Chancellor, in his opinion, it is unnecessary to make a full statement of the case.]

THE CHANCELLOR:

To the original answer of the defendant in this case, the plaintiffs excepted for insufficiency, but before the time fixed for hearing these exceptions had arrived, the defendant filed an answer to the exceptions; and it seems to be conceded that this answer gives all the information required by the bill, and is full and complete except with reference to a part of that specified in the fourth exception, which is in the following words: "That whereas, the bill calls for a particular and detailed account of the entire trust, since it came under the charge of the defendant, either as agent or trustee, specifying the sums of money received, the date of each receipt, the amount of each receipt, and the party from whom received. The sums paid away; the amount of each payment; the date of each payment; and the name of the party to whom paid; the entire expenses of the trust, and the particulars of such expenses." And this exception affirms, that the answer gives no such account as the bill in this respect is assumed to call for.

Independently of other objections, the existence and validity of which it is not proposed now to notice, it is material to inquire, whether the plaintiffs by their bill have made such a case as entitle them to all the information called for by this exception.

It appears by the bill and exhibits, and the admissions of the answer, that James West, the intestate of the plaintiffs, on the 21st of November, 1805, conveyed all his property, of every description, to Humphrey Pierce and Alexander Macdonald, in trust, for the payment of his debts in the mode specified in the conveyance; that the trustees accepted the trust and appointed James West their agent in the management thereof, who continued to act as such until his death in December, 1809; and that there became and was due to him for advances of cash beyond his receipts, and for his services as agent, the sum of about \$9,900.