

TWENTY ONE YEARS OF THE FACULTY OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE: REFLECTIONS OF THE DEAN

I. INTRODUCTION

To mark the twenty first anniversary of the Faculty of Law, University of Singapore, three former Deans of the Faculty, Professor L.A. Sheridan, Professor H.E. Groves and Professor L.C. Green, have contributed articles for publication in this issue. It may be appropriate if, as the present Dean, I could comment on the development of the Faculty. This article is not a comprehensive survey of all the aspects or problems of the Faculty nor does it purport to be a historical account¹ of the Faculty's development. It is, at best, personal reflections on certain selected aspects of the Law School which are of interest to the writer. The discussion of these aspects will proceed under the following headings: II. Students; III. Teaching Staff; IV. Postgraduate Legal Studies; V. Staff Writing and Research; VI. Postgraduate Practical Training for Admission to the Legal Profession.

Until the mid-1950's there were no institutions of higher learning offering organised legal education in Singapore. Those who wished to obtain legal education proceeded to the United Kingdom. In 1955, the University (then known as the University of Malaya) received the Allen-Braddell Report, which outlined a scheme of organisation of courses in social studies and in law.² In the following year, the

¹ The following is a selection of published articles and notes on the Faculty of Law in Singapore or generally on legal education in Singapore. The list is in chronological order. L.A. Sheridan: "University law", [1956] M.L.J. xxviii; L.A. Sheridan: "Legal education in Malaya", (1957) Journal of the Society of Public Teachers of Law 19; L.A. Sheridan: "Development of university law teaching in Malaya", 1 No. 1 Me Judice 3 (1958); Calvert, Coomaraswamy & Sheridan: "Problems of legal education", 2 No. 2 Me Judice 11 (1960); Calvert, Coomaraswamy & Sheridan: "Legal education in Malaya", (1960) Journal of the Society of Public Teachers of Law 155; L.A. Sheridan: "Legal education", [1961] M.L.J. lxxxv; Report on the proceedings of the Regional Conference on Legal Education. Singapore, 1962. Singapore, Faculty of Law, University of Singapore; H.E. Groves: "The optimum number of law students", [1963] M.L.J. xxi; Report on the proceedings of the 2d Regional Conference on Legal Education, Singapore, 1964. Singapore, Association of Law Teachers & Schools in South East Asia, (1964); Note: Board of Legal Education, Singapore. [1967] M.L.J. xxxix; Hariram: "Legal education at the University of Singapore and the practice of law", 3 No. 3 Law Times 7 (1968); T.T.B. Koh: "Legal education in Singapore", 9 Me Judice 21 (1968); S.K. Liew: "Denning a "qualified person" ... a memorandum", 3 No. 4 Law Times (1968); Note: Service of pupillage, [1969] 2 M.L.J. xxvi; S.M. Thio: "The role of the law schools in the developing nations", (1969) 11 Mal. L.R. 250; Molly Cheang: "Legal education and its role in the future of Singapore", June (1973) LAWASIA 53; R.H. Hickling: "Language, law and Singapore", (1975) 17 Mal. L.R. 136; R.H. Hickling: "Some thoughts on legal education in Singapore", [1977] M.L.J. xxii; See also Philip Pillai, "Law Teaching in Singapore—Recruitment, Retention and Socialisation", paper presented to the Conference on Legal Education and Development, organised by the International Legal Center and the Faculty of Law, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 1976.

² See Molly Cheang, "Legal Education and its Role in the Future of Singapore". 4 LAWASIA (1973) 53.

University established the Law Department under the Headship of Professor L.A. Sheridan. The Law Department in 1959 was given Faculty status and the Faculty of Law has, since then, been a Faculty with only one Department, the Law Department. The first intake of students was in 1957 and the first group of LL.B. graduates emerged in 1961.

The Law Faculty has since its inception, maintained a two-fold objective in the legal education it offers. One objective is to provide for the liberal study of law as an intellectual discipline. On the other hand the Law Faculty is conscious of the fact that, except for a diminishing number who go to the United Kingdom, the LL.B. degree is the main route for entry into the legal profession. Therefore a second objective of the Law School is also to equip students for practice in the legal profession to the limited extent that a University is able to do so.

II. STUDENTS

Appendix I shows the number of students admitted to the first year course over the past twenty years. A breakdown is also given of the numbers and percentages of Malaysians and Singaporeans. *Appendix II* shows the number of graduates from the Faculty.

A. *Diminishing number of Malaysian students: evolution from a law school for Malaysia and Singapore to a Singapore law school*

It will be observed that the number of Malaysian students admitted to the Law Faculty decreased significantly since 1970. In the early years, Malaysian students constituted a high proportion of the student intake and in some years the majority consisted of Malaysian students (e.g. 1958, 53% and 1965, 52%). In 1970, the percentage of Malaysian students dropped to 36% and progressively lower to 11% (1973), and 8% (1974). In 1975 and 1976 no Malaysian students were admitted.

What accounts for this decrease? The answer is that the University of Singapore is faced with a rapidly increasing pressure of applications from Singapore for admission to all Faculties with the result that there were insufficient places in the University even for Singapore students. Consequently, the University had to adopt the policy of giving preference to Singaporeans and this included admission to the Law Faculty.

Until 1975, the Constitution of the University provided that "if the number of persons applying for admission as students to the University at any time exceeds the number of vacancies then available the University may, in its discretion, give preference to such persons as are domiciled in Singapore, Malaysia, or Brunei over persons not so domiciled".³ In 1975, the University of Singapore (Amendment) Act 1975⁴ altered the abovementioned provision to provide that the University may, in its discretion, give preference to "citizens of Singapore" (the words "such persons as are domiciled in Singapore, Malaysia or Brunei over persons not so domiciled" being deleted).

³ Proviso to s. 5 of the Constitution of the University of Singapore, (Schedule to the University of Singapore Act, Cap. 181 Singapore Statutes, Rev. Ed. 1970).

⁴ No. 36 of 1975.

One former visiting staff member of this Faculty remarked that it was a pity that Malaysian students in the Faculty are “a vanishing breed”.⁵ I would share the view that, ideally, it is desirable to have some Malaysian students in the midst of the law school student population. First, the interaction between the Malaysian students and the Singapore counterparts in the student community in my opinion has always been a healthy one for both sides. Secondly, it is good policy in the long run to ensure that at least some of the future legal practitioners (or lawyers engaged in other positions) in Malaysia are known on a personal basis to their legal counterparts in Singapore.

The University has not stated that Malaysian students will never be admitted in the future. The policy of giving preference to Singapore candidates means that if there are places some Malaysian students may be admitted; but it is quite correct to predict that even if Malaysian students are admitted in the future, the number will be small.

Malaysian students need to have considerably better results than their Singapore counterparts to merit selection. Although the number of Malaysian students admitted to the Law Faculty has dwindled in recent years, it is curious that for the years 1971 to 1974 the number of Malaysians who actually accepted admission was much less than the actual number of offers made. For example, the following are the figures for the number of Malaysian students who were offered admission and who actually accepted:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Offers to Malaysians</u>	<u>Number who Accepted</u>
1971	61	49
1972	52	30
1973	20	15
1974	23	9

I believe that the reason must be that the Malaysian candidates, having had very good results, are likely to have received offers of admission for other universities in Malaysia and must have accepted such alternative offers. Thus it is possible that many of the Malaysian candidates offered admission by the University of Singapore would have also been offered admission by the Law Faculty of the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur.

The Dean of the Law Faculty in Kuala Lumpur, Professor Ahmad Ibrahim stated in 1976 that the Faculty of Law in the University of Malaya “will therefore virtually become the sole source of law graduates for Malaysia” in view of the cut down of intake by the Singapore Law Faculty and in view of the restrictions on entry to the Universities and Inns of Courts in U.K.⁶

It may be observed that the law school in Kuala Lumpur has a very enviable staff/student ratio, with 19 staff members and a student population of 200 (a ratio of 1:10.5). The teacher/student ratio in

⁵ Hickling, “Some Thoughts on Legal Education in Singapore” [1977] 1 M.L.J. xxii.

⁶ In his paper, “The Law Teacher in Malaysia”, presented to the Conference on Legal Education and Development, Kuala Lumpur 1976; see [1976] *Journal of Malaysian and Comparative Law*, 251.

the Law Faculty in Singapore compares most unfavourably: in 1976, with a student population of 483 and full-time staffing of only 18, the teacher/student ratio was 1:26.8. This ratio has deteriorated even further with depletion in the full-time teaching strength.

This comparison between student/teacher ratio could be another reason why it may be difficult for the University here to take in a large number of Malaysian students to the Law Faculty.

Implications: What implications does the decline of the number of Malaysian students have for the Law Faculty? There are two broad implications.

