

International Capital Inflows, Federal Budget Deficits, and Interest Rates, 1971–1984

Willie J. Belton, Jr.
Georgia Institute of Technology

Richard J. Cebula
Georgia Institute of Technology

This study investigates the impact of federal budget deficits on both short- and long-term interest rates from 1971 to 1984 within an open IS-LM model that includes net international capital inflows. Two time periods are examined using quarterly data: 1971.4 to 1984.4 and 1979.4 to 1984.4. Short-term rates are unaffected by the federal budget deficit in both periods. Long-term rates are an increasing function of the deficit over the 1971.4 to 1984.4 period, but are relatively unaffected by budget deficits during the 1979.4 to 1984.4 period. The evidence implies that net international capital inflows over the latter period offset the interest rate effects of the federal deficit.

INTRODUCTION

The impact of federal budget deficits on the rate of interest has been studied extensively.¹ Most of these studies focus on the short-term rate of interest, especially the three month U.S. Treasury bill rate or the four to six month commercial paper rate; a few of these studies focus on long-term rates of interest, such as the ten year U.S. Treasury note rate, the 20 year U.S. Treasury bond rate, the Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bond rate, or the Moody's Baa-rated corporate bond rate. The various studies have focused on different time periods, principally between the years 1954 and 1984.

There is no consensus regarding the interest rate impact of the budget deficit. Many of the studies that focus on the short-term rate of interest find that the deficit exercises no significant impact, although there are exceptions (cf. Barth, Iden, and Russek, 1984 and 1985; Cebula, 1987; Tanzi, 1985; and Zahid, 1988). A majority of the studies that focus on the longer-term rate of interest, however, find that the deficit does exercise a positive and significant impact, although there are a number of exceptions (cf. Evans, 1985 and 1987; Mascaro and Meltzer, 1983). Unfortunately, interpretation of results is complicated by differences in the time periods examined in the various studies. Several studies deal with the period 1955 to 1984; others deal with time periods such as 1979 to 1983 (using monthly data); still others begin with the year 1971 or 1972 or roughly the time period when the regime of fixed exchange rates (Bretton Woods) began to collapse and net international capital flows into the United States began to grow enormously. Because of the latter considerations, different time periods involve different macroeconomic circum-

¹ For example, see Barth and Bradley (1989), Barth, Iden, and Russek (1984, 1985), Barth, Iden, Russek, and Wohar (1989), Cebula (1987, 1988), Evans (1985, 1987), Feldstein and Eckstein (1970), Hoelscher (1983, 1986), Johnson (1992), Makin (1983), Mascaro and Meltzer (1983), McMillin (1986), Ostrosky (1990), Tanzi (1985), and Zahid (1988).

stances. Most of the studies dealing with the time period beginning in the early to late 1970s have two traits in common:

- They generally find that federal budget deficits in the United States do not influence interest rates; and
- They generally omit international capital flows from their models.

Johnson (1992, pp. 145-146) recently has observed that it is essential for us to "... understand why the data consistently support mutually exclusive views concerning the impact of debt financing. For a question that has far-reaching policy implications, this ambiguity is not acceptable." Accordingly, to identify the impact of federal budget deficits on interest rates in the United States from 1971 to 1984, this study seeks to investigate empirically the impact of both the choice of interest rate measure and of time period studied upon the interest rate impact of the federal budget deficit.

The model examined below uses quarterly data, deals with five different interest rate measures, includes net international capital inflows, and examines two different time periods. The empirical analysis demonstrates that both the choice of interest rate studied and the time period studied affect the empirical results obtained.

THE MODEL

The analysis is couched within the familiar IS-LM framework, although a standard loanable funds model can be shown to yield nearly identical conclusions. This study empirically examines the open economy version of the standard IS-LM model. As noted in Hoelscher (1986) and Johnson (1992), this model basically differs from the closed IS-LM model by including net international capital inflows [NCAP].

