

sion of the transaction, she sold it to her son for what she gave for it, throwing the improvements in, to make up for what she owed him as a clerk, for services in her store for more than two years.

Some light may be reflected upon the character and motives which led to the deed of July, 1843, by looking into the circumstances attending the execution of that of August 22d following. Having by the first deed conveyed her store to her son, by the second she conveyed to him her entire stock of goods, and all her household and kitchen furniture. That she was then insolvent in fact, without credit, and pressed by those to whom she was indebted, is undeniably true; and she herself declares that she executed it "to keep the goods from being swept away." It further appears, from her own testimony, that she retained the possession of the goods and furniture, and disposed of them at her own pleasure. She says, in answer to the fifth interrogatory in chief, "that the goods and furniture never did go to the benefit of Hugh McNeal." "Some of the furniture is still in the possession of the witness, but is not worth fifty dollars." "Other creditors got the benefit of the goods." And in answer to the ninth cross-interrogatory, she says, "that witness sold him the house, and as to the other deed, witness felt that she was indebted to him, and witness thought him as well entitled to be paid as any one else, and he allowed her to dispose of the goods for the benefit of her creditors at large. She made the deed to keep the goods from being swept away, so that every creditor might get their just share." Now this, to say the least, is a very strange vindication of this last-mentioned deed. It was executed by Mrs. Watson because, as she says, she felt that she was indebted to her son, and she thought he was as well entitled to be paid as any one else; and yet he allowed her to dispose of the property for the benefit of her creditors at large. "She made it to keep the goods from being swept away, so that every creditor might get their share."

This appears to be a very extraordinary way of taking care of a favored creditor. The two motives assigned by the grantor for making the deed, are utterly irreconcilable. The first was