whip and the carrot, and that if we remove either the whip or the carrot, people will become beer-swilling bums. I do not share this point of view.

Representative GRIFFITHS. What do you suppose, Mr. Tyson, would be the effect of a guaranteed annual income upon marriage?

Mr. TYSON. It might make it more interesting; I am not sure.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I think it is possible that you should reward people for marrying.

Mr. TYSON. Madam Chairman, I think that with about a third of the labor force, a little better now, in the labor market being women, what would happen is that probably we would find an immediate kind of—it might really actually underwrite a certain kind of instability, and I do not want you to hold that against the concept.

The immediate effect might be this. Why should a woman be married to a person who refuses to support her and her children? We make so much, you know, of marriage, and it is the sort of nice, middle class thing to do. I approve of this; incidentally. I have performed a lot of them.

But in the long run, I believe that it will strengthen the family, it will strengthen the household. Now, then, what will this do as far as other programs are concerned?

I trust two concepts here. One is out of sociological theory, the emergence. You just never know what is going to be. You can do A, B, and C, and you get something you cannot predict. We have to be sort of open ended on it, and if we want guarantees on it, like income, you are not going to be able to say, I know with a predictive certainty what this consequence is going to be. But I believe that if we strengthen the family at the point of this income flow whereby you are able, then, to socialize personality, then you are dealing with the hard, basic causes of ingrained poverty, that persons under those circumstances will become creative working people, they will want to be.

But this cannot happen magically, somehow or other, through deprivation. We have somehow or another invented a belief that the more is kept from the family or the more it must prove its needs—the shoes are actually worn out—then, we have created motivation. When the family has no choice in the marketplace concerning education or training, then we guarantee to ourselves a system which is going to experience built-in failure.

I would be hopeful, really, that it will strengthen family life in the long run.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Mr. Hazlitt, what, in your judgment, would be the inflationary effect of a guaranteed annual income plus all these additional programs to bring people into the work stream?

Mr. HAZLITT. Well, we already have a great deal of inflation, even without the guaranteed income or the negative income tax. We have had a deficit in the budget for 32 out of the last 38 years. We have had a deficit in the last 8 years, we have a deficit in the present fiscal year which is the highest in the last 23 years.

And even after the new tax bill has been signed and so on, we still face a deficit of probably $5 billion or more for fiscal 1969.

Now, these deficits which have been running over a period of 38 years feed inflation. They have fed the inflation that we already have.