otice only 50, 1,750 a weekly which, Mr. t of flour; , and two

es of such
be deemed
ous age, it
behind the

ital—which cities in the

nhabitants.

.. 12, 694.)

cach, Boston alf times its close of the of the veginat of 1790; ghteen years was 49 years rease is—on ensus makes

city that for umbered:

inhabitants.

444, 701.

wo and a half inst six times ly eight times imes in sixty cent. between Hamilton contains now (1852) over five times its population in 1836,—an interval of only sixteen years. In 1850, Montreal consained over three times that of 1816; Quebec fully two and one-eighth times—now over two and one-third—and Sorel about four and one-half times, or 6,646 inhabitants in the place of 1500.

Perchance we may be asked how our Canadian cities compare in growth with Cincinnati, or Saint Louis? Very favourably, we reply, as the following statistics prove:—

The population of Cincinnati was in 1850,—when it reached 115,590,—about twelve times its amount in 1820, (thirty years before,) when it numbered 9,642—[World's Progress, p. 245];—while Toronto had, in the same year (1850) eighteen times its population in 1817—that is, 33 years before; and has new (1852) over twenty-five and a-half times.

Davis's "Half Century" (p. 29) reports Cincinnati at only 82,0. J—nearly 24,000 less than the statement we have adopted. We have given the larger number, because being professedly taken from the census of 1850, we suppose it the more correct; and because too we would do our neighbour full justice.

Saint Louis contained in 1820, 4,597 inhabitants; and in 1850, 70,000—a trifle over fifteen times the previous number. Toronto, we have seen, had in the latter year, eighteen times its population in 1817.

During the last thirty years our growth has thus, in its rate, exceeded that of both these cities, which among those of the west hold first rank.

To the specimens already given of rise in the value of land in the rural districts, we add a few illustrative of what has been taking place in the towns and cities:

In 1840, the Government paid £19,000 for 32 acres of land in Kingston; part of a lot of 100 acres which had cost the party from whom the purchase was made £500. Bishop Macdonnell paid, in 1816, £500 for 11 acres in the same city. The front portion of the block was laid out in 1840, in quarter acre lots, which brought from £160 to £250 a-piece.

Perhaps it may be said that land in Kingston had, at the time in question, an undue value given it by the circumstance of the city's being made the scat of government. Be it so; Brantford has never been the scat of government: yet two lots in Colborne Street, which