ALIEN.

The revolutionary confiscation acts gave to the creditors of alien enemies remedies as effectual as those taken away, and removed no property beyond the reach of such creditors.—Hepburn's case, 116.

ANSWER.

A motion to dissolve the injunction and exceptions to the answer, may be taken up together and determined at the same time.—Salmon *v.* Clagett, 131.

The answer should, in general, be sworn to; but must nevertheless be allowed to have full effect, as such, although made by one who is incompetent to give evidence as a witness, or who is incapable of taking an oath, 141, 165.

The answer called for by the bill is only as to certain facts therein set forth, 140.

An answer is to serve the purposes of the plaintiff, not the defendant; and is equivalent to parol evidence only; therefore written evidence must be exhibited when called for, 141; Neale *v.* Hagthrop, 567.

Matters set forth in an answer by way of avoidance, no evidence; unless made so by the plaintiff's setting the case down on bill and answer.—Salmon *v.* Clagett, 141; *Beard v. Williams*, 164.

A defendant, who submits to answer must answer as fully as the bill requires; or the plaintiffs may except, or have the bill taken *pro confesso*.—Salmon *v.* Clagett, 142; Neale *v.* Hagthrop, 568.

The disclosures called for, must be pertinent and material to the plaintiff's case. —Salmon *v.* Clagett, 144.

No one can be compelled to criminate himself, 144.

A solicitor not allowed to divulge the secrets of his client, 145.

A defendant is not bound to produce, by way of answer, any public documentary evidence of which he is the official keeper, 145.

One who stands as a disinterested witness may disclaim and refuse to answer, 146.

The cases which consider any matter in avoidance embodied in an answer as having the effect of a plea make a new use of such an answer, which cannot be allowed, 149, 158.

A defendant in answering a bill of discovery, may set forth any pertinent matter in avoidance.—Price *v.* Tyson, 398.

No matter stated by way of answer, which affords such information as the bill calls for, or which may be needful as a defence, can be deemed impertinent, 400.

Nor can any matter which is pertinent to the case be deemed scandalous, 400.

Statements in a bill or answer as to agreements with persons not parties to the suit; the nature and validity of which agreements are not drawn in question; and all careless verbiage may be rejected as mere surplusage.—Neale *v.* Hagthrop, 566, 580.

The answer of a defendant is taken for true so far as it is responsive to the bill, unless disproved, 567.

Its allegations of fact not responsive, but in avoidance must be proved, 568.

The proposition that any material allegation left unanswered may, at the hearing, be taken for true, considered; held, that it must be proved, 569, 579, note.

Where a defendant answers that he is entirely ignorant of the matter, and leaves the plaintiff to make out his case, or in words to that effect; the allegations of the bill are thus put in issue and must be proved, 579.

ATTACHMENT.

The object of the judicial proceeding by attachment is to enable a creditor to obtain satisfaction from his absent debtor's property found here.—Hepburn's case, 118.

Although a non-resident alien enemy cannot sue; yet a citizen creditor may, by attachment, obtain satisfaction from the property found here of an alien enemy debtor, 120.

A citizen can only be arrested by civil process, in the county in which he resides; but may be taken by an attachment from the Court of Chancery any where within the state.—The Cape Sable Company's case, 664.

BILL.

A supplemental bill is a distinct record; but an original and amended bill are considered as one entire record.—Walsh *v.* Smyth, 20.

The nature of an amendment, 20.

No amendment can be made without leave; if short, it may be made by interlineation; but, in general, it should be made by a separate bill, 21.

A creditor's bill need not allege and shew an insufficiency of the personalty in order to have a sale of the realty, that being an equity between the heir and the executor.—Tessier *v.* Wyse, 43, 49.

An interrogatory, in the nature of a cross bill, propounded by a defendant to a plaintiff, answered by the monosyllable, yes.—Salmon *v.* Clagett, 130.

The bill should set out an equitable, as contradistinguished from a mere legal cause of suit, 134.

Every bill assumes two propositions: first, that the case is within the jurisdiction of the court; and second, that