Following Cebula (1987), Evans (1985), Makin (1983), and Ostrosky (1990), we assert that, according to the IS-LM paradigm, the nominal rate of interest (R) is determined principally by real government purchases of goods and services (G), the real budget deficit (D), the real exogenously determined money stock (M), and expected inflation (P):

$$(1) R = R(G, D, M, P)$$

where we expect:

$$(2) R_G > 0, R_D > 0, R_M < 0, R_P > 0$$

with subscripts denoting partial differentiation.

Following Hoelscher (1986) and Johnson (1992), the open IS-LM model is a modified version of equation (1) that includes net international capital inflows (NCAP):

$$(3) R = R(G, D, M, P, \text{NCAP})$$

where we expect that:

$$(4) R_{\text{NCAP}} < 0.$$

The greater is the net inflow of foreign capital, the less is the upward pressure on R because the capital inflow in question acts to absorb newly issued debt.

Based on equations (2) through (4), we estimate a reduced form interest rate equation. In this system, aside from the interest rate and expected inflation, all of the explanatory variables are divided by variable Y_t , the actual level of GNP in the economy in quarter t . Variable Y_t is a standard measure of the size of the United States economy. We divide variables by Y_t for two reasons: first, it allows for the secular growth over time of variables in the system; second, government purchases, the budget deficit, open market operations, and net capital inflows should be judged relative to the size of the economy so that we have a relevant criterion against which to evaluate them and their magnitude.

The reduced form equation to be estimated is given by:

$$(5) R_t = a + bG_t/Y_t + cD_t/Y_t + dM_t/Y_t + eP_t + fNCAP_t/Y_t + u$$

where:

- R_t = The nominal average interest rate yield in quarter t , expressed as a percent per annum;
- a = Constant term;
- G_t/Y_t = The ratio of the seasonally adjusted federal government purchases of goods and services in quarter t to the seasonally adjusted GNP in quarter t , expressed as a percent;
- D_t/Y_t = The ratio of the seasonally adjusted total federal budget deficit (National Income and Product Accounts) in quarter t to the seasonally adjusted GNP in quarter t , expressed as a percent;
- M_t/Y_t = The ratio of M_t , which is defined as the average of the current and preceding quarters' values of the seasonally adjusted net acquisition of credit market instruments by the FED, to the seasonally adjusted GNP in quarter t , expressed as a percent;
- P_t = The expected inflation rate for quarter t , expressed as a percent per annum;
- $NCAP_t/Y_t$ = The ratio of seasonally adjusted net capital inflows in quarter t to the seasonally adjusted GNP in quarter t , expressed as a percent;
- u = Stochastic error term;

and where we expect that $b, c, e > 0$ and $d, f < 0$.

In accord with our objectives, we examine five nominal interest rates; that is, R_t assumes five different forms:

- TBR_t , the three month U.S. Treasury bill rate in quarter t ;
- CPR_t , the four to six month commercial paper rate in quarter t ;
- TEN_t , the ten year U.S. Treasury note rate in quarter t ;
- AAA_t , the rate on Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bonds in quarter t ;
- BAA_t , the rate on Moody's Baa-rated corporate bonds in quarter t .

These rates are all expressed as a percent per annum. These five rates are the most commonly studied rates in this literature.

The variable G_t consists strictly of federal government purchases of goods and services and does not include transfer payments (such as unemployment compensation and Social Security). Variable G_t is expressed in billions of current dollars.

The federal budget deficit, D_t , is the seasonally adjusted total federal budget deficit, expressed in billions of current dollars. Variable D_t consists of an exogenous component, the so-called structural deficit, and an endogenous component, the so-called cyclical deficit. (See Barth, Iden, and Russek, 1984 and 1985; Cebula, 1987 and 1988; Holloway, 1986; and Ostrosky, 1990.)

Variable M_t is adopted to reflect United States monetary policy. Following Barth, Iden, and Russek (1984; 1985), Cebula (1987), Hoelscher (1983), and Ostrosky (1990), M_t is computed as a two quarter moving average. M_t also is expressed in billions of current dollars.

The data for the expected inflation variable were obtained from Thies (1986).² These data are expressed as a percent per annum and are available through the end of 1984.

The variable $NCAP_t$ is the seasonally adjusted net foreign financial capital inflow into the United States in quarter t . This variable is expressed in billions of current dollars.

