

above regarding the importance of rates relative to liquidity preference, somewhat increased emphasis is placed on the importance of interest rates as a cost factor to borrowers. Rationing by lenders, however, is considered to be of great significance. What can we conclude from this excursion through more than twenty years of *Issues and Functions*, through many aspects of central banking theory about which, it should again be stressed, there is little or no consensus within the profession? Many conclusions are possible regarding the evolution and present state of particular doctrines. However, I would

like to emphasize a conclusion of a somewhat different nature. Without regard to the merits of specific positions, past or present, it is obvious, at least from this particular chain of evidence, that the thinking of the monetary authorities has not been parochial or dogmatic. It has instead been eclectic, pragmatic, and responsive to both experience and discussion within the profession. It has shown itself capable of change and adaptation in light of trends in both economic conditions and economic analysis. A word of commendation is in order, after which we can, with better conscience, return to the fray.

