And you tend to get the kind of model, to be honest about it, in the President's Economic Report. It has never, in the time I can remember, said that the country is going to wrack and ruin in the year ahead, because we are doing all the wrong things. It always says there are a few adjustments needed and we are going to make them.

Chairman PROXMIRE. The President is elected and he has to look forward to an election perhaps or he has to think with more concern about other people who are up for election much more than the Federal Reserve Board. They are appointed, just one appointment for 14 years.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me they could have more objective critical——

Mr. NOYES. Perhaps.

Chairman PROXMIRE. And less political.

Mr. NOYES. Perhaps, but again, as I say, as long as you do not expect too much, I think the presentation of the sort of report you describe is probably a good idea.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Any other observations on that? I will be right back.

Congressman Reuss?

Representative REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This has been a most useful line of inquiry you have pursued with our witnesses, and a most useful set of hearings. I have read all the papers that have been presented, including the three excellent papers this morning. I unfortunately have not been able to get to the hearings until now, but I am delighted to be able to pursue some of the lines that the Chairman has been pursuing.

You three gentlemen and substantially all the other witnesses have said that the monetary policy followed by the Fed ought to be "discretionary", but I do not think that any of you mean by that that it ought to be philosophically chaotic and without any thinking through beforehand by the money managers of what the general guidelines ought to be.

Mr. HART. Oh, no.

Representative REUSS. By coming out in favor of what is said to be a purely discretionary policy, you are coming out against any artificial oversimplified congressionally legislated mandate, and saying this would not be good, but you are not saying that the Fed should fly by the seat of its pants or make monetary judgments by reading the entrails of animals.

It seems to me actually that the situation is not unlike the practice of medicine as it existed from the days of Hippocrates until about 150 years ago, where medical practice was confined mainly to leeching and blood letting, and did more harm than good.

It could be that monetary science is now in the position of medical science several generations ago, and that we are going to have to learn as we go.

Would you also agree that by and large the basic record that we have of monetary management—the published minutes of the Open Market Committee—give us only in the most general terms the rationale of the monetary policy of the Fed, and particularly in quantitative terms, it does not really tell us very much?