So many people feel it could not be worse.

Mr. HART. But you do not really want to take their discretion away, do you? You are just a little unhappy in the way they have used it.

Senator Proxmire. We want them to explain it in detail as they

have gone off the beam, why they have done so.

Mr. Harr. That is right, and I think everybody would welcome an explanation. I do not mind the peg point, so to speak. If you want to name 2 to 8 percent it sounds all right to me, but if you convey the implication that somehow this is the right range, and that any departure from it is somehow a very exceptional thing, I just wonder what its impact on Board policy would be.

Personally, I would rather see a sort of quarterly report, in which the Board explained what it had done on each one of these major

variables.

I doubt if you could really ask them to explain the total credit flow.

Senator Proxmire. Yes.

Mr. HART. Because there are a lot of things that I do not suppose they can control or perhaps even explain to you. But you certainly can ask them to explain their own actions.

Senator Proxmire. I think, looking at it from the standpoint of a

scholar, Mr. Hart, which I am sure you are

Mr. Hart. Not a very good one.

Senator Proxmire (continuing). And an expert in this area, I think

that that probably would be more satisfactory.

Looking at it from the standpoint of a Senator, a Member of Congress, I think that something as clear, as simple as the money supply, a focus of that kind and range will get a more desirable dialog begun between the two.

Mr. Harr. Why can't you tell them, then, that since the long-term growth in the money supply is 4 percent or something like that, more or less like the economy, you would like an explanation when it exceeds this level.

Get away from the idea that there is something wrong about

exceeding or falling short of this level.

Senator Proxmire. They have been wrong in the past. We want to do more than say the long range is this and in the future we hope to do this. We want to say that our feeling is that whenever you gentlemen have had these drastic fluctuations in the money supply in the past you have almost always been wrong, not because they have not been right about the conditions at the current time, but because, as has been documented repeatedly, there are lags between the time they put a policy in effect and the time it has an effect on incomes, gross national product, and so forth. The lag is substantial.

Mr. Harr. As you point out, there have been periods when there is virtually no growth and they may have been wrong there, so you get it both ways. The proper range, in other words, may be a very wide

one for best public policy.

Senator Proxmire. Let me ask—I am so delighted to have Congressman Reuss here because he has contributed so tremendously as a member of the committee.

Mr. Gaines. Mr. Chairman, could I say——