

## QUESTION.

Illustrate the position in mathematical point of view. No. 7, a farmer after harvest, but before the sale of produce, shortage of Creditors 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Creditor and debtor

7

THE  
LAW.

crop from any cause. No. 6 applies to the law, and was never known to be refused, with a debt of \$50 against No. 7; and we

Debtors 8, 9,

must not forget to add \$40 costs. Take this \$90 out of his already short crop, what shape will No. 7 be in? Now No. 7 is obliged to get mad and jump on to No. 9 with law, for a debt of \$50 and, the law gets another \$40. No. 7 is still \$40 out of pocket, and the law is \$80 in pocket. Things are beginning to look bad, so No. 5 demands his claim to be settled, and there is no alternative but to use the law against No. 7, and No. 7 against No. 8. Now No. 7 is \$80 out of pocket, Nos. 8 and 9 are \$40 each and the law is \$160 in pocket. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 have got nothing, and by the law having taken \$80 from No. 7 it is causing a loss of \$20 each to Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4. The loss the law is causing in selling stock that is not fit for market can not be figured out, but one thing certain, No 7 will be down to the last cow, and will have to mortgage his farm to pay 1, 2, 3 and 4, and how long can No. 7 pay interest to a loan company with stock and implements more than half gone?

## REPLY.

Is it not certain the law had the advantage and intends to keep it to the finish, and No. 7 being creditor to No. 8 and 9 was the cause of their goods and chattles being sold at a sacrifice, also Do we not clearly see that soon as the law did meddle with the property of No. 7 it caused all the creditors and debtors to get mad and ugly toward each other; do we not know it was an injustice when it is known that No. 7 was an honest man or he should not have had so many creditors. We well know a rogue, or tricky person could not have more than one or two creditors in any town where he was known. Can we not feel for No. 7 in his affliction when it is altogether likely he will have to go and work out by the day for a very small pittance. Are we not alive to the fact that expense of wear and tear of implements, boots, shoes, clothing, or a physician in time of illness, 1 lb. or 3 lbs. per acre of twine to tie up the crop, are all things of expense to conduct that business, impossible to be done without, and no man living could tell how much or how little expense may be required to run the farm of No. 7 for one year; do we not clearly see that any honest farmer is liable to be in the position of No. 7 and subject to the mercy of the creditor and the law, and we have facts to prove there has been very little consideration shown a