

and yet Mr. Roe holds that a "thousand familiarities" are her due from her sister's husband, and "always accorded her," under the law as it now stands.

You see into what absurdities men will unconsciously and unintentionally run when they attempt to advocate and defend a bad cause.

But these are not the only absurdities. The advocates of the present law tell us that when a man marries, his wife's sister becomes his sister, and that his brother becomes her brother, and they mean it in the fullest sense: They cannot be persuaded to discount this statement of theirs in the least. If so, then, see what follows: A. and B. are two brothers of a respectable family on Sherbrooke street. C. and D. are two sisters of a respectable family on Dorchester street. Now, if young Mr. B. and Miss C. were to marry, it would be a very wicked thing, on the principles which these gentlemen advocate, for A. and D. to marry. When one of Dr. Roe's brethren was confronted with this argument, the other day, he replied, "Certainly it would be wrong for them to marry," and he could see no absurdity in argument which leads him to such a conclusion.

Paul says, "The woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth, but if her husband be dead she is free from that law."

It is admitted by all parties that the law applies equally to both sexes. Well, then, Paul says the husband is free, that is, the law ends, it ceases to exist. But here are certain men who set up strong claims to intelligence, who say, "Nay, Paul, you are wrong; the law is by no means ended by the death of the wife. The man is still bound by that law to his wife's sister in closer relationship (they say) than that of consanguinity which exists between him and his parent's daughter." If they cannot see absurdity here, I pity them.

Now, sir, what is a sister-in-law? Is she a sister *in law*? Is she an heir-at-law? Does our law, or any law, give her any legal claim or any legal advantage? Is the married man bound by law to support her, even if there be a dozen of her? If Mr. Roe thinks that the Scriptures lay such obligations upon the poor,