

‘Wherever the population is increasing the amount of mortality is under-rated in consequence of there being an excess of young people in those numbers, which make the mortality appear lower than it really is. The mortality of London appears much less by statistics than it actually is; it is reduced in two ways by having a large influx of persons at the period of age when mortality is low, and by the departure and return of patients to the country to die, as consumptives for instance. The causes of disease in London are excessively active, as is seen, for instance, in the mortality of male children under five years of age, which is about 8 per cent. (*i.e.*, 80 per 1,000), while in some of the more healthy districts it is not more than 4 per cent.’ Again: ‘Of the 20,066,224 persons enumerated in England in 1861, nearly 11,000,000 were in the towns and 9,000,000 in villages and country around the towns. The total population in London and 71 of the largest towns in England was over 7,667,622, and the population in the country and in smaller towns was over 12,398,602, so that there are nearly eight-twentieths of the population in those 72 towns. The total increase from 1801 to 1861 in the population of England was over 11,173,688, and one-half of that increase was in those 72 towns. It will thus be apparent that the town population is increasing at a much more rapid rate than the country population.’ ‘The country population now is very nearly the same as it was in 1801. By a law, which at present is quite constant, the mortality