IV. *The United States and Britain—a present contrast.*

If we refer to the United States in particular, we immediately see a great improvement in recent years. First, the body of statistical material has grown; secondly, technical methods of statistical analysis are much better; thirdly, the funds and agencies for the laboratory work are much increased, with numerous endowed organizations for research. In this country it would, I think, be true to say that aggregated and national statistics have considerably improved, although we are still without any knowledge of total production, and have not much knowledge of changes in distribution of income and the net product, while our banking statistics are very difficult to interpret and not so complete as they used to be. But in the field of sampled or *ad hoc* inquiry we are very weak indeed, depending on the efforts of individual statisticians and research students, with very little team work. Our technical equipment is just as good in quality as that in the United States, but there are fewer craftsmen. This is partly because in the third respect we are completely behind the United States, and we have practically no endowed statistical inquiry. The London and Cambridge Economic Service has to rely largely on annual subscriptions from business firms. The importance of this difference cannot be exaggerated, for as Wesley Mitchell rightly says, the quantitative method, unlike the qualitative which needs only a thinker and his books and pencil, has to face a heavy burden of routine labour, computers, and field workers.

The list of institutions in the United States which are responsible for co-ordinated team work and diagnosis is now very imposing.

V. *Examples.* (*a*) *Time series with published statistics.*

It has been shown that there are two distinct aspects of statistical inquiry. In the *first*, the statistics are gathered and massed for their own sake, uniformities and variations are noticed, and hypotheses constructed