

thus, J. S. Mill, and Dr. Dugdale, and practised by the French peasant? Admirable as was the thrift and industry of the French peasant, he (Dr. Farr) could no more hold that England was called upon to practice his social philosophy than to revolutionize our agriculture by either cutting up the land into infinitesimal parcels, or ceasing to employ in its culture the several capitals of the landlord in acres, the farmer in stock, the labourers in thews, sinews and inherited skill. Many current French statisticians now regarded with apprehension the declining population of France. This policy was put forward to lessen the misery of the working classes and to raise their wages by lessening the supply of labor. Their misery has been diminished and their wages raised. Under the opposition policy of increase, let them, then, go on as heretofore in keeping up their numbers and trusting in God, marrying and giving in marriage, as our returns showed they did, in prosperous times, and waiting in adverse times.

After some remarks by Lord Houghton and Mr. Walford, Mr. W. L. Collier considered that those statisticians who had attacked the doctrines of Malthus, J. S. Mill, endorsed by Cairns and Senior, had failed. Had the working classes been considered with families of seven or fifteen, as the case might be, struggling for existence on 16s. a week. Dr. Farr said marry first and sustenance would come after, but the higher and middle classes reversed the position. They did not marry until their means permitted them to do so with fair prospects of comfort, and yet they preached a doctrine of imprudence and improvidence to the working classes. Those classes, however, would find that J. S. Mill was the best friend they ever had. The doctrine of Malthus was based upon the fact that the poor we always had with us. But Mill held that we ought to have no poor in the sense of abject indigence. In the discussion which followed, Mr. T. R. Bourne said that in those cases where there were families of five and food for two, it would mostly be found that what was wanted had been consumed in drink. As a matter of fact, the large families did the best, and all the greatest men in science and its statesmen were mostly members of large families and younger sons, upon whom early struggles for mental growth had produced brilliant results. Mr. George Hurst thought population had dangerously increased in this country. Mr. Turner said that those who were afraid of the ratio in which the population increased seemed to forget that food was increasing on all sides in even a greater ratio. Mr. Fisher, a Canadian, said that those who thought emigration the proper remedy for over-population should remember that the Colonies did not want the children of rickety paupers. Lord Fortescue must remind the section that Mr. Chadwick had been for years recognised by all Europe as one of the most distinguished economists of our time, and, indeed, as such had had the honor conferred upon him of being made a member of the French Institute; that Dr. Farr had also long been recognised as a high economic authority; and both of these—to whom as an ex-Secretary of the Poor Law Board, he could add, in a much humbler degree, himself—had always strenuously inculcated thrift and prudence. The discussion closed with a vote of thanks to Dr. Farr.