efforts to obtain money for Utah educational purposes. His attacks on "Mormonism" for those purposes were unworthy of him and not excused by the object he had in view.

However, he has labored for the public good and we take pleasure in recognizing his services. The free-school bill, framed and pushed by "Mormon" legislators, might have failed of passage if it had not been for his advocacy and personal influence as a "Liberal" member of the Council, the Liberals in the House opposing it vehemently.

The gentleman has made many friends here by his urbanity and cheerfulness and his thorough devotion to educational interests. We wish him success wherever he goes.

NEVADA AND UTAH.

THE Omaha *World-Herald* wants to know "What shall we do with Nevada" and says: "If the population continues to decrease as it did during the last decade, in twenty years there will not be enough people within the State's limits to fill her offices."

While protesting against this plan of "self-erasure," that organ urges, as the only practicable solution of the Nevada problem, that the "rotton borough" be annexed to Utah and the resulting Territory be promptly admitted to the union.

It avers in this connection that Utah would have no good reason to object, and Nevada's "sentiment" on the subject is not entitled to consideration, since her statehood is maintained largely for the accommodation of a few millionaires.

There is at least one feature of this proposition which is commendable: the editor has an obvious desire to have things done on the square. But his excellent wish has not been sufficient to protect him from error. To talk of the annexation of Nevada to Utah with the latter a Territory is nonsense, and besides this there is no use talking of annexation schemes to dispose of Nevada while Nevada is a State without its formal consent to such action.

As for the people of Utah not objecting to the scheme, it will be time enough to look into that matter when time makes its adoption practicable. Meanwhile, we want to congratulate the *World-Herald* in not echoing the still more absurd proposition to "attach Utah to Nevada," which has been agitating the minds of Nevada politicians and numerous other political and newspaper demagogues. The notion of an ocean liner attaching itself to the barnacle that might perchance adhere to its bottom would have quite as large an ingredient of common sense.

Utah is a wealthy, powerful and progressive commonwealth, possessed of the material resources for sustaining a million or more of people. Nevada, by actual demonstration, has proven her utter incapacity to sustain half the number required in the constitution to entitle her to a place in the Union. Yet some of her "statesmen" are wrecking their constitutions in a stupid endeavor to have Utah attached to her desert borders. Their success thus far has certainly not been encouraging.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

GRAND RAPIDS, Michigan, has a law suit now in progress which reveals some curious complications in the way of marriage and divorce. Jennie J. Church commenced suit against her husband, F. E. Church, to restrain him in the distribution of his money. The couple were married early in 1870. Six months after marriage Mrs. Church visited friends in New York. While there, Mr. Church visited Illinois, procured a divorce from Jennie Church, and married another woman. After some time he found that owing to informalities his divorce was void, so he obtained a second divorce, and remarried his second wife. Six years after, this second wife obtained a divorce from Church. In 1855 he met his first wife, Jennie, in Detroit. He renewed marital relations with her, and represented to her that his divorce from her was fraudulent. They went to live together as man and wife. Church is an army pensioner in receipt of $72.00 per month. In religion he is an Adventist, and believes in the tithing system of church support. He pays one-tenth of his income to his church, and the bulk of the remainder he gives to his relatives. His wife seeks by process of law to restrain him from handing his money over to them. She also seeks to have the Illinois divorce set aside, and that she be declared his lawful wife.

Here is a very peculiar history in the life of an humble citizen. In it are involved two marriages and a divorce with one woman, while with another, there are two divorces, one civil marriage, and one common-law marriage. The case is before the Circuit Court, and it promises to prove a knotty problem.

It is only one of the many peculiar marital complications which spring up from day to day, and which calls public attention in a general way to the institution of marriage. Cases of this kind are not confined to the United States. They crop up in every country of the civilized and "Christian" world. Only recently in England the courts decided that a husband could not compel his wife to conform to the letter of the marriage contract, while in Ohio a few weeks ago, the courts sustained a husband who took his wife by physical force to his own home, from that of her father.

But what gives the English case its peculiar character is the fact that though the husband could not by law compel his wife to live with him, yet he could not by law get a divorce from her. This case has caused much discussion among the English public. It is contended on one side that the husband should be entitled to a divorce for desertion on the part of his wife; the lawmaking power to fix a term of from two to four years within which the woman would have the privilege of returning to her husband.

On the other hand, this scheme is opposed most vehemently, the contention being that marriage as a solemn institution, ceremony, sacrament or ordinance would be entirely destroyed. One of the ablest writers on this side says:

"A more serious blow to the institution of marriage we can hardly conceive. The real cause of the great number of unhappy marriages is the light-mindedness with which marriage is contracted. And such a law as Lord Shand suggests would multiply the danger of light-minded marriages tenfold. A contract which could be dissolved by a two years' or even a four years' desertion, would hardly be regarded as a permanent contract at all, still less as a most sacred one which it is a shame and disgrace to break through. We should soon have quite a number of people here, as there already are, we believe in Germany, who had experimented on marriage in various directions, and whose lives were broken up into short sections of close association with a wife and other ex-wives, or a husband and other ex-husbands. And when once this came to pass, and came to pass without shame and disgrace to those who had so ordered their lives, there would be an end to the sanctity of marriage altogether."

In the United States this conservatism on the part of Englishmen is looked upon as lunacy. More decrees for the dissolution of marriages are given in America than in all the "Christian" countries of the world combined. In 1870 3½ per cent of the marriages of the United States terminated by divorce, and in 1890, 6.2 per cent. That is, for every 500 couples married in 1890, 31 married couples were divorced. Furthermore the ratio of divorces to marriages has doubled within the past twenty years. Two-thirds of the divorces obtained in this country are granted on the application of wives.

Many prominent sociologists suggest the establishment of a uniform divorce law for the United States, hoping that it would remove much of the evil now existing. Such a law prevails in