Finally, the seasonally adjusted GNP data (Y_t) are expressed in billions of current dollars. As shown in equations (5) and (6), we follow a number of earlier studies in principle, including Barth, Iden, and Russek (1984), Evans (1985; 1987), Hoelscher (1983; 1986) and Holloway (1986), and divide G_t , D_t , M_t , and $NCAP_t$ by Y_t ; as noted above, this is in part because the level of government purchases of goods and services, the budget deficit, monetary policy actions, and net capital inflows should be judged relative to the size of the economy.

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

The Hausman specification test rejects at the 5 percent level the null hypothesis of exogeneity for three of the explanatory variables in the reduced form interest rate equation: the budget deficit, expected inflation, and net international capital inflows.

Because the total budget deficit is partly endogenous, its inclusion in the analysis introduces the possibility of simultaneous equation bias. Accordingly, we estimate equation (5) using an instrumental variables (IV) technique, with the instrument being the two quarter lag of the seasonally adjusted quarterly unemployment rate of the civilian labor force (U_{t-2}). Our choice of instrument is based upon the fact that previous studies have used this same instrument satisfactorily to address the endogeneity of the budget deficit (Cebula, 1988; Ostrosky, 1990; and Barth Iden, Russek, and Wohar, 1989), as well as the finding that U_{t-2} systematically explains the deficit,³ whereas the contemporaneous error

² Thies (1986) constructs internally consistent time series of business price expectations for the post-World War II period. He uses regression analysis to construct a time series of price expectations based on extensive surveys of business price expectations. He pulls together information previously contained only in scattered and apparently different surveys to generate this new time series.

³ The relationship between the deficit variable and the lagged unemployment rate is shown in the following OLS estimate:

terms in the system are not correlated with the lagged unemployment rate. As the unemployment rate rises (falls), income tax collections should fall (rise) and government transfers rise (fall), thereby increasing (decreasing) the federal budget deficit automatically.

To allow for the endogeneity of the variable P_t , we include a second instrumental variable in our analysis: p_{t-2} , the two quarter lag of the actual inflation rate of the consumer price index. We chose variable p_{t-2} as the instrument because we found that it systematically explains P_t ,⁴ whereas the contemporaneous error terms in the system are not correlated with this lagged actual inflation rate.

Finally, to allow for the endogeneity of the capital flows variable, we adopt a third instrumental variable, the two quarter lag of the three year U.S. Treasury note rate, $TYTNR_{t-2}$. This choice of instrument is based on our finding that $TYTNR_{t-2}$ systematically explains the capital flows variable,⁵ whereas $TYTNR_{t-2}$ is not correlated with the contemporaneous error terms in the system.

The instrumental variables procedure involves first regressing the endogenous explanatory variables on the instruments and other exogenous variables, thereby generating fitted values for the endogenous explanatory variables. We then substitute the fitted values of these explanatory variables for their actual values.

This study examines two different time periods: 1971.4 to 1984.4 and 1979.4 to 1984.4. We begin with 1971.4 because it reflects the period during which the system of fixed exchange rates (Bretton Woods) began to collapse (Zahid, 1988). We end with 1984.4 because this is the last period for which the expected inflation series, obtained from Thies (1986), is available. We also examine a subperiod beginning with 1979.4, when there was a major shift in Federal Reserve policy to allow interest rates to seek their own levels. (See Cebula, 1987; Evans, 1985; and Zahid, 1988.)

Alternative time periods could have been studied. Nevertheless, we argue that our choice of time frames is appropriate and reasonable in terms of relevance to contemporary policy issues.

The IV estimates of equation (5) for our five nominal interest rates are provided in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 provides the estimates for the short-term rates TBR_t and CPR_t for

$$D_t/Y_t = -2.54 + 0.69 u_{t-2}, R^2 = 0.42, DW = 2.00, \text{Rho} = -0.03$$

$$(-3.31) \quad (+5.93)$$

where terms in parentheses are t-values. We use the Cochrane-Orcutt procedure to correct for first order serial correlation.