First, the syllabi and emphases in individual courses would need some modification and re-orientation. At a time when a significant proportion of the student population was Malaysian students, teachers had to ensure that the students were familiar with the principles of both Malaysian law as well as of Singapore law especially where the laws of the two countries differed. Now, with a student population almost exclusively Singaporean the courses are focussed on Singapore law. Of course, Malaysian cases and other sources of law are brought in either for comparative study or because they are still applicable law due to reception-of-law provisions or because of the doctrine of *stare decisis*. A good example is in the area of constitutional law. At a time when there were many Malaysian students the constitutional law course in Singapore dealt in some detail with the Federal State structure in Malaysia, with the position of the Conference of Rulers, State legislatures, Federal Parliament, *et cetera*. Now, however, the constitutional law course in Singapore does not deal with these elements. The Singapore law student, however, is still given an outline of the Malaysian Constitution as well as an historical framework to show how Singapore became a part of, and later separated from, Malaysia. The provisions of the Constitution of Malaysia which are still applicable in Singapore are dealt with in detail. Similarly, Malaysian constitutional law cases which are relevant to interpretation of provisions *in pari materia* are also dealt with in detail.

The *second* major implication is that of manpower projections. For the first sixteen years of the Faculty it could be safely assumed that half of the graduates, or at least a sizeable portion of them, would return to Malaysia to seek careers there. Now with no Malaysian students or with very few Malaysian students, the assumption should be that for the years ahead all or almost all the graduates of the University will be Singaporeans looking for jobs in Singapore. This is an important factor which would have to be borne in mind in terms of overall manpower planning by the decision makers in Singapore as well as by the University and the Faculty in admissions policy.

B. *Optimum Number of Students*

It is not possible here to have a detailed discussion of the optimum number of law students. The fact that the Faculty now has no or few Malaysians has important implications for intake. We have already alluded above to the fact that from now onwards almost all law graduates produced by the Faculty will be looking for job opportunities in Singapore. This means that the University must bear in mind manpower requirements and projections for Singapore when

taking decisions on the numbers of students to admit to the Law Faculty. By this I do not mean bearing in mind only absorption into the legal profession but also projections as to the needs and absorption rates in the public sector (legal service, administrative service, etc.) and also in non-practitioner roles such as in banks, insurance companies and other firms.

The intake of law students will, therefore, vary over the years in future depending on such overall manpower projections.

For 1977 and the immediate years thereafter the University has decided to cut back its intake of law students and this is due to manpower studies which suggest a growing surplus of lawyers over the next ten years if previous admission intakes were maintained. For the 1977/78 session admission exercise, all applicants for admission to the University received a letter from the University's Registrar giving advice on employment prospects in the various disciplines. For Law, the candidates were informed as follows:

4. Law:

In the past because of their relatively small supply, Singaporean law graduates have found jobs easily as lawyers after completing their chambers or as executives in private firms. Many also found jobs in the legal service. In the next three or four years, the supply of Singaporean law graduates will increase sharply, but demand will not rise as rapidly. The result is that the job market for law graduates, especially female law graduates, is likely to become much more competitive. The University intends therefore to adopt a more restrictive policy towards new enrolment in the Law Faculty. The University takes this opportunity also to stress that a very good command of the English language is needed for legal studies.

This advice appears to have the desired effect for the number of students apply for admission to the Faculty for the 1977/78 session dropped by 34.6% when compared with the previous year. In terms of standards what is important, in my view, is that the *quality* of students opting for Law should be good. This is discussed later.

C. *Emphasising non-practitioner opportunities*

Whatever the intake may be, it should be borne in mind that the Faculty's objectives have always been, and will probably continue to be, two-fold. One, to provide legal education as an intellectual discipline in itself and, second, to give students basic training in legal concepts and principles and legal skills to enable them to practise law. Not all law graduates may wish to practise and in admitting students, the University and the Faculty would be making a mistake in assuming that all of the students will want to practise law as advocates and solicitors. Indeed, given that in recent years law firms (especially those adversely affected by a slow-down in property transactions) have been reluctant to employ additional lawyers I would expect an increasing number of law graduates to opt for non-practitioner roles. Perhaps this should even be encouraged: it would not only prevent oversaturation of the legal profession but would have the healthy effect of making available legal personnel for other private-sector and public sector roles. I cannot help observing, for instance, that although the Faculty for many years has produced graduates trained in international law and international organisations, yet there is only

one law graduate from the Faculty employed in the Singapore Foreign Service. I do not know whether this was due to lack of interest on the part of the law graduates or of those responsible for selecting Foreign Service staff, or due to some other reason. This is but one example of under-utilisation of law graduates in non-practitioner roles in the public sector.

D. *High Proportion of Female Law Students*

The large number of girls who have opted to read Law in the Faculty has already given cause for concern. In 1976, the male-female figures for the four years of the LL.B. course were as follows:—

<u>Year</u>	<u>Male Students</u>	<u>Female Students</u>
IV	43%	57%
III	24%	76%
II	45%	55%
I	50%	50%
Total in all 4 years	41%	59%

The Prime Minister, in his address to the Law Society of Singapore⁷ remarked that “In another five to ten years, whoever occupies the office of Minister of Law will discover that his best lawyers are young women and not young men.”

What are the reasons for the high percentage of female law students? One explanation was offered by the Prime Minister himself:

Another reason for this development is the school system. Streamlining took place and still does, as early as 15 plus. Students go into the Science or the Arts stream. The traditional cultural attitudes of parents and students have made many girls believe they ought to be doing Arts. This means that they study English language and literature... and so they go on with greater ease and facility to the study of law. The boys have gone into sciences and on to engineering, architecture, and the hard sciences. But this is changing, albeit too slowly.

Another factor that could have contributed to the high rate of enrolment of females is the method whereby male students who gain admission to law must complete their national service obligations (they enter Law School two and a half years later; places are reserved for them). Some of the males do not, in fact, come to the University after completion of the national service.

The University was so much concerned over the poor employment prospects for female law graduates that the Registrar's letter to applicants drew attention to such discouraging employment prospects. Fortunately, the figures show that the percentage of female law students is dropping gradually (50% in the first year class compared to 76% in the third year class). Whether the Registrar's letter will further reduce the proportion in 1977 intake remains to be seen.

What is of greatest concern to me as Dean is that the female law graduates have difficulty in obtaining employment upon graduation. In particular, law firms are reluctant to employ them. This includes

⁷ 26 March 1977.

girls who have done well in the Faculty and have good recommendations from their teachers.

Three standard explanations are offered by practising lawyers when queried on their bias against employing women lawyers. One explanation is that the law firms find it necessary to indulge in “socialising” and entertaining and that male lawyers are more appropriate. I consider this to be a totally unpersuasive explanation, leaving aside the questions that are raised about the nature of the socialising. The second explanation, which seems more genuine, is that firms which have much litigation need young lawyers who are prepared to “run to and fro” the Courts: it is alleged that girls are not enthusiastic about such tasks. Another explanation, which is plausible, is that clients prefer to talk to male lawyers.

Some of the very bright female graduates with whom I have discussed this matter believe that the law firms are either ignorant or blatantly discriminatory; they do not accept the view that there may be logical reasons for not employing women lawyers.

The reluctance to employ female law graduates is a pity for, in my experience, the good female law graduate is bright, conscientious and has excellent potential. The principle of meritocracy is as important for the legal profession as for other sectors of Singapore society. Discrimination on the basis of sex or other irrelevant criterion, can only result in the profession losing good brains. It is my hope that law firms will open the doors more for them. At the same time, the young female lawyers must realise that they cannot be too choosy over the tasks assigned to them and that, initially, they may have to do a variety of routine and seemingly unexciting, but nevertheless essential, tasks in legal practice.

E. *The General Certificate of Education ‘A’ Level Examinations:*^{7a}
“cut-off” point for admission to Law Faculty

As is well known now, the University’s entrance examination is the General Certificate of Education (G.C.E.) “A” level examination. The results of the candidates are converted to points, the maximum possible score being 64. All the applicants for admission to the University’s various Faculties can then be placed in order of merit on the basis of their G.C.E. points.

The “cut-off” point for each Faculty is the dividing line whereby the limited number of students that the Faculty can admit (given its facilities and teaching staff) is the best of those on the G.C.E. list who have applied for the particular Faculty.

Over the years, different Faculties have had varying cut-off points. These variations can be attributed to changing patterns of preferences of applicants as well as increases or cut-backs in intake by some Faculties. The Medical Faculty has, for example, been a favourite preference by G.C.E. candidates who have done well. Since the competition for admission to Medicine is stiff among the high-scorers

^{7a} Throughout this article, the term “G.C.E.” refers to the Singapore-Cambridge G.C.E. Advanced Level Examination and is used synonymously with the Cambridge Higher School Certificate (H.S.C.) Examination.

in the G.C.E., the cut-off point for Medicine has been usually high: it generally takes the cream of the G.C.E.

The cut-off points for the Law Faculty over the years show interesting variations. These are set out in *Appendix III* where the cut-off points for Law for 1959-1976 are compared with those for other Faculties. In addition to the lowest cut-off point, *Appendix III* also gives the highest (first) point of intake for the Law Faculty.

It will be seen from *Appendix III* that the cut-off point for Law was one of the lowest, if not the lowest, for all Faculties in the early years (1959-1965). Gradually, however, the number of better G.C.E. applicants increased in later years and the cut-off point has gone progressively higher. In 1976, for example, the cut-off point for admission to Law was 44 which was the second highest cut-off point among the Faculties (Medicine having the highest at 49).

