

wrong hands it is too often frittered away, and there is nothing left to testify to its existence but the broken fragments of the wasted and ill adapted plant. In many mining operations the rates of profit are only moderate; and this applies to gold, lead, iron, copper and silver mining. There is ample remuneration for capital if invested with a proper regard to the possibilities of the case. Mining machinery is as perfect as its many and varied purposes require it to be, and when any ordinary operations are contemplated, there is no difficulty in obtaining just what is wanted. Pumps, borers, rock drills, explosives, amalgamators, mills, all are available, so also is the right sort of men to operate them.

Satisfactory returns can only be realized through effective work—and this is the product of capital. Capital is not merely money, neither is it tools; and the men who work them are but the guiding, directing and impelling force, from behind which a wise operator surveys the property, plans operations, and calculates in advance the result of the means put forth to secure them. Blind empiricism can accomplish nothing; it may, and often does, stumble on success, but this is not its legitimate outcome, but rather a matter of luck. In order to convert energy into useful results, calculations are necessary, and moderate expectations are more frequently realized, and the largest aggregate profits more likely to be made, than are the wild fancies of visionaries, or the extravagant dreams of hundreds per cent. without planned work.

OVER PRODUCTION.

The fact of over production, in several lines, in Canada and the United States, lies on the surface. Into the causes, which lie deeper, the *New York Public* has been enquiring, not altogether without success. The explanation that gluts are caused by improved methods of production and increased means of transportation may hold good in certain cases; but it touches on the accidental rather than the uniform and the permanent. In 1879, each man's labor, in the iron industry of the United States, was equal to 100 tons of iron a year; now, with the latest contrivances for making labor effective, the product is 240 tons. From this cause alone, a glut in iron-production is what might have been expected. But this is not the only cause of over production, in this line. New railways have led to the opening of new and productive mines. At the same time, the mineral has been both got out and worked at less cost than formerly. If the force of natural law is to be felt here, a reduction of price must follow.

What has now happened, in this particular, is indeed an old experience. It is as old as machinery, and the same result occurs with every great improvement in the methods of production. Prices adjust themselves to the new order of things; and after the first disturbance, regularity of procedure is found on a new plane.

But over-production has another and more general and permanent cause. Anything which, for the time, makes profits exceptionally high, in any branch of in-

dustry, causes a general desire to share in those profits. New factories are started and production is overdone. The glut brings down prices, by the law of competition. Under a high tariff, the temptation to over-production betrays numbers of people into a competition which can only end in loss. To this cause may be traced, the over-production of woollen goods, in the United States, and cotton goods in Canada.

The remedy is to slacken speed. This means that machinery must lie idle, part of the time, and labor be denied full employment. The sacrifice implies loss; but loss has been bargained for and it is only a question what form it shall take. To go on producing what cannot be sold only adds to the evil; to lessen production till consumption can get rid of surplus stocks is the only rational mode of proceeding. The over-production of cotton, in Canada, is but a trifle compared to the over-production of woollens in the States. There is nothing that leads us to expect a serious sacrifice of cottons.

We do not share the fear of the *Public* that there will be over-production of wheat and cotton. New railways in America may throw some farms out of cultivation in Massachusetts and in England; but this will be the exception not the rule. If the world is in future to produce food with a less expenditure of labor, there will be more mouths to eat it. The capacity of the human race for increase will prevent anything like a permanent glut in food supply, and cotton will not be produced in excess of the world's wants. The price of wheat must have some reference to the average cost of its production; what is produced on soils of exceptional fertility can never fix the price, though if the area of such soils was relatively great, it would affect the price.

MARRIED WOMEN'S RIGHTS.

It is probably impossible in altering materially any long established state of law to make the alteration in such a way as to prevent the subsequent arising of intricate and nice questions. But making all due allowance for the difficulty necessarily attending any change in the law, our legislators in dealing with the rights of married women appear to have been peculiarly unfortunate. Ever since it was decided, some twenty-five years ago, to relieve wives in some measure from the control which their husbands had theretofore exercised over their property as well as their persons there has arisen in the practical application of the statutes passed on the subject an endless number of difficult questions for adjudication. The result as always occurs under such circumstances is that judicial opinions have varied widely. The drift of legislative enactment, if not of judicial interpretation, has, however, been throughout clearly in the wife's favor, until in England, though not yet in this country, it has been distinctly enacted that as to her property a married woman shall have and enjoy the same rights as if they were unmarried. It has been suggested that under such a state of law as that which now exists in England, a wife owning property on which the family resides, may

possibly be held entitled to turn her husband out of doors at her sweet will, since the law casts upon her no obligations to support her husband, and since she is declared to be entitled to exercise the same rights with reference to her property as if she were unmarried.

A somewhat similar question has been raised in our own courts, although the law has not here gone so far, and has been decided in such a way as must cause serious reflection to husbands resident upon their wives' properties who are disposed to show themselves at all independent of conjugal restraints. The suit in question is that of *Close vs. Allan* in the Queen's Bench Division of the Ontario High Court of Justice. The plaintiff, Mrs. Close, and her husband had resided in Deseronto on property which had always been owned by the wife, but the husband was the owner of two parcels of property on opposite sides of a street in the town of Napanee. In 1879, Mr. Close, intending to go to British Columbia for the benefit of his health, and desiring to convey his property to his wife, executed a deed of it to her father, and had a deed from the father to the wife prepared, and both deeds were placed in the wife's hands in order that she might whenever she chose to complete her title, get her father to execute the conveyance to herself. The husband remained away nearly a year and on his return joined his wife at Deseronto. Afterwards, however, they both moved to one of the houses in Napanee. During the husband's absence the wife's father had died without executing the deed in question, but his heirs had in the meantime conveyed the property to Mrs. Close. After a residence of some months in Napanee the pair again returned to Deseronto, where, it appears, the husband ill-treated his wife and was consequently ordered off the premises. He thereupon went to Napanee, leased the property there to Mr. Allan, the defendant in this suit, and went to the United States. The wife then commenced proceedings to have Mr. Allan ejected from the property hearing which the husband returned and intervened as the landlord of the premises and defended the suit.

Under these circumstances Mr. Justice Armour before whom the case was tried decided in the wife's favor, holding among other things that the husband had been guilty of such ill treatment as would have entitled the wife, had the property belonged to the husband, to leave him and insist on being maintained separately at his expense, and had thereby forfeited his right to live with his wife. The case has since been carried before the full Court of Queen's Bench where the decision of Mr. Justice Armour has been sustained.

It will be observed that the parties were not living at the time on the property in question so that it does not necessarily follow from this decision that a wife owning the property in which the family resides may whenever she chooses turn her husband out, although it would appear to follow from the view, at least, of Mr. Justice Armour, that she would have that right if the husband misconducted himself.