

much-married man, why does he not agitate for a new clause in our laws binding the man to provide for his wife's sister while he lives, and making her an heir-at-law if he die intestate? The expression is a misnomer, so far as giving her any legal status with her sister's husband is concerned. The term sister-in-law has no meaning in any other than a mere conventional sense. I am not disposed to put it aside. As long as we know its meaning, it will answer our purpose to use it. All intelligent and reasonable men know that it simply means a wife's or a husband's sister, nothing more. In law it is nothing. However, if I ask Mr. Roe to tell me what is a sister-in-law, he replies, "She is a being who is so circumstanced by reason of her sister's marriage as to justly claim from her sister's husband 'a thousand familiarities,' with all their 'endearing and civilizing influences.'" If he fails to see the absurdity of his own argument, after his attention has been so particularly called to it, I am afraid his case is hopeless.

*Au revoir.*

D. V. LUCAS.

---

#### No. 4.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF THE GAZETTE:

SIR,—I wish to state, on my own behalf at least, that whatever is clearly made out to be the true sentiment of Holy Scriptures on the subject under discussion, as on all other subjects, is with me, as it ought to be with all men, absolute authority.

Do the Scriptures of God prohibit any man from marrying the sister of his deceased wife? Our law as now existing is framed upon the supposition that they do.

Many persons think the Scriptures do not contain any such prohibition; these, therefore, think that the law is wrong and unjust, because it debars some men from doing that which is not only the very best thing for them to do, but which they feel has the undoubted sanction of God himself. A law which is against