

Pratt is an ardent Republican. The statement referred to is made on the authority of Col. S. A. Merritt. An explanation is also made that Marshal Dyer put Mr. Pratt's name down without the latter's knowledge, under the impression that he would contribute, and then paid the amount himself. Col. Merritt is credited with saying:

"I have this to say, that in October last Mr. Dyer asked me to drive with him to the Pen, saying that his employes there would contribute to the National Democratic Committee's campaign fund. As chairman of the Democratic Territorial Committee, I had charge of the subscription books sent me by the National Committee, and taking one, drove to the pen with Mr. Dyer. While there I obtained subscriptions of \$25 each from nine employes, and wrote the name of each person, Mr. Pratt being among the number; and Mr. Dyer on his return to the city gave me a check for \$225 in payment of such subscriptions. I saw each of the employes except one man who was asleep, he having been on guard the night before. I understood all of them to assent to the subscription, and that the amount subscribed would be deducted from their pay. I certainly never understood that Mr. Dyer was subscribing or paying for any of them. If such had been the case he ought to have so stated to me. It appears now from Mr. Dyer's and Mr. Pratt's statements that I have been laboring under an hallucination, although I opine that had Mr. Cleveland been re-elected, I would have still remained under that hallucination. If Mr. Dyer had intended to contribute out of his own funds what was the use of taking me to the Pen to see his employes? I never charged Mr. Pratt with being a Democrat, never thought he was one, and even his employment by Mr. Dyer would be no evidence to my mind that he was a Democrat. I never mentioned that alleged subscription by Mr. Pratt to any one until a prominent local Republican asked me the question and I replied substantially as I have above stated. At the time the question was asked, I was not aware Mr. Pratt was a candidate for marshal, and the party then asking the question stated his reason for doing so was that he understood Mr. Pratt was a candidate for the marshalship and denied ever having contributed to the Democratic campaign fund."

Col. Merritt has probably forgotten a conversation between himself and Mr. Pratt, which occurred in the Marshal's office, in the presence of a reporter of the News about the time named, and which sheds some light on the controversy. Col. Merritt entered the Marshal's office and said, "Pratt, what will you do on this?" Mr. Pratt inquired what it was, and the Colonel explained that it was a subscription for the national Democratic campaign. Mr. Pratt replied, "My name is on the other list, and that is enough for me." Colonel Merritt remarked, "You have been benefited by the Democratic administration, and want us

to win again, don't you?" He then used further brief arguments in this line to induce Mr. Pratt to subscribe. Mr. Pratt's answer was, "I have contributed to the other fund, and have nothing for this one." Col. Merritt then walked into the inner office. The reporter, who had previously been conversing with Mr. Pratt, remarked, "So you are a Republican?" Mr. Pratt's answer was, "Yes, although I have been employed by a Democratic marshal." We publish this statement for the reason that Mr. Pratt is absent from the city, and is therefore taken somewhat at a disadvantage by the assertions that have been made. Further than that we have not the slightest interest in the matter.

THE OFFICIAL SCRAMBLE.

The scramble for office on the part of some ex-Federal officeholders is awakening a lively interest. There has been considerable of an effort to have Judge Sandford removed, and Judge Zane reinstated as Chief Justice. On Saturday a number of members of the bar met in this city and made a protest, to be forwarded to President Harrison, against the proposed plan. This fact became known, and as a result the Associated Press agent in this city sent the following to Washington:

SALT LAKE, March 24.—"A caucus of Mormon lawyers and their confederates was held yesterday, to protest against the appointment of Charles S. Zane for chief justice of Utah. Under Chief Justice Sandford, the chiefs of the Mormon Church, Cannon, Burton, Smith and others came in, received mere nominal sentences and quittances for the past. This agreeable state of things would be broken up on the installment of Zane, which Gentiles of Utah are unanimously asking at the hands of President Harrison."

Now, "the beauty of the thing" is, that lawyers who are "Mormons" had nothing at all to do with the movement, which was conducted by non-"Mormons," some of whom have a long record as bitter opponents of the "Mormons." Moreover, the leaders of the opposition to Judge Zane are staunch republicans, so that, instead of the Gentiles of Utah unanimously asking for the re-appointment of the deposed Chief Justice, they present the most determined opposition to that proceeding.

When the fact of what the Associated Press agent had done became known, it brought down a storm of wrath from most of the leading attorneys. "It is an infamous falsehood!" exclaimed one of them, when approached on the subject this morning. "Not only are the Gentiles not unanimous for him, but the majority of the bar are against him. We have counted noses and ascertained that fact. We've had enough of him, and he should have sense enough to keep out. He's a republican, of course, but the republican lawyers are fighting hardest against

him, because the democratic dog has no place in the ring."

"How about permitting the agent to misrepresent you, as you say he has done?" queried the reporter of another prominent attorney.

"Oh, we have fixed that," was the reply. "That scoundrel has been lying all along about the 'Mormons,' but he can't do it about us without being exposed. We have sent to Wm. Henry Smith, of the Associated Press, a true statement of the case, and if he isn't 'bounced,' I'm mistaken in the kind of men the Associated Press want as correspondents. I think they have had enough of that fellow."

"But the prejudice against the 'Mormons'—"

"—began the reporter. "Oh, yes," was the rejoinder, "I know what you would suggest; that anything can be said against the Mormons and the prejudice is so great that it will be believed. But there is a difference in this case. We're not Mormons. Further, there has been an effort to settle this dispute and have an era of good feeling. Capital has been induced to come here; enterprises have been inaugurated; a new impetus has been given to business. The railroads see this and they are launching out. The D. & R. G. W. is to be a broadgauge within a few months. The Utah Central is to be consolidated with the Utah & Northern, which is to be broadened, and thus secure a line through the Territory, from McCammon, Idaho, down the Cache Valley to Salt Lake, and on to almost the southern part of Utah, and then west to the coast. Salt Lake will thus become the junction of all the big railroads. Now the gang represented by this fellow propose to stop this, because the Gentiles won't answer to his lash. He wants to rule; and if we won't let him do that, he proposes to ruin us by inaugurating a new crusade against the Mormons, and thereby frighten capital away. He wants another reign of terror here, and above all, he wants to make the Mormons his slaves, and enrich himself on their property. Your people have put his class up just right, and you want to keep your weather eye open."

With this expression of regard for the author of the dispatch and his associates, the reporter turned to a Federal official, who said, "They talk about Mormon attorneys, but there wasn't one there. We know the assistance of the Mormons wouldn't help us. Why, as to Mormon attorneys, those employed by the Church, Messrs. Sheeks & Rawlins, support Judge Zane, and they're democrats too."

"What is the cause of the opposition to Judge Sandford?"

"It is because they could not control him. The other day one of those fellows came to him and wanted to make a bargain out of court. It was about Mormons too. The Judge told him he would do no such thing. He had not known Mormons as such in court, and had aimed to act fairly to all. Further than that he would not go. So there is the cause for the opposition to