the foregoing bill of complaint, which answer is in manner and form as follows, to wit:

William T. Manlsby, Harry M. Clabaugh, Trustees, et al., vs Jesse H. Haugh and Wife, and Others.	No. 2258 Equity In the Circuit Court for Carroll County, sitting in Equity.

To the Honorable, the Judges of the Circuit Court for Carroll County, Sitting as a Court of Equity:

The separate and joint answer of Jesse H. Haugh and Margaret A. Haugh, his wife, two of the defendants to the bill of complaint in the above entitled cause, against them and others exhibited:

These defendants now, and at all times hereafter, saving and reserving to themselves all manner of benefit and advantage of exception to the many errors and insufficiencies in the complaints said bill of complaint contained, for answer thereunto, or unto so much or such parts thereof as these defendants are advised is material for them to answer, say:

1st. That they admit the execution and delivery to Manoah Metz, of the deed of conveyance, of which Exhibit No. 2 to said bill of complaint is a certified copy, on the 9th day of May, A. D. 1883, for the sum of $3,500.00.

2d. That they admit that said Jesse H. Haugh did, on the 7th day of November in the year 1883, apply for the benefit of the Insolvent Laws of Maryland; and that said William Haugh and George T. Motter were creditors of him, the said Jesse H., and that said William Haugh was security for said Jesse H. on several notes; and that on the said 9th of May, 1883, the said Jesse H.

was largely indebted to said William Haugh and George T. Motter, and divers other persons; and that he was at that time insolvent, and unable to pay his debts in full even if he, the said Jesse H., had applied thereto the proceeds of the property conveyed in said deed, Exhibit No. 2.

That said Manoah Metz did, in fact, pay to said Jesse H. Haugh the whole of the purchase money in said deed — exhibit No. 2 — mentioned, namely: the sum of thirty-five hundred dollars in United States Government bonds, and these defendants deny that said bonds, or any part of them, or that said purchase money, or any part thereof, were furnished to said Metz by these defendants, or either of them, or by anyone else for them; they further deny, that the transaction attending the payment of said purchase money, was ~~sham~~ simulated and fraudulent, or that it was a device to cheat and defraud the creditors of said Jesse H. Haugh, as alleged in said bill of complaint; and also deny that it was a device to secure to said Margaret A. Haugh the fruits and value of said property, and defraud the creditors of said Jesse H., as alleged in said bill; on the contrary they say that said transaction was bona fide and for a valuable consideration.

They deny that these defendants executed said deed in contemplation of the insolvency of said Jesse H., or with intent to hinder, delay and defraud the creditors of said Jesse H., or that the same was known to said Metz.

They further deny that said deed was executed for the purpose of giving and securing to said Margaret A. Haugh an unlawful preference as a creditor of said