⁴ The relationship between P_t and p_{t-2} is shown in the following OLS estimation:

$$P_t = 1.61 + 0.26 p_{t-2}, R^2 = 0.50, \text{Durbin-h} = 2.13$$

$$(+2.10) \quad (+9.04)$$

where terms in parentheses are t-values. We use the Hildreth-Lu procedure to correct for first order serial correlation.

⁵ The relationship between $NCAP_t/Y_t$ and $TYTNR_{t-2}$ is shown in the following OLS estimation:

$$NCAP_t/Y_t = 0.01 + 0.61 TYTNR_{t-2}, R^2 = 0.36, DW = 2.05, \text{Rho} = -0.04$$

$$(+1.76) \quad (+3.80)$$

where terms in parentheses are t-values. We use the Cochrane-Orcutt procedure to correct for first order serial correlation.

Table 1—IV Estimates for Short-Term Nominal Interest Rates

Rate	Constant	G_t/Y_t	D_t/Y_t	M_t/Y_t	P_t	$NCAP_t/Y_t$	DW	Rho
1971.4 to 1984.4								
TBR_t	7.32 (1.54)	-0.32 (-1.34)	-0.18 (-0.79)	-1.98 (-1.81)	0.61 (3.65)	-0.26 (-2.15)	1.77	0.10
CPR_t	8.45 (1.69)	-0.36 (-1.19)	-0.31 (-1.23)	-1.53 (-1.70)	0.64 (3.67)	-0.25 (-2.12)	1.75	0.11
1979.4 to 1984.4								
TBR_t	6.17 (1.75)	-0.15 (-0.52)	0.05 (0.18)	-1.82 (-1.71)	0.70 (3.45)	-0.42 (-2.92)	1.78	0.08
CPR_t	7.02 (1.67)	0.14 (0.46)	-0.12 (-0.36)	-1.23 (-1.34)	0.67 (3.15)	-0.40 (-2.91)	1.77	0.08

Terms in parentheses beneath coefficients are t-values

TBR_t = The three month Treasury bill rate, as a percent per annum

CPR_t = The four to six month commercial paper rate, as a percent per annum

G_t/Y_t = The ratio of government purchases to GNP, as a percent

D_t/Y_t = The ratio of the budget deficit to GNP, as a percent.

M_t/Y_t = The ratio of net open market purchases to GNP, as a percent.

P_t = Expected inflation, as a percent per annum.

$NCAP_t/Y_t$ = The ratio of net capital inflows to GNP, as a percent.

All data are quarterly observations

Data sources are listed in the appendix

The instruments are U_{t-2} , P_{t-2} , and $TYTNR_{t-2}$, for D_t/Y_t , P_t , and $NCAP_t/Y_t$, respectively

each of the two time periods in question. Table 2 presents the estimates for the three long-term rates, TEN_t , AAA_t , and BAA_t , for each of the two time periods in question. All of the estimations in Tables 1 and 2 use the Cochrane-Orcutt procedure to correct for first order serial correlation.⁶

In Table 1, the only estimated coefficients that are consistently significant at acceptable levels (5 percent level or better) in explaining short-term rates are those for expected inflation and net capital inflows. The expected inflation variable has the hypothesized positive sign in all four estimations; the capital flows variable is negative, as expected. Thus, expected inflation appears to raise and net capital inflows appear to reduce short-term nominal rates.

In three of four cases the estimated coefficient on the monetary policy variable, M_t/Y_t , is significant at the 10 percent level with the expected negative sign; thus, there is evidence, albeit weak, that open market operations may have influenced short-term rates to some limited extent.

By contrast, the estimated coefficients on the deficit variable have the hypothesized positive sign in only one of the four estimates in Table 1, and in none of the four estimates is the coefficient significant at even the 10 percent level. Thus, in all cases the deficit variable fails to exercise a significant impact on the short-term rate of interest.

⁶ Unless we use the Cochrane-Orcutt procedure, the Durbin-Watson statistic lies between 1.36 and 1.71, which for five variables and roughly 50 or fewer degrees of freedom, lies in the range of indeterminacy where one cannot establish the absence of serial correlation definitively.

