

be equivalent to the time of one judge, 583 hours spent in gowning and ungowning, or seventy-two days of eight hours each. Would not these seventy-two days of a judge's time be better spent in writing opinions than in gowning and ungowning?" The notion that a judge's whole time must necessarily be devoted to hearing and deciding cases is a mistaken one. The time spent by a judge in putting on or off a gown is no more wasted than the time spent in shaving, or in getting his hair cut. It does not take a single minute in the year from his sittings in court.

*MARRIAGE—WIFE'S CONCEALMENT OF PREG-
NANCY AT TIME OF MARRIAGE.*

Sir Francis Jeune, president of the English Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division, gave judgment on the 5th June, 1897, in the case of *Moss v. Moss*. This was a suit in which the husband sought for a decree of nullity on the ground of the wife's fraud in concealing from him the fact that she was *enceinte* by another man at the date of the marriage. The suit was undefended, but, at the suggestion of the president, the attorney-general instructed the Queen's proctor to argue the case against the petitioner. The case was argued on May 20th last, and was fully reported in *The Times* on May 21st.

Judgment was then reserved, and on June 5th, 1897, the president delivered the following considered judgment:—

In this case the petitioner seeks to have his marriage with the respondent declared null and void, on the ground that, without his knowledge in fact, and without any neglect on his part to make himself acquainted with the truth, his wife was pregnant by another man at the time of his marriage with her. I find that these allegations of fact were proved. It was also stated that the connection of the respondent with the father of her child was incestuous. The proof of this was not made complete. I do not know whether it could have been; but the allegation was admitted to be immaterial for the purposes of the present case. Had the connection been with a relative, within the forbidden degrees, of the petitioner, there is high authority for saying that the marriage would have been incestuous and void. On these facts, the argument before me was that there was fraud.