

be correct—and the best authorities on spraying accord with that view—we suggest that the officials who have the enforcement of the fruit tree inspection law as part of their duty themselves should adopt measures to prevent the abuse complained of. In our view of the case, the whole business is in their hands; and it would be quite easy for them to put an end to improper or untimely spraying, merely by enforcing the law. As to spraying that may be done while the trees are in bloom, and which is justly complained of, the chief incentive to it in this county is the desire of professional sprayers to get a job, under cover of the requirements made in the probate judge's proclamation. If that document does not require spraying trees in bloom, then those who operate with orchard owners under the presumption that they are carrying out the law are obtaining pay for their work under a false pretense, and the law is not complied with at all.

The way in which the county authorities can regulate the matter is quite plain. The probate judge makes his proclamation, as required by section 8 of the statute, stating the time or times when it is prudent and proper to disinfect orchards; the inspector issues notices in conformity with the orders given. Suppose orchard owners permit spraying at a time not named in the proclamation and notice, what then? Let the law be enforced. The only disinfecting recognized is that directed by the probate judge, and since this is not complied with by spraying at another time than is designated, let sections 6 and 7 be applied by summoning those who do not spray at that time, and by having their trees disinfected in proper season at the owners' expense. This will soon settle the matter, and without any great trouble; for owners of orchards will not long insist upon paying the professional sprayer for work in the wrong season when they will have to pay again for getting it rightly done. One unfortunate feature of experience up to the present is that the probate judge's proclamation comes out several weeks too soon; to delay it until just preceding the spraying season would be an improvement which probably will come in time.

As to the conflict between the honey and fruit interests, that ought to be quickly and forever set at rest. Utah cannot afford to abandon fruit raising; nor can she do without the honey-bee and gain any advantage. There is abundant room for both industries to prosper side by side; in fact, one is in a degree dependent on the other. It is stated that by premature spraying this season one bee-keeper in this city already has lost a hundred dollars' worth of bees. There is something radically wrong in a procedure that causes such damage, and orchard owners as well as bee-keepers ought to be interested in checking it. There are many people who declare that spraying trees is of no value; and well they may, since much spraying is done at an improper season, and is a detriment to the fruit as well as to the bee industry. But spraying at prudent times is beneficial in destroying pests; and at such times it catches only injurious insects, while the useful honey-bee

escapes harm. We believe that if those who have the law's enforcement in hand will work intelligently to this end the people will not be long in finding out just what to do, and the annoying and in some respects disastrous antagonism between orchard owners and bee-keepers will be wholly swept away. In furtherance of this aim we commend Inspector Price's warning to the careful consideration of fruit growers.

GENTLEMEN, TO YOUR POSTS!

The rapidly diminishing number of delegates in attendance upon the Constitutional Convention is presenting an alarming crisis in that body's operations. Saturday there were forty-one members absent out of a total of one hundred and seven. Some of these probably were away only for the day; but some have not shown up for a considerable time. Of the number some who are not residents of the city have left for their homes, with the avowed intention of not returning; and others are indicating that they mean to follow this example. When attention is called to the impropriety of such action, the reply is made that enough members will stay to finish the work.

But what shall the public say of delegates who, except upon urgent pressure, abandon their post before completing the work they have undertaken? Surely none can find justification in the statement that they are tired of the long session. Did any member fancy the Constitution would be framed in less time than the ordinary session of a Legislature? And yet the sixty-day limit of a legislative session has not been reached.

There is danger in this stampede for home among the delegates. Participation in it indicates deficiency in the sense of duty to the public, and a stop should be put to the proceedings at once by men whom the people have regarded as worthy to represent them with fidelity and honor. Delegates have not the right to deplete the number of the Convention so that a majority of those voting on any proposition shall not be a majority of the whole Convention. Members who have gone home should return; absentees should present themselves and participate in the work that devolves upon them. Duty, honor, patriotism, demand that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention stand to their posts till the work is completed.

NOT A LAUGHING MATTER.

In the Constitutional Convention Thursday afternoon Judge Hammond, of San Juan county, offered a resolution which the press report says was read "amid peals of laughter" from the delegates. The resolution contained the suggestion that the Legislature should "by law set apart San Juan county as a reserve in order to protect the remains of the ancient cave and cliff dwellers of that land."

Now, with all due allowance for the risibilities of the delegates at humorous sallies occasionally made by the member from San Juan,

we fail to see any occasion for greeting this serious suggestion with laughter. With most people a reference to the resting place of the dead is not considered a proper subject of levity. The very reading of the resolution, even in the midst of a time of hilarity, should have appended to the reverential nature of the Convention to a degree that would have made merriment as impossible as it was inappropriate on such an occasion. If it were not that still more laughter might have been evoked, Mr. Hammond might well have declared himself in an exclamation that seems to have become very popular in the Convention—only omitting the profanity—"Don't you see I'm terribly in earnest?"

So far as inserting anything in the Constitution with respect to a reserve in San Juan county is concerned, that would be as opportune as are many other provisions which have been proposed but which should be left to the Legislature. That gives no warrant, however, that the matter should be received with ridicule and denied ordinary deference. The Constitution makers might have done a great deal worse than endorse and recommend by their action the spirit of the resolution. For one of the very best things the next Legislature can do, both as a proceeding of respect to the dead who formerly dwelt on this land and as preserving a valuable educational and historical feature to present and future generations in our State, is to protect the dwellings and graves of the prehistoric inhabitants from the hands of the spoiler. The scientific and literary world has displayed, without any peals of merriment, vast interest in the ancient ruins and remains at Thebes and Nineveh, in Egypt and elsewhere. The preservation of similar antiquities in Utah for the people of the future is something whose value cannot be overestimated, and which certainly deserves more respectful consideration than a jeer and a horselaugh.

OFFICERS, HOW IS THIS?

Without any desire to reflect upon the energy or integrity of officers whose duty it is to enforce the Territorial statutes, it appears to be time to call attention to violations of a law that are being carried on openly and with impunity by a very large number of people, particularly those engaged in merchandising. Possibly some of these are not aware that their acts are unlawful—this condition of ignorance very likely arising from the laxity of the officers with regard to the statute referred to. It may be that such officers have drifted into the existing condition of neglect more from thoughtlessness than otherwise; if so, a prompt and efficient discharge of their duty in this respect hereafter will come very acceptably. The law in question was passed by the Legislature in 1890, and section 1 contains the following provision:

"Any person who shall sell, give, or furnish any cigar, cigarette, or tobacco in any form, opium, or any other narcotic in any form to any minor under eighteen years of age in this Territory shall be