

and cross-wires and guard-wires and trolley-wires, are all matters of common knowledge.

That telegraph and telephone poles are an additional servitude is fairly well settled, the cases to the contrary, such as *Pierce v. Drew*, in Massachusetts, being based on highly artificial analogies between the ancient and modern use of highways for purposes of communication. To avoid this class of decisions, the Michigan court would say, with the Supreme Court of Rhode Island, that telegraph and telephone wires are only very indirectly used to facilitate the use of streets for travel and transportation, whereas the poles and various wires of the electric railroad are distinctly ancillary to the use of the streets as such. This distinction is, as Judge Dillon remarks, "so fine as to be almost impalpable."

It is said that the streets of a city may be used for any purpose which is a necessary public one, and the abutting owner will not be entitled to new compensation, in the absence of a statute giving it. As it stands, this statement can scarcely be maintained. Granting that the abutting owner dedicates to the public the whole beneficial use of part of his land for the purposes of a street, his property rights of light, air, and access free from danger to his remaining land still subsist. Surely the need of the public for steam railroads is much greater than its need for electric railroads, yet steam railroad corporations would not be allowed to run their trains on public streets merely as a new method for using an old easement, and if they would lay their tracks across lands not belonging to them they must obtain the right to do so by purchase or condemnation, into which consequential damages enter as an element. The need of the public is to be considered when the right to take the property is under consideration, and not when the courts have to decide whether compensation shall be allowed.

If the public needs a new method of transportation, the public can and should pay for private property rights destroyed or impaired in establishing that new method of transportation.—*Harvard Law Review*.

THE PUNISHMENT OF INSULTS.—The growing frequency and malignity of personal vituperation in contemporary politics is admitted on all hands to be a very serious evil. It is one, too, for which the law supplies no adequate remedy. Towards wrongs