WILEY

Review

Author(s): M. G.

Review by: M. G.

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 82, No. 1 (Jan., 1919), pp. 90-91

Published by: Wiley for the Royal Statistical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2340738>

Accessed: 25-06-2016 19:11 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wiley, Royal Statistical Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*

And now, having thanked Mr. Ormerod for what he has done, and pointed out what he couldn't do, let us end by pointing to a slip or two.

At p. 10 he speaks of "something more than the baits said to have been held out by the historian Fuller" when he means that Fuller said they were held out. At p. 32 he says "and, despite the progress in machinery, even to-day the best and most durable woollen materials are made by hand." We ask, Where? At p. 48 he makes unqualified the statement that "woollens . . . are many times heavier and bulkier than worsteds," when he means that *on the average* they are so. Some worsteds are heavier and bulkier than the average woollens, by several ounces to the yard. At p. 51 the statement that during the war "Not only was there a call for every available pound of wool sheared since the war began, but old stocks were drawn upon to their utmost limit" gives the wrong impression. It is true in Europe, but the stock of wool in Australia, &c., is enormous. At p. 51 he uses the phrase "totally inadequate," which, if we understand it, means literally that in this connection there was no shipping at all! Mr. Ormerod means "very inadequate."

But these are small blemishes, easy of correction when a new edition is called for, as it will soon be if the book gets the sale it deserves. G.H.W.

5.—*Use of Factory Statistics in the Investigation of Industrial Fatigue—A Manual for Field Research.* By Philip Sargant Florence, M.A., Ph.D. (A separate issue of vol. lxxxix of *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, issued by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) 153 pp. 1a., 8vo. New York and London: P. S. King and Sons, 1918. Price \$1 25 cents.

This volume deals with a subject of the highest importance, The study of industrial fatigue absorbed much of the time of the Health of Munitions Workers Committee during the War, and a new authority has now been constituted and entrusted with the expenditure of a considerable sum of public money upon furthering our knowledge of the subject. Some investigators have already been appointed, and in the near future a large staff will be engaged in the elucidation of a cardinal problem of industrial organisation; consequently a demand exists for guides to field work. Dr. Florence, who was for some time a member of the Health of Munitions Workers Committee's staff and has since filled a similar post in America, has had considerable practical experience of research work, and his book contains a good many useful hints for the beginner and valuable warnings as to the pitfalls which yawn at the feet of the unwary. He rightly insists upon what he terms the ambiguity of records and gives several helpful illustrations from his own experience. His chapter on "The Output Rate" deserves praise in this connection.

While we think that most investigators would derive useful instruction from Dr. Florence's book, we cannot honestly say that it is a

very good one. Although the title introduces the word statistical, statistical aspects of the subject are dismissed in the fewest possible words, the reader being advised to obtain the needed information in "any elementary manual of statistical theory." *En revanche*, Dr. Florence continually indulges in language which reminds us of Macaulay's criticism of Gladstone. "He has one gift most dangerous" to a speculator, a vast command of a kind of language, grave and "majestic, but of vague and uncertain import." The explanation is that Dr. Florence has attempted too much and been led to write about matters which he has not yet had time to study adequately. This is especially obvious in the sections devoted to Occupational Mortality Rates and the Measurement of Labour Turnover, respecting which subjects Dr. Florence is a very unsafe guide; the interpretation of occupational mortality rates is undoubtedly a difficult task, but the valuable literature is more extensive, and the conclusions therefrom more important than the readers of this work would suppose.

We do not wish to part from a young investigator whose zeal deserves encouragement in any spirit of hostile criticism, and we shall look forward with interest to future contributions from his pen. M.G.

6.—*Postal Savings: an Historical and Critical Study of the Postal Savings Bank System in the United States.* By Edwin W. Kemmerer, Professor of Economics and Finance, Princetown University. viii + 176 pp., 8vo. Princeton, N.J.: University Press; London: Milford, 1917. Price \$1.25 net.

The postal savings system of the United States was created in 1910. At that time there were existing 11,000 national, state, and other banks "carrying" the savings of 15,000,000 depositors, amounting to more than 1,000 million pounds sterling. By the Postal Savings Bank Act the interest allowed to depositors was fixed at 2 per cent., little more than half the average rate allowed by other banks. At the latest return available to the author (1916) the number of post offices open for savings bank business was 8,421. That the deposits in many of them are as yet small leads him to infer that there is "ample room for the use of the pruning "knife." Instead of the pass book a certificate is issued in an envelope. Deposits were to be made only in sums of \$1 or a multiple thereof, and no person was to deposit more than \$100 in a calendar month or \$500 in the whole. On June 30, 1916, the number of depositors was 600,000, the amount deposited 17 million pounds sterling. On May 18, 1916, the monthly limitation was repealed, the interest-bearing limit raised to \$1,000, and authority given to receive deposits, not bearing interest, up to another \$1,000. This authority had not been acted upon when the author wrote. In the investment of the funds, there is a noteworthy divergence from the English system. Not less than 65 per cent. of the total deposits is to be kept in solvent banks, to bear interest at not less