

also the allegation that defendants have all conspired to withdraw the property of Sleeman from the reach of his creditors by transferring it in various ways, and by ultimately putting parts of it, at all events, in the properties specifically mentioned, which plaintiffs are seeking to reach.

It is not necessary to say whether plaintiffs have made, in paragraph 6, a case which would entitle them to any specific relief as to the matters that are there dealt with. I think it is unnecessary for me to determine that on this motion. Plaintiffs are entitled to full discovery as to the matters that they specifically attack, and the transfers of the lands attacked in paragraphs 8 and 13, and also the dealings with the moneys which plaintiffs allege were employed in putting up the building.

I think it is relevant, also, to the inquiry to ascertain whether dispositions were made by the debtor of his property to these defendants, and, possibly, to others than these defendants, at a time and in circumstances that would tend to throw light upon what the intent was in making a transfer or disposition which is specifically attacked.

There are many instances in which that kind of evidence is admissible. Where the intent of the party is the subject of inquiry, you may shew other acts done, under similar circumstances, and about the same time, for the purpose of shewing the intent in a particular transaction.

Now, so limited, it seems to me that plaintiffs have the right fully to interrogate all these defendants. There must be considerable latitude allowed in these fraudulent conveyance cases in the examination, but care must be taken not to permit the examination to be made use of as a cloak to cover the purpose of examining into any business other than the debtor's with which a plaintiff has no concern. It is impossible to define just what questions may be put, and it will be open to defendants upon the further examination of any of the deponents, if they think the examination is not one fairly directed or relevant to the issues, as I have mentioned, to object to answer that question, and to ask for the determination of the Court as to it.

But, as I say, there must be a good deal of latitude allowed in these examinations. At the trial, I have no doubt, even supposing the claim were confined to the attack upon the specific transactions which are impeached, the Court could not shut out any evidence that was offered of dealings by Sleeman with his property, which would tend to shew that his motive in dealing with the particular property was to