

his former wards, to a considerable amount, at the period of the execution of the deeds complained of, and that he was also, at the same time, indebted to other persons.

2. That in October, 1844, his authority as guardian was revoked by the Orphans Court, upon the application of his sureties for counter security, one of which sureties was the party by whom the present bill was filed, as guardian to the infant complainants, and the other the party by whom, in the same capacity, the suit is now carried on.

3. That the said deeds embraced all the grantor's property, of which, or of a considerable portion of which, he retained the possession and use.

4. That in October succeeding the execution of the deeds, the grantor petitioned for the benefit of the insolvent laws, returning no property in his schedule ; and,

5. I am satisfied from all the circumstances of the case, as disclosed by the evidence, that the party to whom the deeds were made, never did, or could have paid the consideration as therein contained, and that the entire transaction was a scheme to defraud, his, the grantor's, creditors.

Before advertng very briefly to the points presented in the argument of the defendant's solicitor, it may be proper to remark, that the Chancellor thinks the complainants' exceptions to the answer of Richards and wife to the supplemental bill are well taken and must be sustained.

He is of opinion, that though the original and supplemental bill constitute but one record, and must be so regarded at the hearing, yet, as these defendants had before answered the original bill, their answer to the supplemental bill should have been restricted to the matters stated in it, and that they had no right, under pretext of answering the supplemental, to add to or amend their answer to the original bill. 1 *Daniels, Ch. Pr.*, 456 ; 2 *ib.*, 839. *Thomas vs. The Visitors of Fred'k. School*, 7 *Gill and Johns.*, 369.

The first objection urged by the defendant's solicitor is, that during the minority of the wards, no proceeding can be instituted in their names, against their defaulting guardian. But in this