Table 2—IV Estimates for Long-Term Nominal Interest Rates

Rate	Constant	G_t/Y_t	D_t/Y_t	M_t/Y_t	P_t	$NCAP_t/Y_t$	DW	Rho
1971.4 to 1984.4								
TEN _t	5.64 (1.76)	0.19 (0.77)	0.69 (2.92)	-2.34 (-1.34)	1.05 (2.72)	-0.35 (-3.00)	2.07	-0.03
AAA _t	6.90 (1.52)	0.25 (0.51)	0.71 (2.81)	-2.17 (-1.32)	0.95 (2.88)	-0.33 (-2.71)	2.02	-0.01
BAA _t	6.41 (1.73)	0.35 (0.67)	0.87 (3.39)	-2.70 (-1.44)	1.10 (3.08)	-0.35 (-2.61)	1.95	0.03
1979.4 to 1984.4								
TEN _t	3.91 (1.56)	0.29 (0.48)	0.39 (1.71)	-2.07 (-1.28)	0.89 (2.50)	-0.49 (-3.59)	1.80	0.0
AAA _t	6.40 (1.24)	0.13 (0.20)	0.45 (1.75)	-2.33 (-1.51)	0.79 (2.35)	-0.52 (-3.60)	1.78	0.08
BAA _t	5.58 (1.55)	0.15 (0.24)	0.75 (2.19)	-2.49 (-1.64)	0.89 (2.66)	-0.60 (-3.68)	1.79	0.07
1981.4 to 1984.4								
BAA _t	5.54 (1.09)	0.10 (0.18)	0.67 (1.64)	-2.20 (-1.87)	0.90 (3.00)	-0.71 (-4.16)	1.80	0.08

Terms in parentheses are t-values

TEN_t = The ten year Treasury note rate, as a percent per annum

AAA_t = The Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bond rate, as a percent per annum

BAA_t = The Moody's Baa-rated corporate bond rate, as a percent per annum

G_t/Y_t = The ratio of government purchases to GNP, as a percent

D_t/Y_t = The ratio of the budget deficit to GNP, as a percent

M_t/Y_t = The ratio of net open market purchases to GNP, as a percent

P_t = Expected inflation, as a percent per annum

$NCAP_t/Y_t$ = The ratio of net capital inflows to GNP, as a percent

All data are quarterly observations

Data sources are listed in the appendix

The instruments are U_{t-2} , P_{t-2} , and $TYTNR_{t-2}$ for D_t/Y_t , P_t , and $NCAP_t/Y_t$, respectively

Because this finding holds for both of the time periods considered, it appears that short-term rates are insensitive to budget deficits, regardless of the time period studied. This conclusion is consistent with most of the related empirical literature dealing with short-term rates.

Table 2 provides the IV results for the three long-term rates. For the two time periods 1971.4 to 1984.4 and 1979.4 to 1984.4, 16 of the 30 estimated coefficients are statistically significant at the 5 percent level or better. Again, we find that expected inflation is a consistent explanatory variable: in all cases, it is significant at the 5 percent level or better with the hypothesized positive sign.

The deficit variable (D_t/Y_t) exhibits the hypothesized positive sign in all six estimations. It is statistically significant in three of the six cases at the 1 percent level; it is significant at the 5 percent level in one case; and it is significant at the 10 percent level in the remaining two cases.

The capital flows variable is negative (as expected) and significant at roughly the 1 percent level in all six estimations. The monetary policy variable is negative in all six estimates, but not significant at the 10 percent level.

Table 2 indicates that the budget deficit exercises a positive impact on all three nominal long-term interest rate measures for 1971.4 to 1984.4. For this period the budget deficit raised the long-term nominal rate of interest; this finding holds despite the impact of the statistically significant net capital inflows (which lowered that rate of interest).

For 1979.4 to 1984.4 the estimated coefficient on the net international capital inflows variable is negative, as hypothesized, and statistically significant in all cases. The budget deficit variable is significant at the 5 percent level in one of the three cases, but significant in the other two cases at only the 10 percent level. Thus, net capital inflows appear to exercise a negative and significant impact on all three nominal long-term rates for this period. At the same time, the budget deficit appears to raise the nominal rate only on Baa-rated corporate bonds, whereas the rates on ten year Treasury notes and Aaa-rated corporate bonds do not appear to be affected significantly by the budget deficit. Thus, we conclude that the choice of time period studied may influence the determined impact of the budget deficit, even on long-term rates.

