"discussion of medical " without either Asso-

f the near future, and e superficial observer. es on from the north. h-rate for some parts In the city of Mont-000, and the French the largest birth-rate ation, absorption, are our large birth-rate, of the States of the

address should end, medical friends, and I venture to touch tal moment. It is at in certain classes for a long time past ed, not as a Divine on of the species, To use his own he artificial wants is irksome; chilaternity must be ries of 'nameless ." In those few en, are contained rming decline of it, a gradual and zation. This, in nduced organizaw to enter upon ng reserved and lluded to is but id of population some very emiwhen the birth-

rate, in the United States, was as large as in Europe, or in any part of the world. In round figures the States doubled their number, from births alone, every twenty-five years. How is it now? Vital statistics are as yet too incomplete to base any accurate calculation for all the States of the Union, but those of Massachusetts and Rhode Island are most trustworthy, and afford information that is appalling.

The registration reports for Rhodo Island, which I have just received from Dr. Snow, than whom no one is more competent, show an immense falling off in the birth-rate in that state, and leave but little room for conjecture as to the cause. Those of Massachusetts are equally significant; and were they not furnished as State Documents with all the weight of authority, I should not dare to allude to them.*

I fully admit the statement of Dr. Edward Jarvis that: "Massachusetts is one of the most favoured states in the world for the intelligence, at least of its native population, and for their thrift and wisdom in management." In the fifteen years preceding 1870 of the children born in the state only 13.91 per cent. died in their first year—the smallest infantile mortality, excepting Norway, in the whole world. And when it is added that this mortality "includes the record of the foreigners, whose infant mortality was in a larger ratio, as well as that of the native families whose infant mortality was at a lower rate than this average," it may be seen how devoted, how intelligent is the care of the New England mother of her infant.

^{*} The population of Rhode Island last year was 258,239, of these, classed by nativity the foreign born were 71,630, and the native 186,669. I continue Dr. Snow's figures: the report of births for 1875 gives 6,508, divided as follows:—American, 2,727; foreign, 2,906; mixed 875. The birth-rate for 20 years, says Dr. Allan, has steadily decreased among the Americans, but increased with the foreign, so that in 1875 the foreign had 58 per cent of the births in the state. Dr. Snow adds:—The native American population of Rhode Island, by parentage, has increased 12.89 per cent in ten years, while the foreign population, by parentage, has increased 811 per cent in the same time. In 10 years at the same rate the native population of Rhode Island would be 152,087 and the foreign 222,466.

In two years (1874-5) 8,221 married women in Providence, born in the United States, and of on age to bear children, had 2,532 children; while 5,919 married women of the same ages, born in foreign countries, had 2,912 children in the same time; that is, says Dr. Nathan Allan, the foreign married women, 2,302 less in number than the American married women, had 380 children more. If the American married women had had, in the years 1874-5, the same percentage of children age, instead of 2,532, a gain of 1,512 children. If the comparison is made between the American and Irish alone, by parentage, the former class would have had 4,249 instead of 2,532, the actual number, which would show a gain of 67 per cent in two years. I have selected Rhode Island because the system of Registration is singularly correct; and I have taken the ipissima verba of the reports. The statistics of many other states are equally appalling. Those of Massachusetts especially so.