

welfare and forcing them to go to work. To send them to work means the establishment of day care, of all sorts of arrangements, and the discovery of jobs that simply do not exist today, jobs that are for unskilled people who have to be home by 3:30.

So I have gone further on your question, but it seems to me that many mothers do want to go to work. Seventy percent of the mothers on welfare in New York City want to go to work. But the jobs do not exist.

Representative RUMSFELD. My time is up. I would just like to conclude this period of questioning by congratulating Mr. Tyson for, in his statement, indicating exactly what the vote was in his organization on this issue. We have heard many people before committees in Congress say they represent 42 million people, as you do, and leave it right there. I commend you for pointing out that your views represent a board of 225, of whom less than half voted. I do not mean that critically, because that happens in the Congress and it happens in political elections all over this country and it is a fact of life. But I admire the fact that you put it right on the front of your paper.

Mr. TYSON. It was a pretty good vote, wasn't it?

Representative RUMSFELD. One hundred and ten out of 225, with 107 for, one against, and two abstentions.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Mr. Theobald, would you answer Mr. Rumsfeld's question?

Mr. THEOBALD. I would like to make several comments:

First, it seems to me that Mr. Hazlitt is extremely naive, which is not a pattern I would normally attribute to him. Tax exemptions are a privilege. Some of them are given for a period of time and cannot be withdrawn. I would agree there are great problems. I said in my testimony that new tax patterns will have to be worked out. It is going to take time and effort, much more than merely hearings. It is going to take an enormous effort of Congress in conjunction with a great many technicians; we do not presently have the mechanisms to do the job. However, Mr. Hazlitt's apparent argument that once we have given somebody a tax privilege at some point, the privilege can never be withdrawn seems remarkably unreasonable, particularly as he argues that all privileges given to the poor should be limited to 1 year.

In other words, if the poor get a privilege it can be withdrawn at any point. If the rich get a privilege it should be their forever. That seems to me intolerable.

Let me deal with the effect of a guaranteed income on women for a moment. I think one of the things that is happening among young people is that marriage is becoming a contract which has to be a permanently meaningful contract to each of them. I think there is less and less willingness to accept permanent marriage vows simply because of societal pressures.

I think the guaranteed income will give freedom to women and this will lead to more meaningful marriages and also more willingness to break marriages when they are not meaningful. I do not think that this is a disastrous thing to happen.

The third point is that no one is suggesting the introduction of the guaranteed income, given our present revenue situation. No one is suggesting that the guaranteed income can be introduced given present patterns of expenditure. I think we must begin arguing about our