Our conclusion is supported further by the finding that after 1981 the budget deficit did not exercise a significant impact on any of the long-term rates, including BAA_t . Table 2 also provides the IV estimate of equation (5) for interest rate BAA_t for the period 1981.4 to 1984.4. The estimated coefficient on the budget deficit variable is not significant at even the 10 percent level, whereas the coefficient on the capital flows variable is negative and significant at the 1 percent level. Thus, the deficit did not affect BAA_t , but capital inflows did reduce BAA_t . It appears that the impact of the budget deficit on the long-term rate is influenced significantly by the choice of study period.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

This study has examined the impact of the federal budget deficit in the United States upon a variety of short-term and long-term nominal interest rates within a standard open-economy IS-LM framework. Our principal findings are:

- The short-term nominal rate of interest consistently is unaffected by the federal budget deficit;
- The federal budget deficit appears to have had a positive and significant impact upon some nominal long-term interest rates;
- The conclusion that the federal budget deficit appears to have had a positive and significant impact upon some nominal long-term interest rates holds true for certain time periods but not all; for the most recent periods (those beginning after 1979.4), even the nominal long-term rate is relatively unaffected by the federal budget deficit.

The finding that long-term nominal rates of interest are apparently more sensitive to the budget deficit than short-term nominal rates is perhaps to be expected. For instance, in the context of a loanable funds model, Hoelscher (1986) also observes that, empirically speaking, the budget deficit may exercise an impact on the term structure: he alleges that the budget deficit raises the slope of the yield curve but does not provide any explanation

for this conclusion. On the other hand, within the context of a purely theoretical analysis of the IS-LM framework, Turnovsky (1989) and Turnovsky and Miller (1984) find that government deficits should be expected to exercise an impact on the term structure. Despite the existence of such supportive empirical findings (e.g., Hoelscher, 1986) and theoretical arguments (e.g., Turnovsky, 1989; Turnovsky and Miller, 1984), however, the issue at hand may warrant further analysis.

As for the effect of the choice of time period studied upon the interest rate impact of the budget deficit, an analysis (explanation) also would be desirable. The question seems to be: "Why would the deficit impact less upon the long-term rate during recent years than during earlier years?" The issue may be a rather complex one, but the answer to some large degree may involve the impact of international capital flows on interest rates. As shown in Table 2 (as well as in Table 1 and equation (6)), net capital inflows have acted to reduce nominal interest rates in the United States, especially for the period 1979.4 to 1985.4, although their impact is apparent even in the period beginning 1971.4. It may be that the comparatively massive net international capital flows into the United States, especially beginning with the early 1980s but existing in the late 1970s as well, absorbed large amounts of debt and thus served as a source of savings for the United States. This issue may be worth examining further, but is beyond the scope of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. Barth, James R., and Michael Bradley, "Evidence on Real Interest Effects of Money, Deficits, and Government Spending," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, 29 (Spring 1989), pp. 214-224.
2. Barth, James R., George Iden, and Frank S. Russek, "Do Federal Deficits Really Matter?" *Contemporary Policy Issues*, 3 (Fall 1984-1985), pp. 79-65.
3. Barth, James R., George Iden, and Frank S. Russek, "Federal Borrowing and Short Term Interest Rates: Comment," *Southern Economic Journal*, 52 (October 1985), pp. 554-559.
4. Barth, James R., George Iden, Frank S. Russek, and Mark Wohar, "Effects of Federal Budget Deficits on Interest Rates and the Composition of Domestic Output," *The Urban Institute* (1989), p. 87.
5. Cebula, Richard J., *The Deficit Problem in Perspective* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1987).
6. ———, "Federal Government Budget Deficits and Interest Rates: An Empirical Analysis for the United States, 1955-1984," *Public Finance/Finances Publiques*, 43, no. 3 (1989), pp. 337-348.
7. Evans, Paul, "Do Large Deficits Produce High Interest Rates?" *American Economic Review*, 75 (March 1985), pp. 68-87.
8. ———, "Interest Rates and Expected Future Deficits in the United States," *Journal of Political Economy*, 95 (February 1987), pp. 34-55.
9. Feldstein, Martin, and Otto Eckstein, "The Fundamental Determinants of the Interest Rate," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 52 (May 1970), pp. 363-375.
10. Hoelscher, Gregory, "Federal Borrowing and Short Term Interest Rates," *Southern Economic Journal*, 50 (October 1983), pp. 319-333.
11. ———, "New Evidence on Deficits and Interest Rates," *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 18 (February 1986), pp. 1-17.
12. Holloway, Thomas M., "The Cyclically Adjusted Federal Budget and Federal Debt: Revised and Updated Estimates," *Survey of Current Business*, 66 (March 1986), pp. 11-17.

