

125

JUSTICE.

"Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren, or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates:" Deuteronomy 24:14.

A careful study of the laws of Moses shows two things very distinctly. It reveals the mercy and justice of Jehovah's religion and it shows very plainly how much the enlightened laws of nations today owe to this code of laws. Even in the enlightened age in which we live we are constantly finding and repealing laws that conflict with the simple maxims of justice laid down in these great laws. In searching the laws of enlightened lands we are constantly running into laws that were taken from this great standard.

Here is a striking example: "When thou dost lend thy brother any thing, thou shalt not go into his house to fetch his pledge; Thou shalt stand abroad, and the man to whom thou dost lend shall bring out the pledge abroad unto thee." Deuteronomy 24:10-11.

English law: "A man's house is his castle." If the English law was not copied from Moses law they both grew out of the same human thought or the same divine inspiration.

Here is another law that has had a wide influence on English law: "And if a man be poor, thou shalt not sleep with his pledge: In any case thou shalt deliver him the pledge again when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his own raiment, and bless thee: and it shall be righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God." Deuteronomy 24: 12-13.

It would be superflous to say that the pledge should be returned if the debt was paid. Plainly this law means that the garment that a man had pledge for a loan should be returned before night, even if the loan was still unpaid. In Palestine the nights were often very cold. A man who had pledged his outer garment for a loan during the day might suffer without it at night. This law states in plain words, "The man is more important than the dollar. How many laws in Christian lands today meet this simple law in mercy and justice?"

Prior to 1915 the law in Alabama gave the landlrod the right to attach the furniture and household goods of a tenant who failed to pay his rent. This law was so harsh in its application that many landlrods and real estate men refused to use it. It is needless to say that many more, a majority perhaps, did use it frequently. Although the furniture and household goods were a priceless treasure to the poor tenant, being all he had, when they were put on the market they seldom brought enough to pay the rent. So the rent was still unpaid even after the poor tenant was stripped. I do not know what laws ether states had during these years, but I am sure many of them had no better than Alabama.

In 1909 or 1910 the Legislature of Alabama passed another landlrod and tenant bill that was so harsh and unjust it was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. This act made it evidence of felony if a tenant moved off the landlrod's place after he had received advances to make a crop. The tenant was convicted by his act of moving off, no matter how he was used. If the men who passed these bills are still living they would not like to be confronted with the arguements they used to pass these measures and to

defend them before the Supreme Court. I well remember one lawyer's arguement in our county who was trying to show the Supreme Court was wrong. I could not quote him word for word if I tried. But his arguement was based on the assumption that all landlords were noble upright men, who would never think of using the advantage this notorious law gave him over a tenant or his family. It further assumed that all tenants were crooks and rascals trying to beat the landlord out of money he had advanced them. I was only a poor school teacher with limited preparation for that, and knew but little law. But I did know some landlords, and I knew some tenants. I knew that all landlords are not noble and upright and that all tenants are not rascals and thieves.

I well remember the slump in the price of lumber in 1913 or 1914 when so many saw mills in our county were shut down. Since our county was largely forest many people there were facing hunger. A man came into our town and bought some houses for almost nothing. There were no real estate men in the little town, so he went to the largest property owner, who was a doctor and asked him to take charge of his houses and collect the rents. The good doctor reminded him of the plight of many of many of the poor saw mill workers and asked him what he would expect him to do if the rent was not paid. The man reminded him of the law that gave the landlord the right to attach the furniture and household goods of the tenant if the rent was unpaid. The doctor told him plainly that he did use that law to collect his own rents and certainly would not use it to collect rents for some one else. The man finally gave him the business of collecting the rents in any way he saw fit.

Georgia, but I suppose they are very much like the Harris
 Act of Alabama. I saw a cartoon in one of the Georgia ^{papers} lately
 supporting the measure that is now before the Legislature of
 the state. It showed the state house with all the well paid
 lobbyists going in at the door. Each one's brief case was
 labeled with the interest he represented. On the outside,
 at the bottom of the steps was a forlorn and lonely figure
 labeled "Poverty". The caption of the cartoon was "Who
 will speak for him?". In the name of mercy and charity,
 in the name of justice and honesty the notorious Harris Act
 should be repealed, and the usury law enforced. If the cost
 of making small loans is such that they cannot be made at
 the legal rate of interest the law should allow enough to
 cover the reasonable cost of such transactions and no more.