

clerks. Accordingly, the government has compensated these gentlemen for their loss by providing Sir Charles Russell with £250 a year for his 'personal clerk,' and by making the Solicitor-General an allowance of £200 for a similar purpose. The law officers' clerks will, we understand, continue to receive fees in connection with the contentious business in which the law officers are engaged, but their financial position will not be so good as it was under the old régime." This is very nice for the clerks, and there seems to be plenty of money in England.

---

THE legal profession in Madras are considering the formation of a law institute or society. Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar, in an address to the graduates at a recent convocation, as we learn from the *Madras Law Journal*, proposes to form an association composed of representatives of all the three branches of the profession—advocates, attorneys, and vakils (agents). "The object is to maintain a high standard of professional conduct, bring its influence to bear upon every member of the profession, and enable him to seek for and obtain advice as to the rule of professional conduct which should govern and guide him in a matter of some difficulty. The duty of the proposed association will be to bring to the notice of the court cases of professional misconduct, and also to report to the court on cases which, as a rule, should in the first instance be referred to it for investigation." We can not speak with any exactitude of the position of a "vakil," but presume the word indicates a class of native agents or pettifoggers. The writer says that "if the idea of combining the three branches of the profession to form an association of the kind should be found to be practicable, we think there are many things to recommend such a course. The advocates and attorneys have always acted together in questions affecting the profession, but the same relations have not always existed between them both and the vakils. Their professional interests have, for one reason or another, been sometimes regarded as mutually antagonistic, and their opinions on questions in connection with the profession or with the administration of justice have often differed. We do not mean to suggest that this state of things is bound to continue; and it is quite possible for them to act in union in many matters even at present. We hope they may be able to find that their