1982.) Friedman was one of the attendees and, at the end, debated Congressman Pete McCloskey on the draft. It was actually the weakest performance I've ever seen by Friedman, but Friedman's “weak” is still pretty good.

In 1980, in response to the threat from Sam Nunn, I wrote and circulated the following “Economists' Statement in Opposition to the Draft”:

“We, the undersigned, oppose moves toward the reimposition of the draft. The draft would be a more costly way of maintaining the military than an all-volunteer force. Those who claim that a draft costs less than a volunteer military cite as a savings the lower wages that the government can get away with paying draftees. But they leave out the burden imposed on the draftees themselves. Since a draft would force many young people to delay or forego entirely other activities valuable to them and to the rest of society, the real cost of military manpower would be substantially more than the wages draftees would be paid. Saying that a draft would reduce the cost of the military is like saying that the pyramids were cheap because they were built with slave labor.”

Friedman's speed at signing made it much easier, I'm sure, to get the signatures of almost 300 other prominent and not-so-prominent economists, including Kenneth Boulding, Harold Demsetz, David Friedman, Alan Greenspan, Donald McCloskey, William Meckling, Allen H. Meltzer, James C. Miller III, William A. Niskanen, Mancur Olson, Sam Peltzman, Murray Rothbard, Jeremy J. Siegel, Vernon Smith, Beryl W. Sprinkel, Jerome Stein, and James L. Sweeney.

The statement, with about 150 signatures, was published as a full-page ad in *Liberarian Review*, *Inquiry*, and *The Progressive*.

Milton Friedman and I had our differences about foreign policy. I tried, in vain, to persuade him to be against the first Gulf war. Even there, though, he publicly supported, in an interview with the *San Francisco Chronicle*, my economic argument against the war. He stated, “Henderson's analysis is correct. There is no justification for intervention on grounds of oil” (Jonathan Marshall, “Economists Say Iraq's Threat to U.S. Oil Supply Is Exaggerated,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, Oct. 29, 1990.) Friedman did oppose the second Gulf war, as evidenced in an interview in the *Wall Street Journal*, in which he called it, correctly, “aggression.” (Tunku Varadarajan, “The Romance of Economics,” *Wall Street Journal*, July 22, 2006; page A10).

As far as I know, though, Friedman did not oppose the second Gulf war publicly when it mattered most—that is, before the March 2003 invasion. But on the draft, Friedman never wavered. For that, many young American men owe him a lot.

Two weeks ago, I attended a conference in Guatemala at which it was announced that Friedman had had a bad fall and was in the hospital. The person who announced it, Bob Chitester, producer of the Friedmans' 1980 television series, *Free to Choose*, handed out buttons that read, "Have you thanked Milton Friedman today?" Thanks, Uncle Miltie.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1089.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST
OFFICE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1820) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1820

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, a graduate of Princeton University, Dewey Bartlett began his post-collegiate life as a marine combat pilot in the South Pacific during the Second World War. He went on to be-

come a successful rancher and businessman in Oklahoma, and ultimately, it was his interest in improving the State's economy that led him to seek political office.

Bartlett was elected to the Oklahoma State Senate in 1962 and served as its Governor from 1967 to 1971. As Governor, Bartlett dedicated himself to bringing more jobs to the citizens of Oklahoma, and was a huge proponent of vocational-technical education to give workers the skills they needed to succeed. Two years later, in 1973, he became a United States Senator, a post that he maintained until 1979.

In all, Dewey Bartlett devoted over a decade of his life to public service. He was known for his strong work ethic and bipartisan approach to politics, as well as for his commitment to fiscal responsibility and economic growth.

After a 2-year battle with cancer, Mr. Speaker, Dewey Bartlett passed away in the spring of 1979. In recognition of his outstanding service to his State and this country, I urge all Members to join me in voting for S. 1820.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of S. 1820, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma as the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office. S. 1820, sponsored by Senator JAMES INHOFE, passed the Senate by unanimous consent on March 3, 2006.

Dewey Bartlett was born in Marietta, Ohio. During World War II he served in the United States Marine Corps as a dive bomber pilot in the South Pacific. After the war, Mr. Bartlett moved to Oklahoma, working as a farmer, rancher and independent oil producer.

Mr. Bartlett was elected to the State senate in 1962. Four years later he ran for Governor. As Governor, he was recognized for his efforts in economic development.

In 1972 Governor Bartlett was elected to the U.S. Senate, where he served from 1973 to 1979. Sadly, he passed away in Tulsa, Oklahoma on March 1, 1979.

I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of S. 1820, which will designate the 6110 East 51st Place post office in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office.

I was pleased to introduce the companion legislation, H.R. 4051, which passed the House in March, and I again

encourage my colleagues to join me in support of S. 1820. Dewey F. Bartlett was a strong advocate for conservative values, a war veteran and a public servant for Oklahoma and the Nation. He served as the second Republican Governor of Oklahoma and is a distinguished alumni of the United States Senate. He was a true representative of Oklahoma values, leadership and drive, and I am pleased that we are able to honor him in this way.

After graduating from Princeton University in 1942, Dewey Bartlett served in the Marine Corps as a combat dive bomber pilot during World War II. As a result of his courageous efforts in the South Pacific theater, he was awarded the Air Medal. After the war he moved to Tulsa, Oklahoma, and became a farmer, rancher and oilman. He was a partner in the Keener Oil Company, one of Oklahoma's oldest, small independent oil companies.

In 1963, he began his career in public service by joining the State Senate and then, in 1967, he became Oklahoma's 19th Governor. One of his priorities while in office was increasing industry in Oklahoma. As Governor the results of his hard work helped to produce a record \$148.4 million in new industries or improvements in existing facilities and created 7,500 jobs for Oklahomans.

From 1972 to 1978, Bartlett served as a Member of the United States Senate. During his tenure, this proud Oklahoman maintained a strong consistent stance on limited government bureaucracy, reducing burdensome taxes and maintaining fiscal responsibility. I am proud to share Dewey Bartlett's vision of conservatism and work daily toward the goal of promoting commonsense Oklahoma values in Congress.

By designating the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office in Tulsa, we are commemorating an exceptional person who embodied the spirit of Oklahoma.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1820.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
AND LIFE OF EDWARD R. BRADLEY**

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1084) to honor the contributions and life of Edward R. Bradley, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1084

Whereas Edward R. Bradley was born on June 22, 1941, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

Whereas he graduated in 1964 with a degree in education from Cheyney State College;