and they now peofess themselves willing and ready to make any valid defense that may be made in this suit. And futher answering said paragraph 5 to the amended petition these respondents say that as to the conclusion drawn from the allegations of these respondents' answer by the colicitor for the petitioner, the language used in paragraph 2 of the answer of respondents to the original petition is plain, and it is hereby reiterated and repeated, and these respondents again take occasin to call the attention of this Honorable Court to the fact of record in this cause that the same solicitors who filed the petition of February 15th, 1908 asking that Augustus and Elizabeth Ebert, the bankrupts, and Harry and Nargaret M. Ebert, the alleged creditors, to be made parties to this suit, are now appearing for Michael F Seachrist and filed this amended petition for him in his name.

5th. Answering paragraph 6 and 9 these respondants say that they are ready and willing to make any valid and bonafide, legal defense that may be made on behalf of the creditors of the bankrupts in this suit. And futher answering said parAgraph, with particular reference to paragraph 9 of the amended petition these respondents say that for the first time on the readings of this amended petition and paragraph 9 thereof have they had any knowledge of or information of the alleged defenses of Michael F. Seachrist to this suit, whish the solicitors for the bankrupts and of Harry and Margaret Ebert, alleged creditors of the bankrupt, and of Michael F. Seachrist, this prtitioner, desires to make in this cause, and now that the said alleged defense is disclosed in said paragraph 9 of the amended petition, these respondents respectfully submit the same to the consideration of this Honorable Court, and will abide its directions in the matter as to wether the defense as mentioned in the amended petitiom, paragraph 9, is valid and meritorious and should be made in this cause.

6th. Answering paragraphs 7 and 8 of the amended petition these respondents say that the allegations contained in said paragraphs are impertinent, scandalous and extremely offencive, charging as they do, collusion on the part of these respondent in proventing defense being made in this suit, and that "the petitioner and his associate creditors will not have matters which they desire to bring to the attention of the Court properly and rightly presented to the Court, and that the Trustees will not urge these defenses and support them in the same manner and with the same degree of care, and perseverance as if their attorneys represented them sloely and absolutely and were freefrom all entangling alliances with the complainant in this cause, which said alliance your petitioner believes now exists, "And futher answering said paragraphs these respondents say that they do not recognize the rights of the petitioner or of his solicitors to "exact" of the Trustees any assurance "to set up and plead" the alleged defenses as contained in paragraph 9 of the amended petition, and " Upon what meat doth this, our Ceaser, feed?" that these respondents should recognise any right in the petitioner or his solicitors to "demand" of these respondents any assurense," that they will conduct themselves with zeal, fidelity and force and will be sincere, earnest, and aggressive in maintaining them, and in doing every other act and thing in a proper and diligent manner for his protection and those of his fellow creditors," and these respondents say that the solicitor for the petitioner desires, with a much exagerated "Ego," to usurp the power of this Honorable Court when they attempt to "exact" of the Trustees the assurance "to set up and plead" the defense that they outline in paragraph 9. And these respondents say that the language used in paragraph 7 and 9 by the solicitor for the petitioner in his amended petition is extremely bumptious and unnecessarily offensive to honorable gentlemen, members of the Bar of this Honorable Court, charging them with ignorance of their duties as Trustees of the bankrupt creditors, and an asperation upon their legal knowledge and an insult to their characters and standing as professional men, the promptings perhapts of over-heated imagination or "brain-storms" resulting from their zeal to serve the interest of the