Thus we have reached a stage where competition is stiff for admission to the Faculty and the quality of the candidates, in terms of the G.C.E. results, is good. We have come a long way from the early days when it was said that the Faculty was "a dumping ground" for those who failed to make it to any other Faculty and or that the Faculty had to scrape the bottom of the barrel for its students.

Why is it that, in the early years, the cut-off point was so low and that the lower-scorers in the G.C.E. were admitted? My own guess is that the Faculty was new to Singapore and being an unknown factor, some were doubtful of the adequacy of the legal education it provided. Indeed, it was only after it had admitted its third group of students that it was announced that the Government would recognise the degree for entry to the profession. The early uncertainty could have been a factor explaining why *large* numbers of G.C.E. high-scorers did not swarm the new Law Faculty. Furthermore, those responsible for admission at that time seem to have adopted the policy of opening the door as wide as possible, to let as many as possible have an opportunity for legal studies but using the First Year examination as a sieve to separate those who could make it from the others.

The Prime Minister, in his speech to the Law Society, discussed in some detail the changing cut-off points for Law. After commenting on the low cut-off points in the earlier years, he added "I am happy to tell you that the cut-off points for Law, last year, went up to 44 points, against 49 points for Medicine, 40 for Engineering and 40 for Dentistry."

One unfortunate impression conveyed to some by the Prime Minister's speech is that because the criterion for admission to Law was low in some years, therefore the graduates of those years are of dubious quality.

It would be erroneous, in my view, to conclude from the fact that the cut-off points were so low in the early years, *that all or the majority of the Faculty's graduates in those years were of poor quality or generally incompetent.* (No doubt, as can happen in every Faculty, some may have gone through the sieve who should not have). Such a conclusion is erroneous when we consider the following two important qualifications to the low cut-off points.

First: although the cut-off point was very low, the Faculty even in those years did receive students who did well in G.C.E. The cut-off point only indicates the lowest point at which students were admitted. As *Appendix HI* shows, there were also G.C.E. high-scorers who applied for Law. Indeed, I know from experience that in the early years there were students admitted to Law who had done exceptionally well in the G.C.E.

Second: it will be observed, from reading *Appendices I* and *II* together, that in the early years when the cut-off points were low, the casualty rate was exceptionally high. While many were admitted only a few graduated. For instance, the first intake of full-time students was 42 and out of these only 22 graduated and, again from the second intake of 47 students 22 graduated. The attrition rate among the part-time students was even greater. This high failure rate must have been directly related to the poor quality of many of the entrants.

It is necessary, therefore, to read the low cut-off points in the light of these qualifications. While the Faculty should not pretend that poor quality graduates have never been produced, it will be a pity if the bulk of graduates are tainted with the low-cut off criterion. Indeed, the first group of graduates of the Faculty is still viewed as the best group ever produced; yet when they were admitted the cut-off point was the lowest among all Faculties.

F. *Correlation between the G.C.E. 'A' Level and aptitude for Law studies*

How much comfort can we derive from the fact that the cut-off point for Faculty admission is now high? Can we be sure that, on this basis alone, the majority of law graduates from this period will be of high quality? The answers very much depend on the answer to another question: what is the correlation between G.C.E. results and aptitude for legal studies?

The correlation question is particularly interesting for Law because the G.C.E. applicant for Law has not had any special preparation for legal studies in his two years of pre-university classes. (This is unlike Medicine where the students taken in would have undergone thorough preparation for their medical studies in their pre-university).

In 1965, a committee of the Law Faculty looking into the matter concluded that "performance in these [G.C.E.] examinations is not a fully adequate criterion for admission to the Law School" and a suggestion of a special entrance examination was made.

A very comprehensive study may be needed to arrive at a definitive conclusion on the relationship between G.C.E. performance and performance in the Law Faculty. (Even then, one must not be devoid of self-criticism to believe that teaching strengths, teaching methods and examinations processes do not have anything to do with poor performance of students).

A recent internal study in the Faculty, of a limited nature, shed some interesting information on the question of correlation. What was done in this study was to focus on the first year intake for 1971, 1972

and 1973. For each of the three intakes, the top ten G.C.E. scorers (the best of the intake) as well as the bottom ten G.C.E. scorers (the weakest of the intake) were identified and their performances through the LL.B. course recorded.

The objective of this limited study was to inquire whether obtaining poor or good G.C.E. results had a bearing on performance in the Faculty.

The comparative performances by the high scorers and the poor-scorers is tabulated in *Appendix IV*. The following points can be observed:

(a) *First year course.* The high-scorers had no difficulty in passing the 1st year examination at one sitting (without supplementary examinations) 100% in 1971, 100% in 1972 and 90% in 1973. However, a large percentage of the low-scorers (50% in 1972, 40% in 1973) failed the main first year examination. Also revealing is that a decent percentage of the high scorers had A grades and B grades in their subject results, whereas *none* of the low-scorers had any A grades or B grades in their subject results.

(b) *Second year course.* Likewise, the percentage of the high scorers who passed the second year examinations at one sitting (100% in 1971, 80% in 1972 and 90% in 1973) is much higher than that of the low-scorers (70% in 1971, 20% in 1972 and 50% in 1973).

(c) *Third year course:* Again, as *Appendix IV* shows a very much higher percentage of the high G.C.E. scorers sailed through the Third year examinations than was the case with the low-scorers.

(d) *Fourth year course:* The same pattern is repeated. Nearly 100% of the high scorer group passed the Final examination without having to carry forward failed subjects, while there was a significant percentage of the low scorers in 1971 and 1973 who failed and carried forward some subjects to a fifth year.

(e) *Class of Honours.* Also revealing is that among the high-scorer groups, none was placed in Class III Honours and several obtained Class II Upper Division (30% in 1971, 30% in 1972) while the rest obtained Class II Lower Division. However, among the low-scorers, *none* received Class II Upper grade, and the percentage of Class III awards ranged from 29% in 1971, 33% in 1972 and 50% in 1973.

What can we conclude from the above? We may not be able to conclude that top-scorers in the G.C.E. will *always* do well in the Faculty: this is because in the same study, we also looked at cases of students who were ejected or failed badly in their First year, Second year or Third year. Some of these students did have high cut-off points. I believe, however, that the following observations are justified:—

- (a) The high-scorers in each year's Law-intake have generally shown a tendency to do well in the LL.B. course.
- (b) The poor-scorers, on the other hand, have a tendency to flounder through the four-year course, several being ejected in the first year and second year, and on rare occasions even being ejected in the Finals.

- (c) In view of (a) and (b) it should be important for the Law Faculty that it maintains the high cut-off point attained in 1976 and, if possible, to reach a stage where Law entrants are even higher G.C.E. scorers.
- (d) Since even some good G.C.E. scorers have difficulties in the Law course, the G.C.E. examination is not an adequate criterion in some cases. In view of this, the case for an aptitude or entrance examination *in addition* to the G.C.E. examination still deserves very serious consideration.
- (e) The case for an aptitude test or entrance examination is particularly urgent when there is no special pre-university preparation for legal studies for prospective Law applicants and where there are no special subject requirements for admission to the Faculty.

G. *Student Wastage*

In the preceding discussion of the G.C.E. cut-off points, it was observed that in the early years of the Faculty, there was a high casualty rate and student wastage. As Dean Tommy Koh wrote in 1968:

“One of the major problems of the Law School is high student wastage.... In the last two years the percentage of passes (in the first year examinations) has surfaced the fifty percent level. But of the total number of students admitted to the Law School between 1957 and 1963, only 38 percent managed to complete the course successfully.”⁸

He suggested that one factor contributing to this high student wastage was the poor quality of the intakes in those years.

Has the failure rate and student wastage improved with the better quality of intake in subsequent years? The figures indeed suggest that with better quality of intake, the wastage has been reduced. A study done by the University of Students passing in the Minimum Time period shows the following:—

<i>First Year Intake of:</i>	<i>% of Students who passed the Final LL.B. Examination</i>
1969	73.6%
1970	86.4%
1971	71 %

The above percentage figures have excluded repeating students. If repeating students are included the passing rate would be even slightly higher than the figures given but the repeaters, of course, would not have completed the course in the minimum time.

III. TEACHING STAFF

A. *General*

The three ingredients for a good law school are good students, a good law library and good full-time teachers. A serious problem faced by law schools, even in developed countries, is that of recruiting

⁸ “Legal Education in Singapore” (1968) 9 *Me Judice* 21 at p. 28.

and retaining high calibre staff. The University faces stiff competition from law firms, the public sector and private sector employers. In this competition, the University faces great odds because it can hardly match the remunerations offered by some of the other employers. In Singapore, the University and the Law Faculty are also committed to the objective of developing a strong core of local staff to ensure stability and continuity in the Faculty's development. (By "local staff" I refer to staff who are on contracts with "local terms" — they are mainly Singaporeans, Malaysians or permanent residents in Singapore; by "expatriate staff" I refer to staff on contracts with "expatriate terms").⁹

Thus the Faculty not only has to compete with other law schools abroad in getting good quality expatriate staff but has also to compete with employers in Malaysia and Singapore who are anxious to lure the same young lawyers that the Faculty wants.