13. Johnson, Colleen F., "An Empirical Note on Interest Rate Equations," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 32 (Summer 1992), pp. 141-147.
14. Makin, John, "Real Interest, Money Surprises, Anticipated Inflation, and Fiscal Deficits," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 65 (May 1983), pp. 374-384.
15. Mascaro, Angelo, and Allan H. Meltzer, "Long- and Short-Term Interest Rates in a Risky World," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 20 (March 1983), pp. 151-200.
16. McMillin, W. Douglas, "Federal Deficits and Short Term Interest Rates," *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 8 (Summer 1986), pp. 403-422.
17. Ostrosky, Anthony, "Federal Budget Deficits and Interest Rates: Comment," *Southern Economic Journal*, 56 (January 1990), pp. 802-803.
18. Tanzi, Vito, "Fiscal Deficits and Interest Rates in the United States," *IMF Staff Papers*, 32 (December 1985), pp. 551-576.
19. Thies, Clifford, "Business Price Expectations," *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 18 (August 1986), pp. 234-250.
20. Turnovsky, Stephen J., "The Term Structure of Interest Rates and the Effects of Macroeconomic Policy," *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 20 (August 1989), pp. 321-347.
21. Turnovsky, Stephen J., and Marcus H. Miller, "The Effects of Government Expenditure on the Term Structure of Interest Rates," *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 16 (February 1984), pp. 16-33.
22. Zahid, Khan, "Government Budget Deficits and Interest Rates: The Evidence Since 1971. Using Alternative Deficit Measures," *Southern Economic Journal*, 54 (April 1988), pp. 725-731.

Data Appendix

Variable	Source
P_t	Thies (1986, Table 2)
U_{t-2}	Holloway (1986)
TBR _t , CPR _t , TEN _t , AAA _t , BAA _t , TYTNR _{t-2}	<i>Economic Report of the President</i> : 1957, 1959, 1961, Table C-47; 1963, 1964, 1966, Table C-48; 1969, Table B-54; 1971, Table C-57; 1974, Table C-58; 1977, Table B-63; 1978, 1981, Table B-65; 1982, Table B-67; 1987, Table B-68
Y_t , G_t	<i>Economic Report of the President</i> : 1957, 1959, 1961, 1963, 1964, Table C-1; 1967, 1968, 1969, Table B-1; 1970, 1971, Table C-1; 1972, Table B-1; 1973, 1974, 1975, Table C-1; 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1986, 1989, Table B-1
M_t , NCAP _t	<i>Flow of Funds Accounts</i> , Federal Reserve System, 1955-1987, via DRI
D_t	<i>Economic Report of the President</i> : 1957, 1959, Table C-57; 1961, Table C-58; 1963, Table C-59; 1965, Table B-61; 1966, Table C-60; 1968, 1969, Table B-67; 1971, Table C-70; 1972, Table B-70; 1974, Table C-67; 1976, Table B-66; 1978, Table B-73; 1980, Table B-72; 1982, Table B-75; 1984, Table B-75; 1986, Table B-76; 1989, Table B-79
Pt-2	<i>Business Conditions Digest</i> , March 1988, p. 98.