

how it checks with the mimeograph copy. It does look very low I admit....

That's only one table, the number of children dying in these countries under the age of one year per 1,000 births, I am pretty sure that it's per 1,000. They have certain standard rates all over the world, but they vary. TB is per 100,000; maternity death rate is per 1,000 live births, what proportion of the mothers die in childbirth, but in all these different things it varies. I believe in infant mortality it is per 1,000 live births. Short of checking with the original copy, does that answer you Mr. Hollett?

**Mr. Hollett** Yes, but I want to be sure, because I have here the Canada year book for 1945 which gives the infant mortality rate by provinces and for the whole of Canada, and I find that in 1940 the infant mortality rate was 64 for the whole of Canada....

**Mr. Fogwill** I have a table showing the world rates for 1934-35-36, and this is somewhat similar to those quoted by Mr. Hollett. For the years 1921-25 the average is 98; in 1934 it was 72; 1935, 71; and 1936, 66.

**Mr. Ashbourne** I am glad Mr. Hollett brought up that matter. We have here the original script given to be mimeographed, and I notice that there are several changes made on this list. Perhaps Mr. Smallwood can explain because I believe he was responsible for this; for New Zealand the original he had was 22.6, and several of the others were corrected and altered to give other figures. It seems to me he has taken the wrong rate. I notice that New Zealand, Denmark and several others have been marked off, but the figure for Canada was left there. It seems as if an error was made.

**Mr. Smallwood** I notice too that some of the figures have been corrected in ink. I don't recall from memory, but Australia is raised from 18 up to 36 and Great Britain from 15 up to 54, USA from 17 up to 40, Denmark from 18.3 up to 45, South Africa from 25.3 up to 52, New Zealand from 22.6 up to 31. Evidently the wrong figures were typed in there in the first place and the corrected ones were written in. What strikes me as being possible is that Canada was also typed and not corrected. I expect that is what happened....

**Mr. Ashbourne** I think we want to get this report as correct as possible. I suggest that this be amended to read Canada 1936 — 1940, average

64, and down below, Canada 1941 — 60. I think that would cover it. As regards checking the others I would be only too glad if any member would do that, because we don't want any misleading information in our report....

**Mr. Butt** I suppose this table is given to show something of a picture of Newfoundland's assets. You will find that there is a little note on one of these tables which says that this figure of 64 does not include statistics for the territories. I point out that nine-tenths of the population of Canada runs straight across the American boundary. There is something like 1,400 miles from that up, and there is one tenth of the population in that area, and they have a problem of isolation something the same as we have. We ought to take into consideration the problem of isolation in this country as well. I know the problem we have in public health. It is serious and terrific. We should all give all the time and attention and energy that we can do it, but it strikes me as odd that we make ours out as a little worse than we need to. I think 64 would be a little high if you take in the isolated districts. I am only just trying to keep in my mind the fair picture of the problem in relation to our own and those of other countries.

**Mr. Smallwood** This figure of 93.5 per 1,000 is for Newfoundland and Labrador. The same thing applies to the other countries. You take the figure for all Newfoundland and you see how it stacks up against other countries. Naturally, you take the figure for all Newfoundland, and all the USA and all of Canada, not a part of it. We had figures for parts of Newfoundland which were much better than that, but the average for all Newfoundland and Labrador is 93.5 per 1,000 live births for 1943, but there are parts of the country that were deliberately left out of the report because we thought it would be queer to pick out certain parts. There was one part that was 210, another part 145.5, 118.4 ... another part is 43.5, another part 51, etc.... Taking the country as a whole with Labrador it is high, but it is dropping. The report gives the results from 1920 up to 1944, every year inclusive, and the rate is dropping. In 1944 it shot up again, but there is a general fall in the rate, in other words an improvement in the infant mortality rate. We have a long way to go but our rate is improving....

**Mr. Hollett** I am only interested in correcting the figures presented to us. Apparently there is a