

scrutiny, may be classed as respectable.

But France and Belgium do not get all their horse-meat, outside of local production, from Great Britain. While the European countries are shutting out American beef and pork, the American horse-slaughterers go on undisturbed, though some of them need handling bad enough. Instead of giving the care to their product that is exercised in England, that the flesh of only healthy animals shall be disposed of for human food, the opposite is said by those who know to be the rule. Old, blind and decrepit animals, with bad joints, huge spavils, frightful ringbones, all go in together. Their hides, hoofs and bones find a legitimate home market, while their flesh—it is said—all goes in pickle and is shipped to Belgium or France.

This latter statement, however, has been shown by recent investigation to be not strictly correct. For instance, several Indiana horse-slaughterers have been found shipping a portion of their product to Chicago, there to be placed upon the market as pure and wholesome canned meat. The best and choicest is mixed with beef, and goes in with it. The poorer grade is chopped up with pork or beef and made into sausage, and the worst of little frankfurters or big bologna-like are manufactured from this mixture.

Of course, it is only the least reputable packing establishments who do this kind of business; but there is so much competition that the evil creeps in in many places. Now that the facts are being brought to public attention, it is not very probable they will encourage the use of imported meats and sausages to any great extent in an off place like Utah; but it is just as well to give people a hint. Those who do not fancy horse-meat, and especially the flesh of decrepit, diseased animals, will keep a sharp lookout toward importations liable to contain it, at least until there are such regulations as will secure comparative immunity from danger of being imposed upon in that manner. Horse-meat may be all right with some people for food, but it would be just as well to have it under its proper name.

#### IF A RECOUNT—WHAT?

Last evening's issue of this paper contained the account of a pumpkin-seed-prize-guessing contest and its result, the winners coming into ownership of various sums of money and other articles as a reward for having correctly or most nearly estimated the number of seeds the round, red, fat body of the squash contained.

The record tells us, not upon oath, it is true, but upon the testimony of the judges, that there were exactly 574 seeds in that pumpkin. One gentleman guessed 575, and another 576 and 577 respectively. While no one appears to have hit the true figure, these were the nearest, and public notice was given that the proper parties should call and get their prizes.

But it is noticed that there were other close guesses. One, for instance, was 587; another was 590; and so on. Besides, the matter was very close, as

will have been seen, as between the leading three. In view of all this the News suggests that that particular pumpkin and its seeds may still become an object of a whole community's attention.

Let's suppose a case: What if the party who guesses 576 should demand a recount, and the demand should be granted. Cannot anybody see that the mistake of a single or double pumpkin seed would change the result? And how interesting this would be if, pending the recount, the ballot box—we beg pardon, the pumpkin—should be in possession of that party's friend?

Suppose further that the winner should demand to see the recount and demand the prize he was already declared to have won. Would it not then be in order for the winner by the recount to grandiloquently offer the seeds themselves in evidence, demand an inspection of them one by one, insist that his opponent prove not only who put in the extra ones if there were any, but also be able to pick out and discard said extra ones? And will it not seem to any fair-minded person that the objector cannot do all this he ought to cease his contest and forever hold his peace?

These are mere suppositions, instances, as stated in the notice; but we submit that in view of even the possibility of its being brought forth as later evidence, that pumpkin should be well and honestly taken care of.

#### RELATING TO PROHIBITION.

The following circular letter, a copy of which was today mailed to each of the members-elect of the approaching Constitutional Convention, speaks clearly for itself:

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah,—189

Mr.

The undersigned committee have been named by the Ministers' Association of the Protestant churches, and First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and the bishop of the Catholic church of the diocese of Utah.

The purpose and object of this committee is to aid in securing the submission by the Constitutional Convention, to the legal voters of the Territory, of the question of the prohibition of the manufacture and sale as a beverage of intoxicating liquors in the proposed new State. We favor said question being submitted to a vote of the people at the same election with the Constitution, but as a separate article in substantially the form and manner shown in the enclosed circular.

You will observe that the proposed article is directed solely against the manufacture and sale as a beverage, or in other words against the saloon as an institution; it is not directed against the personal liberty or private habits of the individual citizen.

We desire as a committee to solicit and if possible to secure your co-operation and active support, as a member of the Constitutional Convention, for the submission of this question as above indicated. We do not ask whether you are in favor of prohibition, but simply whether it will be consistent with your views to aid in extending to the legal voters their constitutional right of expressing their decision upon this question at the ballot box.

If you have no objection to so doing, the committee would be pleased to have

you advise them at an early date of your views with reference to this question of submission.

Respectfully yours,

Geo. F. Goodwin,  
L. E. HALL,  
A. J. OREM,  
W. R. HUTCHINSON,  
JOHN NICHOLSON,  
WILLARD YOUNG,  
WILLARD W. MADGHEAN,  
EDWARD H. ANDERSON,  
SPENCER CLAWSON,  
F. T. YARSDORFER,  
Committee.

Please address Geo. F. Goodwin, chairman, 20 and 21 Commercial block, or John Nicholson, secretary, Box 18, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Here is the proposed article on prohibition together with the method of submitting the same to vote of the people:

#### ARTICLE.—PROHIBITION.

To be submitted to a separate vote of the people as provided by the schedule and ordinance.

SEC.—No person, association or corporation shall, within this State, manufacture for sale or gift as a beverage, any intoxicating liquors, and no person, association or corporation shall import any of the same for sale or gift, or sell or offer or keep the same for sale, or gift, barter or trade as a beverage.

The Legislative Assembly shall by law prescribe regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this article and shall thereby provide suitable penalties for the violation thereof.

#### SCHEDULE.

SEC.—There shall be submitted, at the same election at which this Constitution is submitted for rejection or adoption, Article —, entitled "Prohibition," and persons who desire to vote for said article shall have written or printed on their ballots, "For Prohibition," and all persons desiring to vote against said article shall have written or printed on their ballots, "Against Prohibition." It shall appear according to the returns hereto provided for, that a majority of all the votes cast at said election for and against prohibition are for prohibition, then said Article—shall be and form a part of this Constitution and be in full force and effect, as such, from the date of the admission of this State into the Union. But if it shall appear, according to said returns, that a majority of said votes are against prohibition, then said Article—shall be null and void, and shall not be a part of this Constitution.

It will be observed that the parties who named the committee who have taken the initiatory steps in this movement are undoubtedly influential, and those persons whose signatures are attached to the circular are gentlemen of character and standing in the community. The object of the committee is reasonable, and is strictly in consonance with American institutions. Had they asked for the primary insertion of a prohibitory article in the proposed Constitution, proper objection might have been raised against the proposal. They simply desire that the people of Utah be given an opportunity to express their wishes by vote, separate and apart from the exercise of their suffrages on the adoption of the Constitution. If the majority favor the detached article, then, according to the genius of American institutions, it would become an integral part of the instrument. Should the vote run the