In this competition, the Faculty has not done badly. Very high standards have been set in recruiting both expatriate and local staff. It is true that some of the staff recruited might not have been as good as we would have wished; this is inevitable for it is difficult to assess whether a lawyer with impressive scholastic qualifications will prove to be a good law teacher. On the whole, however, the Faculty has been fortunate in attracting high calibre staff, both expatriate and local staff. The problem the Faculty faces is that of retaining such staff for any significant length of time.

Appendix V gives the list of all the past and present teaching staff, in chronological order of their joining the Faculty. Also indicated is the period the staff member stayed with the Faculty.

Appendix VI sets out figures which may help in understanding staff turnover and retention. The total number of local staff and expatriate staff who resigned is given, with breakdown of staff who resigned within three years, those who resigned after serving three years but less than six years and those who resigned after serving on the staff for six or more years. (From the Faculty's viewpoint, it is desirable that a competent staff member be retained for more than three years.) *Appendix VI* also separates staff recruited in the first decade of the Faculty from those recruited in the second decade.

In the Faculty's history, a total of 71 full-time appointments¹⁰ were made including the seventeen existing full-time staff.

Expatriate Staff/Local Staff. The figures in *Appendix VI* show that 56.3% of all the full-time staff appointed to date were expatriates. This reflects the high proportion of expatriate staff appointed in the early years. This is because the development of local staff took time and during the first decade only 31.6% of the staff recruited were local staff. From the mid-sixties, the local staff development was accelerated. Thus, in the second decade, 57.6% of the staff recruited

⁹ Generally, local staff would, after their second three year contract, be eligible for a "tenure contract" operative until the age of 55 years (with either side being able to terminate employment by giving six months' or three months' notice). Generally, expatriate staff are not eligible for tenure contracts but are appointed usually on a three year contract which can be renewed.

¹⁰ Professor Bartholomew's appointments on two separate occasions are counted as two appointments

were local staff and the expatriate staff were a minority. At present, of the seventeen full-time staff only one is an expatriate member.

Recruitment and training of local staff. In developing the local staff, the Faculty has relied heavily on its own graduates. Most of the local staff appointed were the top graduates of the Faculty who were appointed almost immediately after graduation. Some may question the wisdom of appointing a fresh graduate immediately onto the staff. But so long as it is near-impossible to get practitioners to join the full-time staff, there is no other choice.

However, the graduates who join the full-time staff are sent abroad for postgraduate legal studies. This training programme has been applied consistently and some have proceeded to law schools in U.K. while others went to U.S.A. The two important objectives of such postgraduate training are (a) to expose the young staff member to legal education and research techniques in established universities abroad; and (b) to enable him to acquire expertise in specific areas of importance in the Faculty's teaching programme. The methods of funding for such postgraduate training have been various; in some cases, new appointees were sent abroad under a Ford Foundation grant to the Faculty and in other cases, the staff either obtained funds from the University itself or obtained scholarships/fellowships such as the Commonwealth Scholarship.

The Faculty has been fortunate in being able to appoint some local staff who are not its own graduates but graduated from other Universities (including the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur). This is helpful in preventing parochialism.

Professional training of staff. Most of the full-time staff have had little, if any, experience in professional practice. The University may not be able to do very much to overcome this problem. However, the University has consistently allowed a staff member extended leave during vacations so that he can serve the pupillage period and be admitted as an advocate and solicitor. There is, of course, a risk in this for such staff member, upon being admitted as an advocate and solicitor, is more vulnerable to offers of employment from law firms. But it is a risk which is worth taking; a staff member who is professionally qualified feels less insecure and would be more confident in his academic career.

Furthermore, the University allows staff to engage in outside/consultation work and to retain the fees from such work provided they do not exceed 60% of his annual salary. The Legal Profession Act permits qualified members of the full-time staff to act in an advisory capacity directly without necessarily having to act on instructions of an advocate and solicitor. In this way staff can keep in touch with practice and procedure and also supplement their University incomes to some extent. However, not all staff members are engaged in such consultation work or to the same degree. The teachers involved in commercial law orientated areas receive more consultation work than others.

Turnover of staff — expatriate staff. As pointed out earlier the problem confronting the Faculty is that of retaining its staff for reason-

able periods. The turnover rate of expatriate staff is very high; except for one, all other expatriate staff have resigned over the years. There may be two reasons for this. First, most expatriate staff do not join the staff with the intention of staying indefinitely or for extended periods. They, especially the younger expatriate staff, accept the appointment out of a desire to have working experience in an Asian country for a short period. Secondly, the practice of appointments is such that expatriate staff, generally, cannot obtain "tenure" contracts and are placed on a three-year contract which can be renewed. Thus, even where an expatriate staff member desires to stay indefinitely or for a long period, the system of successive three-year contracts gives him a feeling of insecurity and, not surprisingly, he opts to leave even when offered continued employment. (An expatriate who becomes a permanent resident can obtain local terms and a 'tenure' contract).

As *Appendix IV* shows, most (64.1%) of the expatriate staff who resigned did so within three years of joining the Faculty.

Turnover of staff—local staff. When we look at the turnover of local staff, it will be seen that 48.4% of local staff resigned over the twenty year period. However, a good proportion of the local staff resigned after serving at least three years (i.e. they had begun their second contract). In fact, 33.3% of the resigned local staff had served on the staff for more than six years. Thus, although some valued local staff left, some comfort can be derived from the fact that most of them served on the staff for a reasonable length of time.

It is curious to note that in comparing the rate of resignations among the local staff recruited in the first decade with those recruited in the second decade, the "first generation" local staff seem to have stayed on the staff longer. Of the seven staff recruited in the first decade who resigned, four had served more than six years (two had served at least ten years). Furthermore, of the local staff recruited during that period, five are still on the staff. It has not been possible to retain the "second-generation" staff for such long periods. There could be two explanations for this. One is that in the stepped-up recruitment of local staff in the mid-sixties, some were appointed who realised their choice of an academic career was ill-advised and opted out. The second explanation, in my view, is that the "second-generation" local staff have inevitably been affected by the distinctly higher costs of living operating at the time they selected academic careers. The financial pressures would have been more acutely felt by them in their first few years than by their senior counterparts at the corresponding tie. This means that far greater efforts than before have to be made by the University to retain good local staff appointed in recent times.

Where did all the resigned local staff go to? The fifteen local staff members who resigned took up the following careers: —

Teaching overseas:	3
Commercial sector in Singapore:	2
Private legal practice in Singapore or Malaysia:	9
International Organisation:	1
	<hr/>
	15
	<hr/>

Causes for resignation of local staff: There are divergent reasons for the different cases of resignations of local staff. Some decided, after a short experience, that an academic career was not satisfying or suitable for them; others had pressing financial needs which could not be met by their University remuneration and sought alternative employment which offered far greater remuneration. A reason for resignations in recent years is the unhappiness of some staff members over certain decisions of the University on promotions and merit increments in the Faculty.

B. *The Future*

Increasing the staff complement. Due to a spate of resignations in recent years, the full-time teaching strength has been reduced very much. In 1976 and the early part of 1977 a total of seven full-time teachers resigned including three local staff members who had served on the staff for six years or more.

As a result, the staff: student ratio has worsened. With the present complement of 17 full-time staff, the staff: student ratio is 1:29. This compares most unfavourably with the overall University ratio which is 1:13. Except for the School of Accountancy and Business Administration no other faculty or school in the University has such an unsatisfactory ratio. If we consider that one of the 17 staff members is on secondment to the Foreign Ministry and that one other is on study leave, the effective ratio is even poorer.

An urgent problem therefore is that of building up the full-time teaching complement. The problem is not with the number of posts available; in fact the budget contemplates a total complement of more than 30 full-time teachers.

However, we have never reached a stage where the number of appointments has neared the total budgetted for. Nor is there the problem of lack of applications. When vacancies for Law are published in Singapore and abroad, a large number of applications are received.

The problem is that few of the applicants, however, possess impressive qualifications or their areas of specialisation do not coincide with the Faculty's own priorities. The University has quite correctly insisted on high standards in its selection process so that, as far as possible, mediocre candidates are not appointed. However, those good applicants to whom offers are made also receive offers from other law schools and quite often the candidates we selected had accepted alternative offers and did not come.

Fortunately, it appears at the time of writing that four new staff members will be appointed. Further efforts to appoint new staff, if successful, will improve the staff-student ratio.

In my view, it is, in the long run, sensible to be highly selective in appointing staff. True, it leads to problems for, with a smaller complement, the staff-student ratio is bad, classes tend to be large and the teaching load and other pressures on staff are greatly increased. It is, however, better to bear these problems than to have a large

teaching complement that includes poor or incompetent teachers for that will almost certainly lead to a drop in teaching standards and in the morale of other staff.

