

## The Legal News.

VOL. VI. AUGUST 11, 1883. No. 32.

### LORD COLERIDGE'S VISIT.

The Lord Chief Justice and party are expected to arrive August 23. The following rather extensive tour has been arranged by Mr. E. F. Shepard, chairman of the committee of arrangements of the N. Y. State Bar Association:— Monday, August 27, to Irvington by train. W. D. Sloane's reception. Tuesday, August 28, and Wednesday, August 29, at Saratoga. Garden party, etc., at the Grand Union Hotel, fireworks in Congress park. Judge Hilton will entertain the party. Trip to Mt. McGregor. Thursday, August 30, and Friday, August 31, at Newport. Saturday, September 1, at Windsor, Vt., William M. Everts' guests. Sunday, September 2, rest at the Profile House, White Mountains. Monday, September 3, Fabyan's Twin Mt. House, Glen House, etc. Tuesday, September 4, leave the White Mountains and arrive at Boston. Wednesday, September 5, guests of Gov. Butler and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; take part in the exercise of the "Manufacturers' and Mechanics' Institute for the purpose of the General Improvement of Manufacturing and Mechanical Interests and the holding of Industrial Exhibitions Annually." Thursday, September 6, in Boston, attending receptions and dinners. Friday, September 7, to Portland and Bangor. Saturday, September 8, at Fredericton, N. B., where Lord Coleridge will visit his old friend, the Bishop of Fredericton, N. B. From Fredericton the party go St. John and Quebec. At the latter place there will be a reception and dinner. At Montreal there will be a reception. Also at Ottawa. At Toronto a reception by the bar of the Province. Thence the party will proceed to Niagara Falls, the Thousand Islands, Watkins Glen, Rochester, Buffalo (reception), Cleveland, Sandusky, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago (reception by State bar), Milwaukee, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Sioux City, Omaha, Council Bluffs, St. Joseph, Kansas City, St. Louis, Decatur, Logansport, Indianapolis, Dayton, Cincinnati, Springfield, Columbus, Wheeling, Chattanooga, Pittsburgh, Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Mansfield, Sa-

lamanca, Rochester, Syracuse, Albany and New York. The date for the Albany visit has not been settled as yet. In New York the Lord Chief Justice will be given the public reception by the New York State Bar Association, on the conclusion of the trip, which will be in the latter part of October.

### PREGNANCY AS GROUND FOR AVOIDING MARRIAGE.

It is quite well settled that there is no implied warranty of chastity on the part of a woman contracting marriage. *Varney v. Varney*, 52 Wis. 130; S. C., 38 Am. Rep. 726. In the case of concealed pregnancy by another man at the time of the marriage, however, the courts have generally given relief to the deceived husband. The most recent case on this subject is *Allen's Appeal*, 99 Penn. St. 196. Here the late Chief Justice Sharswood said: "Thus it is well settled that want of chastity on the part of the woman—ante-nuptial incontinence—even though she may have expressly represented herself as virtuous—forms no ground for avoiding the contract. \* \* \* This seems also to be the dictate of humanity and in conformity to the gospel which so strongly throughout inculcates the duty of mutual forgiveness. For otherwise, one of strong passions, led astray or seduced by the wicked arts of others, could have no hopes for reform. In such cases it is best for society that the past should be entirely buried in oblivion, and that the poor erring creature should have the best chance of a new life of respectability and honor. It is best that the other party should know, when the sin is afterward revealed to him, that it can do no good, but unmixed evil, to make it public by applying for a divorce. They must learn to submit to the inevitable. \* \* \* And if ante-nuptial incontinence be a sufficient ground of nullity as against the woman, it is not easy to see why it should not be so likewise against the man, and the consequence of such a doctrine it is not easy to predict. Actual pregnancy at the time of the marriage presents an entirely different question. It introduces a different element. The marriage status of the parties is changed. The man is then necessarily put to the alternative of either publishing his wife's shame, or submitting to have the child of a