

According to the census, Montreal had 1-6th of its population under 5 years of age, while London had only 1-9th; in other words, there were in Montreal nearly one-half more children under 5 years than there were in London. So that, if the cities were equally healthy, the deaths of children, in Montreal, under 5 years, must have been one-half more than in London. The number alive in Montreal under one year is clearly incorrect, as the average number of baptisms in 1860 and 1861 is 803 more than in the census, so that at least 808 should be added to the number under one year. In the *Canadian Naturalist* for April, 1867, there is a table intended to show the number of deaths under 5 years compared with 1000 deaths at all ages in Montreal, London, &c. Montreal seems to have more than one-half more deaths than London, and relying on this mode of comparison there is much said about "the slaughter of the innocents in Montreal." Will it be credited that the essayist states the London death-rate of children under 5 years is below the average, because of the large immigration of adults, and yet, having made a table which shows that the children in Montreal were 1-6th of the population, makes no allowance for the increased proportion, but actually believes that, *the death-rate of children under 5 years should be below the average as in London, and for the same reasons.* The numbers used by the essayist in this table are from the Census returns, and may be relatively correct, although containing only two-thirds of the burials recorded at the Cemeteries. Throughout the whole of the essay, the still-born in Montreal, nearly 8 per cent., of the burials, are included among the deaths under one year, while the rate of mortality in England is calculated on the number living, and shows the actual deaths. It must now be evident that, before we can compare the relative number of deaths under any given age, with deaths at all ages, we must know the proportionate numbers living at the specified ages in the different cities. The large proportionate number of children in Montreal, makes them constitute a large proportion of the deaths. Table I. furnishes a reply to the essayist's argument. In Montreal the burials, including still-born, are only 74 per cent. on the baptisms, while in London the deaths are 86 per cent. on the births. The high birth-rate is the cause of the fallacy in both arguments. But the one is as good as the other, though both are deceptive.

Table III. exhibits the *apparent* rate of mortality in Montreal, compared with London, &c. The number of still-born in Montreal is calculated at 7.866 per cent. on burials, the average rate of 6 years, according to the register of the Mount Royal Cemetery, and is certainly below the average of the whole city. The number of still-born in the other cities is calculated at the rate observed in Glasgow in 11 years from 1840. The total burials in Montreal were 3181. The deaths