

health, education, and economic opportunity transcend local concern? It is fitting that these questions should be explored by competent students before the inevitable demand for legislative correctives becomes strong.

CLYDE V. KISER

• • •

A CANADIAN STUDY OF HEALTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT¹

IN the United States there has been a tendency to use the survey method for the study of health in relation to economic factors, although there are isolated studies, such as that of Diehl,² in which the clinical method is used. The Canadian approach, as summarized by Marsh and his collaborators, is a comparatively diversified one with emphasis, however, on the clinical approach.

The first three chapters, constituting Part I, review the field covered by the book and the work done in other countries. The publications of Sydenstricker, Falk, Collins, and Perrott are ably summarized, together with the results of the Health and Depression studies.

The next six chapters make up Part II and detail the findings of the clinical examination of a thousand unemployed men, as contrasted with those of a large group of employed men. The reader is given a very adequate basis for interpreting the factual findings here, for the characteristics of the sample are well presented, many sources of bias eliminated and such as could not be avoided are indicated so clearly that critical comment on the adequacy of the sample and the comparability of the control group could be taken from the authors. Part III takes up the results of examinations of a smaller group of unemployed young men between 14 and 18 years of age, studied with respect to the prevalence of defects in different socio-economic groups.

Part IV considers data assembled on the family as a whole from social agency records, available data on children, with particular reference to nutritional status, and minimum standard budgets. A final section, Part

¹ A REVIEW OF HEALTH AND UNEMPLOYMENT by Leonard C. Marsh in collaboration with A. Grant Fleming and C. F. Blackler. Oxford University Press, 1938.

² Diehl, H. S.: Physical Condition and Unemployment. *Public Health Reports*, November 15, 1935, Vol. 50, Part 2, p. 1610.

v, surveys medical services for the indigent and unemployed in various sections of Canada, emphasizes the uneven distribution of these and suggests needed reforms.

The chapters on medical findings in the unemployed and employed groups support, with reservations, the thesis that ill health and unemployment are related. The reader is left with the impression that the routine medical examination approach offers at present a qualitative test of the existence of this relationship rather than a quantitative measure of it. For more extensive results and to amplify the conclusions which can be drawn from the data it would seem advisable to modify the examination or to supplement it somewhat. A useful form of supplement is inferred in Chapter 10 where observations on the mental status and the home environment of the unemployed are made, and the impression given that an intensive study of these factors would have an important bearing on the problem of unemployment and health.

Comments on the somewhat limited returns from the method of approach used in this study should not, however, detract from the value of such findings as are obtained. One of the advantages of this approach—and undoubtedly the reason it was used here—is that quite factual data are obtained. It is noteworthy that the results in general tally with those obtained by other methods and that the recommendations of this group of investigators are also in line with those growing out of similar independent studies in the United States.

In addition to the presentation of useful data, the authors make a contribution in the form of temperate and judicial evaluation: in fact, they introduce their subject as “an essay in interpretation” and as a plea for further research.

RALPH E. WHEELER

ERRATUM

*A Study of Mortality Among Individuals with Active
Pulmonary Tuberculosis*, by Jean Downes

The Milbank Memorial Fund *Quarterly*, Vol. xvi, No. 3, July, 1938,
page 308, footnote 10, Column 3 of the table, *Differences*:

for 5.1 ± 0.55 please read 5.1 ± 0.88

for 37.6 ± 0.90 please read 37.6 ± 1.77