

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

ANOTHER TREE SUGGESTION.

Referring again to the subject of the spraying and care of fruit trees, which these columns briefly alluded to yesterday, Mr. John P. Sorenson, one of the inspectors in this city, offers a suggestion that is certainly worth consideration. In the performance of his official duties he says he frequently meets with people who are disposed to chop down their fruit trees—where the latter are at all old or unsatisfactory by reason of poor shape and too much wood—rather than continue the annual expense of spraying. They argue that the quality of the fruit from such trees, even if the quantity is all right, is not such as to make profitable the keeping of the tree. Past neglect has brought many otherwise excellent trees into very bad condition, and, while this is not the trees' fault, it is easy to understand that their present owners should be tempted to act radically, now that the law imposes upon them certain duties and expenses that cannot be evaded.

Mr. Sorenson's suggestion is that in such cases tree owners think twice before laying the ax to the root and instead thereof apply the saw a few feet higher up, just below the crown, for instance; the cutting off of the whole top of the tree, and the placing of a suitable cap upon the standing trunk will not destroy the sound roots and healthy body at all, but will cause the putting forth of new and vigorous branches at and below the point of previous decapitation. These can be trimmed and pruned off as desired, and within two or three years the owner will have what to all intents and purposes is a new tree, only much larger and stronger and heartier than a young tree could have possibly become in the same length of time, because all the old sap and roots and vigor are already there to push along the new growth. Ordinarily the getting of a five-year-old tree requires five years; by this method a five years' growth of wood can readily be obtained from an old trunk with tolerable certainty in two years.

We cordially second the suggestion, and think it may be adopted with profit. Furthermore, every patriot must regret the destruction of a tree for trivial or resentful reasons. The country has none too many of them, and the statute on spraying was never intended to reduce their number. He who preserves, as well as he who plants, is a public benefactor, and all such should be encouraged not only by law but by the good words and examples of others.

"MONEY SPENT NOT WASTED."

The NEWS, on April 16, in an editorial under the above caption, referring to the attitude of certain demagogues and grumblers who complain against rich people for spending their money on luxuries, characterized such complaint as unreasonable and incon-

sistent, for the reason that "so far as his fellowmen are concerned, a spender is more useful than a lender." It was pointed out that the more horses and carriages, carpets and furniture, silk dresses and porcelain, etc., the nabob and his family buy and use, the better for all the people engaged in the raising or manufacture of the articles named. The doctrine here laid down was expressly qualified by the statement that these are not the best ways of spending money; more people would be benefited by a rich man's wealth, if he established factories and aided in developing the country; but if he chose to spend large sums upon his domicile and his person (supposing all the time that he has neither ability nor inclination to invest his gold in any other way) in all conscience he ought to be encouraged to do so; by this means he would do some good to the community in which he lives. All this was plainly stated in the article referred to.

It would seem that this proposition is as plain as the simplest of Euclid's axioms, needing no proof, no demonstration. Were it not for the fact that people suffering from real or imaginary wrongs, oppressed under burdens too heavy to carry and yet impossible to throw off, often lose their cool judgment and reason to the extent that the most glaring argumentum ad hominem appears in the light of an infallible syllogism, such demagogues would not be able to secure a hearing. They would at once be recognized as unreasonable and inconsistent.

Incontrovertible as this seems to be, Professor J. H. Paul, as will be seen by a correspondence in another part of the NEWS, has found it necessary to hasten to the rescue and furnish a well studied argument for the proposition briefly stated by this paper. The professor's letter is highly didactic in tone and is so written as to convey the idea that the NEWS was radically wrong in something, whereas when the writer's argumentation is followed out the fact appears that it is really an endorsement of the doctrine it at first seems to condemn. Let us see.

Professor Paul very properly argues that the money of a man who spends \$1,000 on a watch will benefit the laborer who receives this sum for his work. He further argues that the man who spends \$1,000 on a farm benefits first the people who sold the land and secondly, indefinitely the men who get employed on the farm; therefore, it is better to spend money on industrial enterprises than on luxuries. The NEWS stated the same truth thus: "We do not say that these [referring to buying luxuries] are the best ways of spending money; we think more people would be benefited by a rich man's wealth, and he would be much better and happier himself, if he established factories and aided in developing the country." Now, if there is any difference in the position of this paper and its learned critic, except in the manner of expressing the ideas sought to be conveyed, it is not apparent. Probably more clear-

ness and greater elegance will be claimed for the latter, but that is a matter of taste and cannot form the subject of a serious controversy.

Leaving this, then, out of consideration and turning again to the only point made by this journal and which our correspondent totally loses sight of, that it is unreasonable to base agitation among laboring classes on the fact that wealthy men sometimes spend vast sums on luxuries, we again say, without fear of being misunderstood, that so far as his fellow men are concerned the spender is a benefactor. When he spends \$1,000 for a watch, that money presumably will find its way to the laborer's home, the merchant, the farmer or the bank and go on indefinitely doing good. The spender to that extent enables other people to do with the money what he himself declines to do, to wit—invest it in enterprises, lend it to investors or give it out for charitable purposes (a way of spending money, which, by the way, is not considered in the professor's communication). What, then, is the reasonable ground of complaint?

The feeble effort to give the subject a religious touch calls for only a passing remark. If the exhortation to the people of the Lord to be lenders and not borrowers proves anything at all, it is that borrowing is an undesirable transaction belonging to a state of imperfection inconsistent with a higher moral development. But that does away with the whole argument for the business of the money-lender so learnedly advocated in the letter. Again, the reference to the poverty of Christ and some of the early church fathers as a proof against luxuries has the fatality of proving too much; it might with equal force be quoted—as it in fact has been—as an argument against an accumulation of wealth for any purpose, since it is well known that neither of these used his intelligence for the acquirement of wealth. Some of them even renounced it as the property of Satan. As to Christ, it is well known that He wore a garment so costly that the soldiers at the cross refused to divide it, and also that He gently rebuked the disciple whose principles of political economy allowed him to see nothing but waste in the ointment—worth at that time the immense sum of \$50—poured out by loving hands on the feet of the Master. That false apostle is but too good a representative of some modern agitators to be lost sight of in this matter.

Possibly these remarks are needed to guard some people from construing the letter of our able correspondent as a justification of greed.

FRUIT AND BEES.

In another part of this issue of the NEWS is a communication from Fred W. Price, fruit tree inspector for Salt Lake county, in which he warns the owners of fruit trees not to have them sprayed while in bloom. Mr. Price bases his objection to such spraying on the fact that the fertilization of the fruit is thereby prevented, and also that such spraying kills the honey-bees.

Assuming the inspector's position to