Building up the local staff. Urgent attention needs also to be directed to the rebuilding of the local staff. The development of the local staff has been affected by two problems. The *first*, already mentioned earlier, is that some long-serving local staff resigned leaving the local staff very thin at the senior level. It becomes incumbent on the University, therefore, to do everything possible within its means to retain existing local staff for as long as possible and to prevent further resignations. The *second* problem is that the top graduates of the Faculty were not appointed in the years 1974, 1975 and 1976 thus breaking the pattern of previous years where Faculty usually succeeded in getting its best graduates to join the staff. The better graduates of 1974, 1975 and 1976 preferred to join legal practice before considering an academic career. (One good graduate in 1976 who applied, was offered appointment but was unable to accept the offer due to national service obligations). Fortunately, the tide seems to be turning as evidenced by the interest of at least two of the top 1977 graduates in joining the teaching staff.

It may take time to rebuild the local staff. In the interim period there should be no hesitation whatsoever in appointing *expatriate staff* in order to strengthen the overall teaching complement. While it is true that expatriate staff may not stay for extended periods, past experience shows that expatriate staff have contributed significantly to the Faculty's development, not only in the teaching programme but also in research and other activities (such as the *Malaya Law Review*.)

Part-time teachers: The Faculty has always relied on the services of part-time teachers, especially in subjects which deal with practice and procedure — such as civil procedure, evidence or administration of criminal justice (criminal procedure). In times when the full-time teaching complement is under-strength, the Faculty has increased its use of part-time teachers. In the 1976-77 session, for instance, a total of 18 part-time teachers were employed, even for the teaching of core subjects such as tort, criminal law, land law and constitutional law. Most of the part-time teachers are younger legal practitioners or members of the Legal Service. In my view, with the development of the full-time teaching complement to a more satisfactory number, the Faculty should reduce its use of part-time teachers to an absolute minimum. However good or enthusiastic a part-time teacher may be, his non-availability to students for most of the days of the week imposes serious limitations for students in the learning process, and prevents the desired communication between teacher and student. Furthermore, part-time teachers inevitably must give priority to their full-time jobs, and not infrequently classes have to be cancelled when important, unforeseen commitments prevent the part-time teacher from conducting a scheduled class.

Visiting Fellows: Except for a handful of senior staff, the full-time staff of the Faculty are generally young. There is a need for more senior staff experienced in both teaching and research to stimulate ideas on research and teaching methods. Towards this end, visiting fellows or visiting professors have been appointed on a short-term basis (one or two years), and although their stay is limited, such

visiting fellows have proved helpful to the Faculty and greater use could be made of this system. The visiting fellowship device has also enabled the University to appoint, on a short-term basis, teachers who are working in leading Universities elsewhere and whose study leave coincide with both our semesters or one semester. This, too, has been useful but experience has shown that appointments of visiting fellows for only one semester has limited usefulness; special arrangements have to be worked into the teaching programme to accommodate the duration of stay of the visiting fellow. Except for rare instances when we are convinced that such a short-term appointment is justified, visiting fellows should be appointed for the duration of at least both teaching semesters.

IV. POSTGRADUATE LEGAL STUDIES

A. *Degrees Available*

The three postgraduate degrees in law which are available are the Master of Laws (LL.M.), Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) and Doctor of Laws.

The Master of Laws Degree. For admission as a candidate for the LL.M. degree a person must be a graduate of this University (or of another University as may be approved by the Senate), must possess a Bachelor of Law degree and “must submit evidence of adequate training and ability” to undertake the course. Alternatively, he should possess “such other qualifications and experience as the Senate may approve.”

In practice, fresh graduates of high calibre (Class One or Second Class Upper Honours grade) have been admitted to LL.M. candidature. Other applicants possessing Second Class Lower or other results have usually been asked to produce evidence of their ability to engage in legal writing and research. For example, they may be asked to produce articles or casenotes which they have published as evidence of their ability in research and writing.

The regulations provide for two methods of obtaining the LL.M. degree. The first is by writing a thesis on an approved topic and to obtain the degree exclusively on examination of the thesis. The second method is by examinations in course work and submission of a dissertation. At one stage (1968-1972) most LL.M. candidates obtained LL.M. degrees through course work-examination and dissertation. In recent years however LL.M. candidates have been admitted on the basis of writing a thesis only.

Ph.D. A candidate who wishes to obtain a Ph.D. degree in Law is governed by the general University regulations concerning the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and the main feature of admission requirements is that he must possess “a degree with honours or a Masters degree... and must submit evidence of adequate training and ability to undertake the proposed course.” The Examination is by way of submission of a thesis on an approved topic and University Act G14 requires that the thesis “must contain original work or critical interpretation worthy of publication”. In addition, the candidate can also be required to attend certain postgraduate courses.

Degree of Doctor of Laws. Act L5 of the University provides for conferment of the degree of Doctor of Laws. To be eligible, a candidate must be a graduate of this University (or of another approved University) who must be a Doctor of Philosophy of at least five years standing and whose thesis must have been on a legal topic. The criterion for award of the degree is that the candidate must provide "evidence in the form of books or collected published papers by which he has made an independent and notable contribution to the advancement of legal knowledge."

B. *The University's Board of Postgraduate Studies*

There is a centralised University Board of Postgraduate Studies which is responsible for the policy and decisions on questions of admission to postgraduate studies as well as examinations for award of higher degrees. This Board, is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor and comprises Deans of the Faculties and Directors of the Schools in the University (or their representatives). Although it is the Board which makes the final decisions, the Faculty's representative on the Board makes the recommendations to the Board on questions of approving or rejection of applications for candidatures to higher degrees. The practice within the Law Faculty is that the Vice-Dean is entrusted with the responsibility for attending to postgraduate studies and consequently, for many years the Vice-Dean has been the Dean's representative to the Board of Postgraduate Studies. In the early years (when the University did not have a centralised board dealing with post-graduate studies) the rather grandiose office of "Director of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies" existed in the Faculty; it was eventually done away with.

C. *Higher Degree Studies in the Law Faculty*

Appendix VII gives a list of higher degree graduates in law together with the indication of the titles of their theses and dissertations. To date there have been three persons who have obtained the Ph.D. degree and twenty-three persons who have obtained the LL.M. degree.

The majority of the postgraduate degree graduates are the Faculty's own graduates (two out of three Ph.D. graduates and sixteen out of twenty-two LL.M. graduates).

In the late '60s an attempt was made to bring into the Faculty junior research fellows from abroad to undertake postgraduate degrees as well as to assist in Faculty's teaching programme. Their visits were financed largely through assistance from Foundations. Subsequently the number of foreign candidates for postgraduate degrees has become negligible, the main reason for this being that lack of University funds to finance the travel or other costs of aspiring foreign applicants.

The higher degree programme has not been accorded priority thus far in the Faculty. Postgraduate studies in Law have been on an *ad hoc* basis and have not been institutionalised within the Faculty. The main reason for this could be that the Faculty has always been preoccupied with discharging its obligations for the LL.B. degree programme. Other factors explaining why postgraduate degree studies have not been institutionalised within the Law School are the rapid turnover of staff (and, therefore, of potential supervisors) as

well as the relative youthfulness of the Faculty's teaching staff and the presence of only a few experienced scholars and researchers to direct and supervise research and legal writing programmes.

D. *Drop-out rate among higher degree candidates*

Up to the 1968-1969 session, there was a high drop-out rate among higher degree candidates. As Dean Tommy Koh wrote in 1968, 70 percent of the higher degree candidates between 1957 and 1966 withdrew.¹¹ In my view, the following are factors possibly contributing to this high drop-out rate: *First*, the policy on admission of higher degree candidates was liberal; if a candidate had the required good first degree qualification and was interested in pursuing the LL.M. degree, he was generally admitted. For example, in 1966, 1967 and 1968 a total of 22, 16 and 12 LL.M. candidates respectively were admitted. The result was that a large number enrolled, including many who did not have the intellectual self discipline which post-graduate study requires; *Secondly*, the rapid turnover of staff led to frequent changes of supervisors for candidates, often leading to decline in a candidate's industry and enthusiasm where there was inadequate supervision and guidance; *Thirdly*, as pointed out by Dean Tommy Koh many registered for higher degrees immediately after graduation, inspired by their good LL.B. results but without a clear perception of the time which they would have, in their full-time jobs, for research and writing. Many candidates withdrew because their full-time employment in the public sector or private sector did not provide sufficient time for them to work on their research; *Fourthly*, the choice of topic was also a factor contributing to dropouts. In some cases, topics were chosen hastily and unwisely. Candidates withdrew when they discovered, for example, that the library had insufficient materials for their research purposes or, that the research topic had already been well canvassed by others. *Fifthly*, the method of LL.M. candidature seems to be related to the drop out rate. The drop out rate was low among candidates who registered for the LL.M. by coursework-examinations and dissertation. On the other hand, there was a high drop out rate among candidates who enrolled for the LL.M. by thesis alone. This is understandable; the LL.M.-by-thesis method is the far more rigorous of the two methods requiring wide reading and research as well as considerable sophistication in legal analysis and legal writing.

From 1969 onwards the drop out rate has been reduced mainly because of stricter admission to the LL.M. programme.

