

condition that the mortality of the country is probably not much greater than that recorded."

These remarks are confirmed by another article in the same magazine, in April 1867. Every Englishman knows that the death-rate in all England, is about 2.2 per cent., or 1 in 45 of the living, but the tables of which the essayist writes, give to Upper Canada a death-rate of only .82 per cent., or 1 in 124; and to Lower Canada, 1.31 per cent., or 1 in 76! In England in the 4 years 1838-1841 the lowest apparent death-rate was in the South Western division, 1 in 54 (in equal numbers of males and females); and this rate was attained under the very low birth-rate of 2.967 per cent., or the second lowest in all the divisions.

Before comparing the rate of mortality in Montreal, with that which has obtained in other cities, it may be well to point out that we are not to reason like Dr Farr, in the appendix to the Fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General, when he says,—“Wherever from the combined effects of intemperance, dirt, bad ventilation and drainage, the mortality is greatest, there also the ratio of births to the population is the highest.” *But we must say, wherever the ratio of births to the population is the highest, there also the mortality is greatest; and, the conditions being equal, will be in proportion to the birth-rate.* Commenting on Dr. Farr's observation, Charles A. Coke in “The Census of the British Empire,” in 1861, p. 83, selects two groups of districts in the Metropolis. The 1st includes St. Giles and Whitechapel, showing a birth-rate of 33 in 1000 and a death-rate of 27 in the 1000. The 2nd includes London City Union, and St. James, Westminster, and shows a birth-rate of $26\frac{1}{2}$ in the 1000, and a death-rate of $22\frac{1}{2}$ in 1000. He then writes, “These combinations or comparisons show extraordinary results. In group 1 there is the greater mortality existing,—at the same time the greater increase of births. In group 2, as if in defiance of all natural law, with a decreased mortality, with more health—more vigor, we have a decrease in the number of births, and hence the scientific observations of Dr. Farr are here fully confirmed.” Mr. Coke is a compiler of statistics, but does not understand them. If $26\frac{1}{2}$ births in 1000, in group 2, gives $22\frac{1}{2}$ deaths in 1000, 33 births in group 1 should give 28 deaths, so that the result is, of course, in accordance with all “Natural law.” If the figures are reliable, group 1 is more healthy than group 2, as it actually produces children at a loss of 27 per 1000 instead of 28, the proportionate rate and did so on the average of 10 years 1850-1860.

The Registrar-General, Major George Graham, makes the same mistake; in the official report quoted by Mr. Coke on page 86, he says: “It is a fact well worthy of notice, that the county of Lancashire, with a population less than that of London by about 380,000