

4th November, 1955.

My dear Oscar,

For many years I have refrained from the controversial discussion of the tests of significance associated with the names of Behrens and Welch, although, as the discussion organized round Miss Creasy's paper last year shows, a great many people seem inclined to discuss them.

For my own part, for the matter had been discussed in theory about 20 years ago in some detail, I did not think it was worth wrestling further with an argument which certainly appeared to me to be fallacious, unless, and until, their results were offered in numerical form to practical statisticians. Indeed I scarcely expected that Pearson would stretch his neck out so far as to do so, but now that Table 11 of Pearson and Hartley has been published, the question cannot be avoided as to whether it is always grossly misleading, or whether there are any practical cases allowing legitimately of its use.

In any case so much propoganda has been devoted to assuring us of the merits of this "solution" that it is necessary to point

out that the actual effects of its use are very different from those which one would be led to expect. Perhaps one beneficial result of such an examination may be to reveal the flimsiness of the grounds on which Behrens' solution was so dogmatically rejected.

I should like to publish in the Statistical Society Journal, and if you would like us to supply the printer with a cleaner copy than the enclosed please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Enc.