This omission is especially disturbing in view of the continued restrictive impact of the 4¼-percent ceiling applicable to new Treasury issues with a maturity in excess of 5 years. The average maturity of the public marketable debt, now at 4½ years, is the shortest since 1960. The 4¼-percent ceiling obstructs an orderly approach to debt lengthening and should be removed. We urge administration officials to initiate discussions with congressional leaders in order to resolve this problem.

### BUDGETARY CONCEPTS AND PRESENTATION

We applaud the decision of the President, as announced in his Budget Message, to seek the advice of a bipartisan group of informed individuals with respect to budgetary presentation and concepts. Each of the current budget approaches—administrative, consolidated cash, and national income accounts—has its strengths and weaknesses, but none of the three is sufficient in itself to meet the needs of Congress and the public.

In view of the President's decision to seek such advice, we deem it unfortunate that the administration has, starting this year, adopted the national income accounts budget as the basic instrument for presentation of the Federal program. As the President noted, the NIA budget is not well suited for an analysis of individual Federal programs. It does not include Federal lending activities, which at times can be of special economic significance. Moreover, the NIA budget (as well as other approaches) can be misleading with respect to the initial impact of Federal spending programs.

Admittedly, both the administrative and cash consolidated budgets have serious shortcomings. But in view of the impending study, a strong case could be made for no change in the basic budget concept at this time. If the administration deemed such a change mandatory, the cash consolidated budget, which includes Federal lending activities, would appear to be superior to the NIA budget.

As for the study group from which the President will seek advice, development of some measure of Federal Government activities is likely to be its first order of business. To illustrate the problem, expenditures for fiscal 1968 are estimated at $135 billion in the administrative budget; $172 billion in the cash consolidated budget; and $169 billion in the NIA budget. But each of these budgets conceals a wide range of Government activities. For example, it is estimated that in fiscal 1968 expenditures of the Postal Department will run $6.7 billion and receipts $5.3 billion, leaving a deficit of $1.4 billion. However, only the deficit is entered on the expenditure side of each of the three budgets, thus understating the dollar total of Government activities by more than $5 billion. Some indication of such "netting" is indicated from the official statement of "Gross Expenditures of Government-Administered Funds" which estimates fiscal 1968 spending at $210 billion. Clearly it will be no easy task for the study group to determine the best measure of total Federal activity.

Even if one had an acceptable measure of past expenditures, receipts, and the resulting deficits or surpluses, he could not make inferences regarding the fiscal impact of Government activities; i.e., whether fiscal policy was restrictive or expansionary. Under the exist-