

Now, I would like to point out, however, some difficulties that I anticipate, that you undoubtedly have anticipated. But I would like to have your help in knowing what we can do to help with Congress, because I anticipate there is going to be some objection to this in Congress.

No. 1, it seems to me there is likely to be objection on the grounds that you ask for the administrative budget to disappear. And to the best of my knowledge in the past what happens is you usually come in with a new proposal or concept, and let it live side by side with the old one and hope by emphasis that time will erode away the old, and the merits of the new will let it prevail.

I am delighted to see you are not going by that uncertain route, because on the basis of all my experience what would happen is that the old one would only disappear if it were to the political convenience of the Congress and the President to make it disappear, not on the basis of what the merits are.

But the difficulty—and I say this as a member of the Appropriations Committee—is that there is a reason for the administrative budget. The administrative budget best represents what the impact of appropriation is and, of course, of revenues, on the surplus or deficit, and ultimately on the national debt.

The trust accounts are left aside, I presume, if for no other reason, in part because we do not have the same degree or kind of control over the highway fund and the social security fund and so forth—they are considered as fairly—they balance themselves. They sometimes are in deficit and sometimes in surplus.

So it is going to be hard to persuade the members of the Appropriations Committee to go along with this. And what brings this to mind especially is in looking at—comparing the three present major budget concepts with yours, in terms of the deficit—now, in 1966 I notice that the administrative budget was in deficit by \$2.3 billion—this is on page 83 of your report—the cash budget was \$3.3 billion in deficit, the NIA budget was \$3 billion in surplus. And your proposed budget was \$8.4 billion in deficit.

This is quite a stark and sharp contrast, especially on the NIA budget, but all the way through.

In other words, the President at that time could say that our budget was pretty close to balance. But the budget you have would indicate a deficit that would concern many Members of the Congress and the public.

In 1967 you have roughly the same kind of thing, although the administrative budget that year was almost \$10 billion in deficit. The cash budget and the NIA budget were both much smaller than that. Your budget was larger, almost \$13 billion in deficit.

In 1968 you have another situation in which the administrative budget is \$8.1 billion in deficit—this I presume was before the latest nightmares we have had about what happened in Vietnam, various things that have increased our spending—and cash budget, \$4.3 billion, the NIA budget only \$2.1 billion, and your budget is \$10.3 billion in deficit.

Now, looking at all of these, putting all these things together, it would seem that the Members of the Congress are going to take a look at these figures, and especially those of us who are on the Democrat side, and have to bear the political brunt of criticism for deficit financ-