E. *What should be the future policy on postgraduate studies?*

In my view the LL.B. degree programme will continue to take priority over higher degree studies in law. We must be absolutely satisfied over all major aspects of the LL.B. degree programme and fully confident of stable staffing situation before embarking on major plans for intensifying postgraduate legal studies.

In admitting candidates for the LL.M. degree or Ph.D. degree, the following considerations are important: *first*, the candidate must

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, (f.n. 8) at p. 23.

have the ability to engage in research and legal writing. It should not be sufficient just to look at the degree that he obtained but also, his class records to see whether he has some evidence of legal analysis and writing; *Secondly*, the proposed field of research or subject of his thesis must be one where there are materials available in Singapore. There have been a few cases when candidates embarked on a topic and encountered difficulties because of insufficiency of materials; *Thirdly*, an important consideration is whether there will be a supervisor on the teaching staff of the Faculty who has the competence in the area of the candidate's work and who will be able to undertake the necessary supervision. This factor can be crucial in view of the high turnover rate in some years. Some higher degree candidates have experienced difficulties when the initial supervisor left the Faculty resulting in a situation where there were no suitable alternative persons to act as supervisors or where the candidate had to undergo a series of successive supervisors.

These considerations explain why the Faculty, in recent years, has been very circumspect in making recommendations to the Board of Postgraduate Studies. In my view such criteria must be adopted for otherwise we may revert to the period when we had a high drop out rate. In view of the high drop out rate amongst candidates doing LL.M. by thesis, serious discussion should also be given to resuscitating the coursework-examinations and dissertation method (it seems to have fallen into disuse in recent years where most LL.M. candidates are doing the LL.M. by theses).

V. STAFF WRITING AND RESEARCH

The output of publications by the Faculty's teaching staff in the form of books, monographs or contributions to legal journals is good. In particular, the Faculty can justifiably be proud of the contributions of its staff to the development of legal literature on Singapore and Malaysian Law.

A. *Books on Singapore and Malaysian Law*

Appendix VIII gives a list of books on Malaysian and Singapore law published by former and present fulltime members of the teaching staff. Members of the staff have, of course, also published important books on general topics.¹² In my view, however, publications on local law must be given priority because the dearth of such publications in both Singapore and Malaysia poses numerous problems for students and staff in the two law schools as well as for practitioners. Therefore the momentum of the contribution which the Faculty has made thus far to the development of such legal literature (at least twenty books) must be maintained and increased.

A perusal of *Appendix VIII* shows that most of the books on Malaysian-Singapore law emanated from the Faculty after 1970, coinciding with the period where a core of local staff had developed. Most of the books were written by local staff and the fact that they were able to author these books only after being on the staff for more

¹² For example, Thio Su Mien's *Locus Standi and Judicial Review* (1971, Singapore University Press), Peter Ellinger's *Documentary Letters of Credit* (1970, Singapore University Press), and James C.K.K. Wong's *The Law of Packing in Modern Export Trade* (1976, Martevick Distributors).

than four years shows clearly that the publications output from the Faculty is closely related to the University's ability to retain its staff for reasonable periods.

Casebooks and Sourcebooks. It is interesting that a significant number of the books listed in *Appendix VIII* are casebooks or sourcebooks on specific topics. The explanation for this is that such casebooks were, and are, felt to be urgently needed for teaching purposes. The limited number of law reports in the Law Library is subject to such intense and frequent use by law students. Law teachers, non-Law departments in the University which teach law subjects as well as non-University users that the law student has a serious difficulty in reading the required cases in time for a class. To make matters worse a particular volume of a Law report containing cases on Tort, Contract or Criminal Law cited by teachers in the first year course may also be sought after at the same time by Second year, Third year or Final year students for similar purposes.

The compilation of casebooks and sourcebooks is one way of overcoming this problem and so far casebooks have been published on constitutional law, criminal law, public international law, company law, insurance and banking. Casebooks on other topics are presently being prepared. Although such casebooks are designed essentially for teaching purposes, their sales outside the Law Faculty suggest that practitioners also find them useful.

While the casebook certainly solves a serious problem in law schools, one must be aware of a danger that should be avoided. I refer to the temptation of students to rely exclusively on the casebook and, consequently, to use the Library (and the original law reports) less frequently if at all. No casebook can be an effective substitute for the original law reports, especially where the casebook reproduces selected extracts of a judgement or omits separate judgements. The law teacher, therefore, has to ensure (by the devices of written assignments, essays, etc) that students do make use of the original primary materials in the library.

The future: Need for textbooks. One can envisage that within the next five years, casebooks on the other major topics would have been published. In my opinion, the direction of future publications by Faculty staff should focus more on *textbooks* and treatises on Singapore and Malaysian Law (such as that by David Wong on *Tenure and Land Dealings in the Malay States*). From producing books and casebooks as essential teaching materials, we should thereafter move towards an exposition and analysis of the local legal system. It may not be an easy task to produce such books in subjects where English Law is still largely applicable; one may think it to be a futile task since there exist established books from England. It is, however, a task which must be undertaken and the following view of Bartholomew (while not agreeing with him that there is an absence of books on Singapore law), has considerable persuasive force:—

A second factor necessary for the development of an independent legal system is the existence of a legal literature relating to the system.It is only when legal writers, thinking about the system as a whole, attempt to expound it as a whole, that a coherent and integrated system can begin to emerge; it is only then that the law will become a system and not just a collection of bits and pieces borrowed from various places.

If, in the absence of books on Singapore law, Singapore lawyers and law students are thrown back on books expounding the law of the countries from which the rules have been borrowed, then Singapore law will remain a pale reflection of something else and not a vigorous and independent system.

What is, if anything, even worse than the absence of an independent legal literature is the idea that English legal literature can be used with the mere addition of local supplements, as if, for example, the law of Singapore could be expressed merely as a series of footnotes to English law.¹³

Problems facing staff in publishing books. Staff members who are interested in preparing manuscripts for books are confronted with several problems. The *first* problem is that the pressure of teaching duties often does not leave sufficient time for the serious and intensive research and writing needed. The problem is compounded in times when the full-time teaching staff is under-strength and the teachers have a heavier teaching load. A former visiting professor, Hickling, who spent two years in the Faculty, observed that there was an:

“... extraordinary disparity in the workload of academic staff. In some departments, lecturers seem to do but a few hours’ work a week: a couple of lectures, say, and a tutorial or two, while in others (I am thinking of course of the Faculty of Law, although the position in say, Accounting, may be comparable, or indeed be more intense) staff fling themselves from one lecture and tutorial to another, with an almost desperate frenzy. ... Law lecturers — an endangered species — tend to be so exhausted by teaching, that they have no time for research.”¹⁴

Efforts are being made to reduce the heavy teaching loads, by recruiting more full-time staff and through use of part-time teachers. However, until the full-time teaching strength is *significantly* improved, this problem will continue to exist.

The *second* problem is that the market for legal publications is very limited in Singapore and Malaysia. Unlike countries like India or Australia which have numerous law schools and large legal professions, Malaysia has one law school and about 1,000 lawyers and Singapore also has one law school and a smaller legal profession of about 600 lawyers. Furthermore, the sad fact is that most law firms do *not* purchase local legal publications, though publications on commercial-law subjects enjoy greater sales than on other topics. The limited market, therefore, tends to discourage staff members from publishing books. The *third* problem, closely related to the second, is that hitherto there were too few publishers interested in publishing legal texts. Fortunately, some staff members have succeeded in persuading other publishers to accept legal manuscripts.

B. *The Malaya Law Review*

Since 1959 the Faculty has published its law review *The Malaya Law Review* (formerly called *University of Malaya Law Review*). Each annual volume consists of two issues published in July and December and, inclusive of the 1976 volume, eighteen volumes have been published. Each issue contains main articles and sections on case-notes, book reviews and legislation notes. The responsibility for publication of the *Review* is entrusted to an Editorial Committee elected by the Faculty.

¹³ “The Singapore Legal System” in Riaz Hassan (Ed.) *Singapore: Society in Transition* (1976) 84 at pp. 108-9.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, (f.n. 5) at p. xxv.

Appendix IX indicates how many of the total number of main articles (excluding case-notes) dealt with Singapore-Malaysian law, or with the laws of other South-east Asian countries and also indicates the number of articles written by teaching staff (part-time and full-time). The following observations can be made:—

(a) *Number of articles on Singapore-Malaysian law.* Of the total number of 228 main articles in the *Malaya Law Review* for volumes 1-18, 42% dealt with topics of Singapore-Malaysian law. The *Review* serves practitioners in Singapore and Malaysia as well as libraries, law schools and scholars in the region, the U.S. and Commonwealth countries. There will, therefore, have to be a mixture of articles of a general nature and articles on local law. It is, however, not practical for the *Review* to compete with the great number of established law journals, but should, instead, establish itself as a leading law journal on *local law*. Indeed, the present Editorial Committee has precisely this objective in mind and is planning to re-orientate the outlook of the *Review* by focussing on laws and legal systems of Singapore especially and also of Malaysia. This will certainly make the *Review* more relevant and useful to legal practitioners in Singapore and Malaysia.

