

THE *Law Journal* (England) refers to a statement that the judges have under consideration a plan for dealing with the reporting of proceedings in Chambers, and then proceeds to comment on the subject as follows :— " This information will be received with mingled feelings by busy practitioners. The accumulation of reported decisions is so great that it is more than doubtful if reports of Chamber proceedings would be really beneficial. Chamber practice is of such a rough-and-tumble character that it scarcely lends itself to the recording pen of the reporter, while the wordy and frequently noisy conflicts between counsel, with which we are familiar in these largely informal tribunals, would be often protracted to a length which is really horrible to contemplate if the disputants had at their disposal a few volumes of these projected reports."

---

THE LENGTH OF THE CHANCELLOR'S FOOT.—There is a story told of a law student at his final examination being asked a question as to when a court of equity would interfere by injunction, and of his making answer, " Where the conduct of the defendant is such as to shock the conscience of the Lord Chancellor," who then was Lord Westbury, about the sensitiveness of whose moral organ doubts had begun to be whispered. The naive reply of the student may excite a smile ; yet more is to be said in support of it than might at first appear. For the equity remedy by injunction is not one *ex debito justitiæ*, but one entirely in the discretion of the court ; and, when we once get into the region of discretion, the only guide we have is the knowledge of the mental and moral constitution—moral quite as much as mental—of the particular Chancery judge from whom an injunction is sought. The tender conscience of one might be roused by conduct on the part of a defendant which would not even ruffle the equanimity of another. And when we have done with the judge of first instance, we have still to reckon with the idiosyncrasies of the members of the Court of Appeal.—*Law Journal*.

---

THE EXCLUSION OF PARTIES AND EXPERTS FROM COURT.—In the case of *Trevaskis v. Brunsten*, which belonged to the familiar category of " running down " actions, Mr. Justice Gran-