SCOTTISH NULLITY SUIT.

WIFE'S UNSUCCESSFUL CLAIM.

Lord Hunter has delivered judgment in the Court of Session, Edinburgh, in an action in which Agnes Lockerbie Faulder, or Guild, of Newon Cottage, Darvel, sought to have her marriage with Thomas A. Guild, teacher, of Mossbank Industrial School, Millerston, Glasgow, declared null and void on the ground that Guild had previously been married to Margaret T. Ramsay, otherwise Margaret T. R. Scarth, of Hucheson-street, Outremont, Montreal, the wife of Professor G. W. Scarth, of McGill University. Both Mr. Guild and Mrs. Scarth denied that they were ever married to one another.

Lord Hunter absolved the defenders from the conclusions of the summons, and found the defender Guild liable in expenses to the plaintiff and to Mrs. Scarth.

His LORDSHIP said that the plaintiff was married to Guild in April, 1923. About May of that year the plaintiff discovered letters written to him by a Miss Ramsay and certain documents which suggested to the plaintiff that her husband had contracted an irregular marriage with Miss Ramsay some years before. The defenders met in 1903, when Miss Ramsay was 17 and at school, living in Dundee. They were not engaged and no suggestion of mar-riage had been made. In 1905 Miss Ramsay became anxious as to her condition, and Guild wrote out two documents, one of which was signed by him and the other by Miss Ramsay. signed by him and the other by Miss Rainsay. Guild said he got the form of declaration out of the English Church Prayer Book. Both documents were retained by Guild, whom she trusted to make them forthcoming if she be-came pregnant. Guild never gave Miss Ramsay a wedding ring, but bought Ramsay a wedding ring, but bought her an engagement ring, which she her an engagement ring, which she wore. She also visited Guild's parents, and was received as his *fiancée*. In March, 1916, Guild sent to the Registrar-General "the contracting papers of marriage," which had been prepared and dated as of 1913, but which in reality had been signed in 1916. In any view of the case the state-ments in Guild's letter to the Registrar-General and in the documents were false. It was clear that no marriage took place on the was clear that no marriage took place on the date stated. What was inexplicable was date date stated. What was inexplicable was Guild's retaining Miss Ramsay's letters and the declarations not only after her marriage but his own. He ought certainly to have destroyed them before Miss Ramsay's marriage, and he (the Judge) could only ascribe his not having done so to his vanity and stupidity. His Lordship did not think that there was evidence from which he would be entitled to draw the conclusion that the defenders were ever effectively married to each other.