

Glasgow, Blyths-
and in another
given, but from
years 1855-1857,
were respectively
proportionate death-rate
to the proportion
Anderston was more
these years the
2.841 per cent.
ratio of Blyths-

of life, has made
would not be
inks that the rate
; which it would
age is much less
births. The mean
od, 21 in Ander-
ongest in Blyths-
birth-rate. The
course, the rate of
g population, but
the average, the

le by the rate of
rate, is clearly
(n, 1851 page 18.)
ed Kingdom and
and not from an
elined; it is said
the proportion of
33.66; while the
re diminished in
d have been only
of 1817, so that,
e French conti-
the same ratio,
generations. In
he above is an
to the Bills
years, in pro-
uring the sixty
ple lived longer.
ngland, in 1811,
9. The evidence

given before the Committee of the House of Commons in May, 1830, confirmed these rates. The imperfect registration of the years 1837-1842, gave an average of 1 death in 46, so that, it is not likely, that the Census returns were correctly made. But the Parish Registers in England are not more reliable than the Clergy returns in Montreal. "The annual mortality of the county of Middlesex; the largest proportion of whose population belongs to the Metropolis, was, according to the Parish registers" only 1 in 53 in 1840: but the Civil register shows that it was 1 in 42. (Porter's Progress page 27.) Is it surprising, that it has been said that everything is true, but facts and figures?

The conflicting evidence of the Census and Parish registers suggests the question. On what authority is the following statement made? "It has been proved that the population of some of the States of North America has, after making the most ample deduction on account of immigrants, continued to double for a century, in so short a period as twenty, or, at most, five and twenty years, &c." (McCulloch on Population in Smith's Wealth of Nations: Senior's "Political Economy," &c., &c.) Such a rate of progression would require an increase of 3 per cent. per annum, and a birth-rate, three times greater than that of the United Kingdom.

On page 13 of Dr. Carpenter's third essay it is stated that, in Boston in 1867 "the yearly rate of deaths among 5500 children under 1 year" was 23.3 per cent. If such was the case, then Boston should have had a birth-rate of 4.22 per cent. else the death-rate of infants was greatly in excess of the proportionate rate in Montreal and even of that of London. If Boston had so high a birth-rate, exceeding that of Glasgow, its character has hitherto been very much misrepresented.

In Dr. Carpenter's essays the still-born are included among the deaths, so that no comparison can be made with returns in which the *deaths are calculated on the number living*. On page 13 it is said "that of the total deaths in the year only 24 per cent. in Boston were under one year, instead of 46 per cent. in Montreal." The statement regarding Montreal is entirely wrong. (See his table on page 10, where it is stated that 201 still-born are included.) Deducting the number of still-born, the deaths are less than 42 per cent. of the *burials*, and only 43.6 per cent. of the *deaths*. In Montreal, the Catholics do not return the number of still-born, and as the rate used in this article is the average of 6 years among the Protestant population, there can be no doubt but that, in 1867, when the mortality was above the average, the number of still-born was at least 7.866 per cent. on the burials, or 351 instead of 201. If such was the case, then the deaths of infants