glass. Reciprocity suggests the noodle story of the men who, having built a temple without windows, tried to carry light into it in their hats. Had they made windows, the light would have carried itself in. Thus it is that our reciprocityites build a trade wall around their own country, and then try to bring trade into it in reciprocity hatfuls.

The report of the special committee of the Massachusetts legislature on the relations between cities and towns and street railway companies, is as timid as such reports usually, and perhaps wisely, are; but it does give the sanction of its approval to a principle of street railroad control which has in it the germs of a sound system. This principle contemplates the ownership by the municipality of the whole surface of its streets, whether paved with iron rails or other material, and the leasing to private companies of exclusive rights to run vehicles over prescribed routes. Essentially the principle discriminates between public and private functions, by placing the management of highways in the hands of the government—or, rather, keeping it there, for no one acquires highway rights without a grant—and leaving their use to private companies and individuals to the fullest possible extent.

What the limitations upon that use might be may not be determined now. Common pavements may be used freely. They do not necessitate a monopoly of use. And it may be that a system is possible under which rail tracks could be used in the same way—different transporters using the same track under time table provisions. If that could be done, the ideal system would be one under which the municipality would provide the tracks, and cars would be run competitively by transporters as trucks are run now on common pavements. But if that cannot be done, the lessees of street tracks would acquire highway monopolies which must be held in check by the terms of leasing. Either this, or the municipalities themselves must operate street cars as well as control street car tracks. The one great desideratum is to eliminate the element of monopoly from street car transportation. A long stride toward doing this will have been taken when the recommendations of the Massachusetts committee—of which, by the way, Charles Francis Adams was chairman—shall have been put into practical operation. The resumption of public ownership of public highways is the first important step in the reform of street monopolies.

On the subject of the distribution of wealth, the Financial Reform Almanack for 1899 will contain some valuable information from British statistics. The "total net capital value of all real and personal property in the United Kingdom for the year ending March 31st, 1897," as shown by the fortieth report of the British inland revenue department and the British statistical abstract for 1897, has been compared with the population, by J. W. S. Callie, editor of the Almanack, with astonishing results. In the light of this comparison, Edward Atkinson's assertion that "the laborer is getting an increasing share of an increasing product," requires revision. In one of his tables, Mr. Callie divides the population of the kingdom into three classes, distinguished as A, B, C, and D, and specifies the number of persons in each class, together with the net value of the real and personal property they own. In class A he puts 14,751 persons; in class B, 185,364; in class C, 2,800,950, and in class D, 36,463,517. Classes A and B, the smallest in number, are the richest in property. And what a vast proportion of the wealth of the United Kingdom this small proportion of its population owns! Though numbering only 200,115 persons and constituting only 51-100ths of one per cent. of the population, these two classes own £8,879,169,527 worth of real estate and personal property, or more than 70 per cent. of the total value. Over against this superabundance, Mr. Callie sets the figures as to the wealth of Class D, which numbers 36,463,517 persons and constitutes more than 92 per cent. of the population. It owns only £39,039,478 worth of real and personal property, or but 31-100ths of one per cent. of the total value.

The foregoing figures are too important to be buried in text. Let us tabulate them, so that the eye may take in their awful significance at a glance. For greater simplicity and emphasis we give in the table only the percentages. Here they are:

	Population.	Wealth.
Classes A and B..	0.51	70.06
Class D..........	92.40	0.31

Does anyone believe in his heart that the two hundred thousand persons who are thus shown to own over 70 per cent. of the wealth of England, have earned that wealth in the sweat of their faces—or of their brains, if you please? and that the thirty-six millions who own only 31-100ths of one per cent., have received all their earnings? Yet that is the crucial question. It makes little difference how rich a man is or how poor, provided if he be rich he has earned his wealth or if he be poor he nevertheless has received all he has earned. The question suggested by Mr. Callie's figures is fundamentally not one of relative wealth and poverty, but of social honesty. It is simply unbelievable that 200,115 people should own 70 per cent. of the wealth of the United Kingdom, while 36,463,517 people in the same kingdom own only 0.31 per cent.—unless the 200,115 have a large share of the wealth that the 36,463,517 have earned. Either Mr. Callie's figures are grossly wrong, or the distribution of wealth in the United Kingdom is grossly wrong. But Mr. Callie's figures are official.

The Albany Law Journal takes sensible ground on the question of dissenting opinions in law suits. It has been contended that a court decision should be the decision of the court and not of the judges as individuals,