

mission. Please advise me of the date of acceptance of this resignation by wire, so that I may know when my official functions shall cease.

Yours very respectfully,
A. B. CARLTON.
SALT LAKE CITY, Utah, May 2, 1889.

It is not improbable that an entire reorganization of the Board of Commissioners will be effected. There are several local as well as outside applicants for the position. There are also obligations to meet which the Administration cannot altogether ignore, and lucrative offices are so disproportionate to the number of patriots, anxious to serve their country—provided it pays well, that the President is puzzled how to meet the situation satisfactorily. As the people of Utah, who are most concerned in the matter, have no voice in these appointments, it is useless to express any choice. We hope, however, that the President will select honorable, respectable and able men for these places, when we will endeavor to be content.

We sincerely wish Judge Carlton a happy future in whatever position he may choose or be called upon to occupy. And we believe that his experience in Utah will occasion many pleasant memories, and warrant the expression of many kind things concerning a people much misunderstood in the great world, and whose true position and views he has had ample opportunities to understand.

SAM BRANNAN GONE.

SAM BRANNAN, the California pioneer, is dead. He breathed his last in Sonora, on the 6th inst., having suffered agonies for two weeks from inflammation of the bowels. His name and career are familiar to the people of Utah. He was once a "Mormon" and obtained some prominence in early times, as he took a company by water from New York to San Francisco and wanted our people to settle on the coast. His course and habits were not consistent with the life of a Latter-day Saint, and so he was disconnected with the Church and plunged into the speculations and excitements of the pioneer Californian experience. He was at one time quite wealthy but finally drifted into poverty. He hoped to recuperate by the sale of land which he acquired by a Mexican grant in Sonora, but never realized his expectations. He had some redeeming qualities and it is to be hoped that these will out-

weigh the faults which were manifested in his adventurous and eventful life. Poor Sam! will be the general expression over the news of his departure to another sphere.

DIVORCE DODGES.

THE following, published in *Town Topics*, lets a little daylight in upon the manner of procuring divorces in Chicago. The rapid city by the lake is a rigidly monogamic, progressive and church-building centre of modern "Christian civilization."

"Not a little disquietude was caused in Chicago last week by the exposure, in a leading daily newspaper, of the manners and methods by which a certain lawyer in the metropolis of the west has been securing divorces for his patrons at the lowest possible cash cost and with as little delay as need be. The lawyer in question is a Mr. A. Goodrich, an unobtrusive gentleman of middle age, whose business of one sort and another in the courts has gathered him in a fortune of several hundred thousand dollars and has led incidentally, sad to relate, to his disbarment from active practice. Mr. Goodrich, however, has been in the habit of conducting the technical part of his divorce industry through the medium of an associate counsel, who was quite content to perform these offices for a moderate money consideration, leaving his principal to eumesh the fish, and by his good generalship and tactful display of sympathy bring their affairs to a head.

The author, or rather authoress, of the expose is a young woman who, in journalistic circles, is known as the Nellie Bly of Chicago. Personating a married woman, who sought release from matrimonial fetters, she called on Mr. Goodrich, explained to that gentleman that she had not the slightest ground, under the law, for a separation from her husband, but nevertheless wished to secure one. The lawyer bit at the bait savagely. He agreed, for a consideration of \$100 to procure his caller her desired divorce.

The young woman then found a masculine acquaintance who, for the sake of the joke, was willing to figure as the husband from whom she desired to emancipate herself. In each other's company the pair called on Mr. Goodrich, who was handed a retainer by the supposed would-be divorcee and negotiations were opened in earnest. The supposititious husband agreed on his "wife's" paying him \$1000 not to contest the suit, whereupon the lawyer asked him plumply whether he preferred to be divorced for cruelty or infidelity, adding with much frankness that the latter charge was preferable, inasmuch as most judges were ready to believe it quicker than anything else. He assured the couple that their way was now easy, despite the fact that no infidelity had been

committed, and he went so far as to pledge his word that they should have their divorce in ten days.

All this constituted pretty strong evidence as to the airy lightness with which divorces have been procured in Chicago, but the redoubtable Mr. Goodrich, in the fullness of his heart, volunteered to his fair client a few statements as to his own record as a divorce procurer that even Chicago finds a little astonishing. He declared, in substance, that he had been instrumental in divorcing innumerable couples as devoid of legal grounds for the severing of their marital chains as the couple then before him; he announced, moreover, that if he chose to step up to the bar and tell all he knew about collusive divorces—of the methods by which divorced people of both sexes, of his own acquaintance, had procured decrees, of the adroit, if irregular, means which he himself had employed to separate legally bound but mutually hated souls—that there would be a stir up in the town beside which the great fire would be as a mere whiff of hot air. It is hard to imagine the results of such a wholesale disclosure upon Chicago society. The young detective journalist is making her revelations in serial form, and their termination is awaited with breathless expectancy by persons who may or may not be interested in the possibility that 50 per cent. of the divorces (and remarriages) solemnized in the Garden City within the last ten years may be illegal on account of the methods by which they were procured.

THE DIVORCE QUESTION.

IT is singular how strong minds, educated, as the term is usually applied, will differ on important public questions. Here is an epitome of certain supposed moulders of public morals on the question of marriage and divorce and the desirability of a national law regarding the same. The communications were made to the *New York Herald*:

Speaker Carlisle: "The laws should be made as nearly uniform as possible." Senator Sherman: "The marriage relation should not be dissolved except on the clearest and strongest proof of a breach of the duty imposed." Kate Field: "Legislators had better beware how they put a premium on vice by forging the marital chains so tight as to make a separation too difficult." Dr. Howard Crosby: "Easy divorce breaks up families and leads inevitably to a low standard of morality." Marion Harland: "Neither of the divorced parties should be permitted to marry again." Francis E. Willard: "Divorce is easier than marriage. There should be a national law." Joseph Cook: "Loose di-