

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

THE CITY HIGH SCHOOL.

Now that an election for members of the city board of education is at hand, there is considerable discussion regarding the necessity and manner of conducting a high school in this city; and occasion is taken to antagonize or endorse one or other of the candidates because of the attitude taken on this matter. It is commonly the case in political contests that the expressions or supposed views of the candidates are distorted by antagonists to be something entirely different than they actually are, and thus great injustice is done. The present is no exception to the rule.

The real situation is this: There are some people here who insist on maintaining the city high school on its present lines, and who would construct a large building for the accommodation of the students; to carry out this purpose, they would impose an additional tax upon property owners to furnish the necessary funds for constructing the building and conducting operations therein. People with these views are heralded as being the friends and advocates of the city high school. On the other side, there are people who say that the present system of conducting the city high school should be modified so that the education comprised in the public school system should include all the branches of a good, solid school training, but that the public revenue should not be used in the high school to give those who may desire it a training in French, German, Greek, or other branches usually classed as specialties; these people also insist that it is unnecessary at the present time to tax the property owners for a costly high school building. Because of having taken this position, persons who do so are decrised as "opposing the high school."

Accurately speaking, therefore, there is no such issue in the present election as "opposition to the city high school." There is some question as to how the work of the high school shall be accomplished, and how far it shall reach; and virtually this is to be passed upon by voters next Wednesday. In other words, they are asked to say in some of the precincts whether the taxpayers shall provide for pupils to be trained in the city high school in French, German, Latin, and other special studies that are paralleled in the University, or whether this particular class of training shall be paid for by tuition charges on those who receive it.

This is the pro and con of the whole high school discussion, so far as it relates to the candidates now in the field for members of the board of education, and every taxpayer ought, in his own interest, to express himself where the issue is raised, that the members-elect may know the sentiment of the people. The views of the various candidates on national party politics cuts no particular figure in the case. If the voters wish the board of education to conduct a high school which teaches the advanced branches at

public expense, let them support candidates committed to that policy; if they desire the public revenue to pay for an education in the high school only in those branches which do not parallel the University work, then men who take that view should be voted for. The issue involves a considerable amount of public funds which taxpayers must provide, but in neither aspect of the situation is the existence of the city high school endangered. That is an institution recognized by both sides as necessary.

BY WAY OF SUGGESTION.

The NEWS, like every other honorable and independent paper, is always glad to give a hearing through its columns to any reputable correspondent who has a grievance to ventilate, a policy to criticize or the acts of public officials to expose or inquire into. We are here for the very purpose of forcing a redress of grievances, even though we may have none of our own; being pledged to no party policy, we are not only ready ourselves to bestow unparing criticism wherever we think it may be deserved, but also to permit those who have examined into details and are able to point out necessary reforms, to offer their strictures and suggestions in their own words and way; having no pets or favorites either in or out of office, we never expect to shield or defend anyone whose public acts deserve rebuke, and we are at all times ready to offer the medium of a widely read column to exposure of official misdemeanors. Generally speaking, where we have not been able to obtain such information ourselves, we are very pleased to have it supplied our readers by a correspondent, and if the latter is responsible and of good repute, we are content to withhold his name and permit his communication to appear over a nom-de-plume.

But in every community there is a class of fault-finders, who while they may be fully respectable and reliable, are nevertheless at times unreasonable; they have fallen into such a habit of criticism that nothing seems right; like the Irishman at Donnybrook fair, wherever they see a head they hit at it; all of which, while it may be evidence of reverence and pugnacity, is less effective and forceful than if the assaults were better-timed and more consistently made. In yielding to the fault-finding habit they are sometimes inaccurate in their charges, and very frequently assail men whose duties and obligations they do not understand, and policies which their narrowness of vision does not enable them correctly to estimate.

We have a small class of that kind here, and some of them are excellent citizens and good friends of the NEWS. Usually we like to talk with and hear from them, and in most cases if they have any views to submit to the public we are pleased to give them the opportunity. But there is a limit to good nature, as there are

limits to good taste; and we have been somewhat pained at being criticized on our own part for not publishing everything they had chosen to offer.

In order to meet the objections thus urged, we have a proposition to submit to our friends, the perpetual critics; and that is that they divide with us the responsibility of their more severe arraignment of public officials and their policy, by giving permission to publish their own names to their contributions. We are not afraid to tackle any man or subject that our own knowledge and observation enable us to criticize intelligently and with reason; but where we receive such information merely on a correspondent's say-so, and we already know the drift of his mind from long acquaintance, we should like to be able to say that he would be more sure of seeing his views and comments in print if in forwarding them to the editor he would say, "You are at perfect liberty to use my name if you want to."

What say you, friends? Shall we agree on the brave course that a man who has a public complaint to utter is ready to make it like a man if in the judgment of the newspaper the use of a nom-de-plume would be unfair to the paper itself and to the men or measures against which the complaint is directed?

DEFENSE AGAINST TRAIN ROBBERS.

In view of the diabolically artistic manner in which train robberies are now committed by adepts at the business, the life of the express messenger and the postal railway clerk cannot be said to be a very happy one. The desperadoes bent on accomplishing the looting of the cars in which treasure is carried, do not hesitate to blow open the doors with dynamite and maim or kill the occupants; and it has come to pass that men employed in the service are subjected not only to the exactions which their duties impose but to a continued nervous strain as well as the presence, almost any time, of actual physical danger.

It will give general satisfaction, therefore, when the new armored mail cars, which are being introduced on some lines, shall come into universal use. As described by a writer in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, these cars are exceedingly ingenious pieces of construction. They are supposed to be both bullet proof and wreck proof and judging from their description they are actually so. They are built without platforns, thus depriving the train robber of one means of approach. This makes it possible to couple them so closely that three cars appear as one, the whole being two and a half times the length of the ordinary car. It is only when rounding a curve that the three distinct cars are evident. There are no apparent doors. The two doors on each side, for the reception and delivery of mail, are too high for the ingress of a train robber. They are constructed of two thicknesses of tough yellow pine, running around the sides and ends, and sandwiched with a thick steel plate. This renders them absolutely bullet proof, and affords a partial protection against concussion received in an accident. In addition