(b) *Articles on ASEAN and other Southeast Asian countries.* The *Review* in recent years has also sought to include articles on the laws and legal systems of other countries in the region, especially ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations) countries. As *Appendix IX* shows, in eight of the first twelve volumes, there were *no* articles on other countries in the region, whereas from volumes 13 to 18 (1971-76) each issue had at least one main article on laws of a regional country. Towards this end, a section on “Aspects of Asean Law” has been included in recent volumes and correspondents have been appointed in some Asean countries to assist in obtaining good contributions. This is a wise step in view of the increasing cohesiveness of Asean as a regional group and also in view of the increasing interactions between Asean countries in trade and investments and the consequent need to be familiar with each other’s laws and legal systems.

(c) *Contributions by Staff-members.* The *Review* is, naturally, a convenient vehicle for encouraging Faculty staff to publish. As *Appendix IX* shows 47% of the total number of main articles were from teaching staff (full-time and part-time). This is not a bad figure when we consider (i) the fact that staff also submit contributions to the *Malayan Law Journal* (the M.L.J. has greater circulation among practitioners and because of its monthly appearance, can publish an article faster than the *Review*); (ii) the fact that staff are engaged on other writing projects and (iii) when we recall the earlier-mentioned pressures of teaching load.

Subject matter of articles in the Law Review. The breakdown, according to subject-matter, of the 228 articles published in Volumes 1-18 is as follows: Constitutional and Administrative Law (42 articles), Land Law (19), Public International Law (19), Family Law (18), Company Law (18), Muslim Law (12), Legal History (9), Trusts (8), Tax Law (8), Criminal Law (8), Jurisprudence (7), Contract (5), Tort (5), Conflict of Laws (5), Maritime/Shipping Law (5), Banking Law (5), Labour Law (5), Commercial Law (4), Law and Develop-

ment (4), Criminology (3), Evidence (3), Civil Procedure (2), Insurance (2), Customary Law (2), Legal Education (2), International Business Transactions (1) and others (7). It is difficult to explain why there are more articles on constitutional-administrative law, land law, public international law, family law and company law than on other topics; this probably reflects the predominant interests of those who contribute articles rather than any conscious effort of the Editorial Committee to bring about an emphasis in those areas.

C. *The Singapore Law Series*

The Editorial Committee of the *Malaya Law Review*, in addition to publishing two issues of the *Review* each year, has also undertaken the publication of other works such as the *Tables of Written Laws*, *Legal Essays* (in memory of the late Bashir Mallal) and, most recently, *The Singapore Law Series*.

The *Singapore Law Series* launched in 1976 is a particularly valuable contribution to the available local legal literature. Until the publication of the *Series* there was no publication providing an introductory account of Singapore Law. The pioneer work edited by Sheridan, *Malaya and Singapore, the Borneo Territories*, not only had a limited discussion of Singapore law but is also out of date in many respects. The *Singapore Law Series*, consisting of separately published monographs on different areas, seeks to fill this gap by giving an *introductory* survey of the main areas of the law of Singapore. As stated by the Editor, K.L. Koh, in her Preface "Only an outline of the basic principles is attempted and, where necessary, the problem areas are highlighted. No in-depth study is made: that would be beyond the intended scope".

At the time of writing, three books in the *Series* have appeared: No. 1 on Constitutional Law (by S. Jayakumar), No. 2 on Family Law (by Kenneth Wee) and No. 3 on Criminal Law (by K.L. Koh). Others in the *Series* which are in preparation include shipping, banking, evidence, civil procedure, and tort. An optimistic assessment is that the *Series* will be completed by 1979.

VI. POSTGRADUATE PRACTICAL TRAINING FOR ADMISSION TO THE LEGAL PROFESSION

For the purpose of admitting a person to the legal profession, the kind of vocational or postgraduate practical training he receives prior to admission should be viewed as an important complement to the formal legal education he undergoes in a law school. This is because no law school can claim that its legal education has so completely equipped its graduate in *professional* skills, practice and procedure as to justify immediate practice of law; law schools not only have broader educational objectives but generally have very few, if any, experienced practitioners on the teaching staff to "teach" such professional aspects. Furthermore, it is also indisputable that several aspects of professional skills can never be "taught" in a law school in the traditional sense but can only be learned by on-the-job training. This "learning by doing" theory, demands, therefore, that a well-thought out programme of practical training should be organised for law graduates who wish to be admitted to the legal profession.

The Legal Profession Act entrusts to the Board of the Legal Education the responsibility for providing the “training, education and examination... of qualified persons¹⁵ and articled clerks intending to practise the profession of law in Singapore.” The Board is established under the Act and consists of ten members namely, the Attorney-General; a judge of the Supreme Court nominated by the Chief Justice; two advocates and solicitors nominated by the Minister for Law; three advocates and solicitors nominated by the Law Society; the Dean of the Law Faculty, and two members of the Law Faculty nominated by the Faculty.

There are two aspects of such postgraduate practical training for our LL.B. graduates and other qualified persons who wish to be admitted as advocates and solicitors. First, the graduate must “attend and satisfactorily complete” a course of instruction known as the Postgraduate Practical Course in Law; Secondly, he must serve a six-month period of “pupillage” with an advocate and solicitor (“master”), who is and has been in active practice in Singapore for “a total of not less than five out of the seven years immediately preceding the relevant date”.¹⁶ This pupillage requirement is generally referred to as “reading in Chambers” or “chambering”.

A. *The Postgraduate Practical Course: transfer from the University to the Board of Legal Education*

For a long time, the Board did not itself conduct any practical course. Instead the University, for historical reasons, conducted practical courses annually during the period 1961 to 1974 and the Board, on its part, extended recognition to the University’s course.

Based on the experience during the period 1961-1974, the University and the Law Faculty became convinced that the *University’s* conducting of the course was an unsatisfactory and ineffective system. Why? There were many reasons,¹⁷ the more important of which were: (a) while the University “conducted” the course, most of its full-time Law teachers had no experience in legal practice and were ill-equipped to teach a “practical course”; (b) the University, therefore, had to recruit teachers from the legal profession and Legal Service. This led to two problems — first, great difficulty was experienced in recruiting the good teachers from these groups (they were too busy to assist in the teaching programme); and secondly, because the teachers were drawn from outside the law school, the Faculty was unable to exercise the necessary direct control over its part-time teachers and the course generally; (c) the lack of direct control even resulted in

¹⁵ Under the Legal Profession Act (Cap. 217, Singapore Statutes, Rev. Ed. 1970) a “qualified person” means any person who (a) has passed the final examination for the Degree of Bachelor of Laws in the University of Singapore or in the University of Malaysia; or (b) is a barrister-at-law of England or of Northern Ireland or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland; or (c) is a solicitor in England or Northern Ireland or a writer to the Signet, law agent or solicitor in Scotland.

¹⁶ The five-out-of-seven years provision has been interpreted by the courts to cover an advocate and solicitor who has been in active practice for a total of five consecutive years.

¹⁷ This summary of reasons draws heavily on a paper prepared for the Faculty by Dean Tommy Koh.

some cases of irregularities and misconduct in tests; (d) furthermore, because most of students were in full-time employment or attached to law firms, classes were held in the early mornings or late evenings and the students were unable to devote the time and energy which the course deserved. Thus, although conceived of as a full-time course (the 3 months period of the course *cannot* be counted for computing the six months pupillage period) it was, in actuality, a part-time course.

In 1974, discussions were held between representatives of the University and the Board of Legal Education and the Board agreed that with effect from 1975, it would assume the responsibility for the organization of the course. The University, on its part, agreed that it would provide free lecture room accommodation to the Board.

In my view, it was a sound and progressive decision for the Board to have taken over the conduct of the practical course. This is because: (a) the Legal Profession Act *itself* envisages that the Board, and not the University, will run the course; (b) the Board's conducting of the course will help overcoming some, if not all, of the earlier-mentioned problems experienced by the University, and (c) my study of the practice in other Commonwealth countries has convinced me that practical training can be conducted effectively only where the body responsible for such training is not the University Law Faculty but a separate agency, either the legal profession itself or a body analogous to our Board.

The first two years (1975 and 1976), when the Board conducted the courses, already have demonstrated the wisdom of transferring to the Board the conduct of the course: the general consensus is that the course is taken very seriously by both students and teachers.

B. *The 6-months pupillage ("Chambering")*

Dean Tommy Koh has already commented (in 1968) on the highly unsatisfactory nature of this second aspect of vocational training:¹⁸

It seems to us that Gower's devastating critique¹⁹ of the pupillage method of training is wholly applicable to the Singapore experience. With a few notable exceptions, most senior lawyers in Singapore regard the acceptance of pupils a great burden. Few masters have the interest and the time and ability to instruct their pupils. This leads the pupils to take a very negative attitude towards the requirement of pupillage which many regard as a farce.

If the above was true in 1968, the situation has worsened in recent years. The problem is *not* that there are not enough practitioners with the five-out-of-seven-years qualification eligible to be "masters". It is the sheer reluctance and unwillingness of such practitioners to accept pupils. The most common reason given by law firms for not accepting pupils is that there is no spare office room in the law firm and that they do not wish to "embarrass" the new graduate by seating him together with the clerks or secretaries. I suspect this is more of an excuse than a valid reason. The fact remains that the pupillage requirement is mandatory for entry to the profession; if law

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, (f.n. 8) at p. 34.

