

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Montreal is greatly obliged to the gentleman who has furnished us with a series of statistical articles. * * * * * In these articles he shows the fallacy which has hitherto led us astray; namely, comparing the mortality of a city where the birth-rate is high with other cities where it is low. * * * * * To make this plain, let us suppose that in London there are 30 children under one year to every 1000 of the community, whilst in Montreal there are 60. Take then, again, for example, the death-rate in each case of the infants under one year at 16 per cent. and of all the rest at 2 per cent. and we have:—

LONDON.		MONTREAL.	
970 at 2 per cent.....	19.4	940 at 2 per cent.....	18.8
30 at 16 "	4.8	60 at 16 "	9.6
<hr/>		<hr/>	
1000	24.2	1000	28.4

The whole mortality is thus increased from a little more than 24 persons per 1000 to 28 per 1000, though the sanitary state in the two places, both as to infants and adults, and the percentage of death in both classes, is precisely the same! But great as is this difference, that of the infant mortality is very much greater,—the one being 0.48 while the other is 0.96 per cent. of the population, or exactly double; and yet, as before stated, the healthiness of both places is precisely equal.—*Witness*, 24th Aug.

The article will be read in England with a degree of interest little inferior to what it will excite here. For the present, we merely call attention to the subject, and hope that our contemporaries, who have had so much to say about the fearfully high rate of infant mortality in Montreal, will give an equal amount of publicity to the views of our correspondent.—*Daily News*, 25th Oct.

We draw the attention of the Sanitary Association and Dr. Carpenter, to an article which appeared yesterday on the fourth page of the *Daily News*, and which refutes, in the most crushing manner, several of the statements advanced by that learned statistician.—*Nouveau Monde*, 26th Oct.

We find in one of the late numbers of the *Daily News*, an important anonymous article, but which is, nevertheless, carefully digested, upon the subject of the sanitary condition of the city. It is a relation of the last report of Dr. Carpenter, whose figures and statistics it shows to be false by means of official proof. We do not wish to mix ourselves up with this discussion, further than to point out to Dr. Carpenter the necessity there is for him to explain himself, and to advise the Corporation to do nothing before the question shall have been settled.—*L'Ordre*, 25th Oct.

VITAL STATISTICS.—The deductions from the mortality returns of the city of Montreal drawn by Dr. Carpenter, have led to a somewhat important contribution to the discussion of this important subject. The writer is a gentleman who from his knowledge of figures and the attention he has given for some years to the consideration of the laws which regulate the growth of the population is entitled to be heard with respect and his statements carefully examined. * * * * * He shows that Montreal, instead of being the "plague spot" described by Dr. Carpenter, in reality enjoys fully more than an average exemption from infant mortality.

* * * * * Other tables show, according to the writer's figures, that Montreal is more healthy than London and Glasgow, and much more healthy than Manchester. Should these statements be correct, and from the very cursory examination we have yet been able to make of them, it seems difficult to disprove them, it is of the utmost importance they should be known, so as to remove the charge always brought against Montreal in this respect.—*Herald*, 28th October.

THE SANITARY ASSOCIATION.— * * * * * It is quite impossible to convey even a faint idea of the complete destruction of the whole of the arguments of Dr. Carpenter. The castle in the air has vanished. The Sanitary Association, like a class of beggars who extort money by exhibiting their sores, delighted in representing Montreal as a polluted Queen, swollen with drink and debauchery, and covered with all manner of filth. But "Experience" has torn away the rags with which Dr. Carpenter had clothed her, and she steps forth glowing with health, young and

" Beautiful as Ruth among the corn,
Or Rebekah by the stoney well."

Star, 28th October.

The writer of the paper signed "*Experience*," which we published some days ago showed how grossly wrong were the figures on which Dr. Carpenter relied in those papers of his, which attracted very much attention, and which described our fair city as an exceedingly murderous place for infants—one of the most destructive places, in fact, under the sun. It is satisfactory to find that it is not so bad as represented, in fact, not worse but better, than many other places.—*Gazette*, 8th Nov.