

## *The Corrector of Destinies*

legal form and recites another and valid consideration, when the moving consideration was in fact the resignation of a federal office."

The atmosphere of victory rising about John A. Garnett was less impressive than that atmosphere of disaster fallen thus swiftly on his daughter. The wondrous vitality of her figure vanished; the light fled from the silver, the blood from the porcelain. Then, as by some masterful effort, going to the very springs of life, it all splendidly returned. She looked steadily at Randolph Mason, her eyes two lines of light.

"I repeat it," she said slowly, "you have failed. This man shall receive everything that he expected to receive—my father's influence, the controlling interest in this railroad and a seat in the United States Senate."

The lips of Randolph Mason parted in a cynical smile. "I should be interested to learn," he said, "by what avenue of propitious fortune he is to obtain these benefits."

"I shall marry him," replied Margaret Garnett.

For the legal principle involved in this story, see the following leading cases: *Forbes v. McDonald*, 54 Cal. 98; *Basket v. Moss*, 115 N. C. 448, 20 S. E. 733, 44 Am. St. Rep. 463, 48 L. R. A. 842; *Eddy v. Capron*, 4 R. I. 394, 67 Am. Dec. 541; *Meachem v. Dow*, 32 Vt. 721. The officer's real motive for resigning is immaterial. *Eddy v. Capron*, 4 R. I. 394, 67 Am. Dec. 541.