¹⁹ L.C.B. Gower "The Inter-relationship of Academic and Professional Training" Vol. IX No. 4 Journal of the Society of Public Teachers of Law, 434 at p. 442.

firms do not have the ideal of spare rooms then both the master and pupil should not hesitate to resort to other arrangements, including seating the pupil in the general office area. Indeed the pupil may, in this way, learn much about office management in a law firm.

Even where pupils are accepted, the masters are generally too busy to guide the pupils. It is appreciated that pupils should not expect “spoonfeeding” and that they must use their own initiative in maximising the usefulness of the 6 month’s period (for instance, by attending and observing court sessions). However, the pupillage system *assumes* that the master will give a certain amount of instruction, advice and guidance. This rationale of the pupillage requirement is never attained in the vast majority of cases; indeed, the few lawyers who take the time and effort to guide their pupils have become well-known and much sought after.

It was once suggested that the 6-months pupillage period be extended to one year and the LL.B. course be reduced to three years. This is an absurd proposal for it would have the effect of prolonging the pains of the pupillage period over a greater period with increased frustrations among pupils and perhaps even greater unwillingness among lawyers to accept pupils.

C. Postgraduate Practical Training: The Future?

The existing system of postgraduate practical training can certainly be improved. In my view, any reforms must take into account the unsatisfactory nature of the pupillage system. If we cannot ensure that the pupillage system is effective then it should be scaled down and even gradually abolished provided that the postgraduate practical course can be intensified and institutionalised.

In some jurisdictions in Africa and Australia, the equivalents of their postgraduate practical courses are run on a *full-time* basis, with full-time directors, teachers and administrative staff, and with self-contained premises. Formal classes may be given but a great portion of the instruction is by practical exercises and simulations of transactions (such as simulated searches and investigations of land title).

It will not be an easy task to organise such intensive full-time practical courses in Singapore. The two major problems are finance and availability of good teachers. In my view, the legal profession itself has a major role to play in overcoming both these problems (although the Government, too, should be asked to contribute towards the costs). Members of the legal profession should realise that a sound, effective postgraduate practical training serves the interests of ensuring high standards among new entrants to the profession. At present, each advocate and solicitor contributes \$10.00 annually to the Board of Legal Education. If this amount has to be increased to meet the costs of any improved, intensified practical course, then the profession’s investment would be certainly worthwhile in the long run. Likewise, it will not be possible to have any intensified practical course unless the capable practitioners are willing to devote some of their time to teaching.

I can only endorse Dean Tommy Koh's suggestion that the practical course should be extended to a one year full-time course, whereupon the six-month's pupillage can be abolished. I would add a further requirement: that a newly admitted advocate and solicitor should not be allowed to practise on his own immediately; he should work with a law firm for a period of one year or two years.

But these and other reforms are capable of achievement only when the legal profession itself demonstrates interest in reforming the practical training and is willing to contribute the finances and personnel necessary to realise such reforms.

S. JAYAKUMAR *

* LL.B., LL.M., Associate Professor and Dean, Faculty of Law, University of Singapore.

APPENDIX I

**FACULTY OF LAW: FIRST YEAR ENROLMENT
1957-1976***

Session	Intake			No. & % of Singaporeans	No. & % of Malaysians
	Full-time	Part-time	Total		
1957-58	42	83	125	107 (86%)	18 (14%)
1958-59	47	17	64	30 (47%)	34 (53%)
1959-60	47	16	63	(figures not available)	
1960-61	94	2	96	55 (57%)	41 (43%)
1961-62	117	7	124	67 (54%)	57 (46%)
1962-63	131	3	134	71 (53%)	63 (47%)
1963-64	171	10	181	115 (64%)	66 (36%)
1964-65	100	6	106	57 (54%)	49 (46%)
1965-66	148	6	154	74 (48%)	80 (52%)
1966-67	104	4	108	58 (54%)	50 (46%)
1967-68	100	5	105	65 (62%)	40 (38%)
1968-69	116	5	121	68 (56%)	53 (44%)
1969-70	102	6	108	65 (60%)	43 (40%)
1970-71	85	4	89	57 (64%)	32 (36%)
1971-72	103	4	107	58 (54%)	49 (46%)
1972-73	122	4	126	96 (76%)	30 (24%)
1973-74	135	4	139	124 (89%)	15 (11%)
1974-75	119	0	119	110 (92%)	9 (8%)
1975-76	145	0	145	145 (100%)	0
1976-77	117	0	117	117 (100%)	0

* Figures include repeating students

APPENDIX II

FACULTY OF LAW
No. of LL.B. Graduates 1961-1977

1961	22
1962	22
1963	47
1964	28
1965	57
1966	75
1967	66
1968	46
1969	45
1970	60
1971	79
1972	75
1973	87
1974	82
1975	81
1976	108
1977	113
<hr/> Total No.	1093

APPENDIX III

CUT-OFF POINTS FOR ADMISSION TO UNIVERSITY

1959-1976

	LAW FACULTY	Arts	Science	Medicine	Dentistry	Business Administration	Accountancy	Architecture	Building/Estate Management	Engineering	Chemical Engineering
1959	19(51)	24	23	36	20
1960	18(48)	24	23	34	19
1961	15(47)	21	13	34	18
1962	15(50)	22	14	37	25
1963	17(59)	20	22	37	25
1964	23(63)	21	18	30	25
1965	21(56)	24	22	34	23
1966	26(52)	23	25	39	24
1967	25(61)	26	24	36	32
1968	22(58)	27	27	37	30
1969*	32(62)	30	30	47	40	35	37	30	40	40	.
1970	32(62)	30	30	40	35	30	30	30	30	40	.
1971	35(61)	30	32	38	35	35	35	32	32	40	.
1972	35(63)	32	32	38	35	35	39	32	32	40	.
1973	38(64)	32	32	40	32	35	39	33	33	40	.
1974	38(63)	32	32	40	32	35	39	35	33	40	.
1975	40(64)	33	32	40	34	38	40	35	35	40	40
1976	44(62)	34	32	49	40	38	43	40	35	40	40

Figures in brackets for Law indicate the highest G.C.E. points of the best applicants in each intake but it does not necessarily mean that the candidates accepted offers.

*Medical and dental courses shortened respectively to 5 and 4 years. No further admission to Pre-Med. and Pre-Dent. as from 1969.

APPENDIX IV

CORRELATION BETWEEN G.C.E. PERFORMANCE AND LAW SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

Students with the Highest G.C.E. points compared with students with lowest G.C.E. points: 1971, 1972 and 1973 intakes

	First Year students with HIGHEST G.C.E. points per intake (10 top students in each year)			First Year students with LOWEST G.C.E. points per intake (bottom 10 students in each year)		
	1971 incl. Malaysians with higher pts.	1972 incl. Malaysians with higher pts.	1973 incl. 3 N.S. men	1971 incl. 1 N.S. man	1972 incl. 4 N.S. men	1973 incl. 4 N.S. men
FIRST YEAR:						
% who passed all subjects without re-exams	100%	100%	90%	90%	50%	60%
% who obtained in any subject:						
A grade	0%	10%	20%	0%	0%	0%
B grade	40%	40%	50%	0%	0%	0%
C grade	100%	90%	70%	100%	70%	50%
D grade	100%	70%	90%	100%	100%	100%
SECOND YEAR:						
% who passed all subjects without re-exams	100%	80%	90%	70%	20%	50%
% who had to repeat 2nd year for failing re-exam	0%	0%	10%	20%	10%	10%
THIRD YEAR:						
% who passed all subjects without carrying forward any subject	100%	100%	86%	62.5%	78%	83%
FINAL YEAR:						
% who passed all subjects	90%*	100%	100%	50%	100%	80%
HONOURS CLASSIFICATION:						
% of Class I Honours	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of Class II (Upper Division) Honours	30%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of Class II (Lower Division) Honours	60%	70%	100%	71%	67%	50%
% of Class III Honours	0%	0%	0%	29%	33%	50%

* Represents one student who was deprived of passes and required to repeat all subjects by the Board of Discipline.

APPENDIX V
LIST OF TEACHING STAFF OF FACULTY (past and present)
1956 - 1977 as at 1st May 1977*
(in chronological order of joining staff)

	Number of Years on Staff														
	1 year or less	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5-6 years	6-7 years	7-8 years	8-9 years	9-10 years	10-11 years	11-12 years	12-13 years	13-14 years	14-15 years
1. L.A. Sheridan (31 July 1956 - 1 May 1963)							X								
2. B.L. CHUA (July 1957 - June 1965)								X							
3. W.E.D. Davies (16 March 1958 - 1 February 1961)			X												
4. ALICE TAY ERH SOON (1 July 1958 - 31 December 1959)		X													
5. JOHN TAN CHOR YONG (1 May 1959 - 19 November 1960)		X													
6. H.G. Calvert (29 May 1959 - 1 January 1960)	X														
7. B.J. Brown (7 October 1959 - 1 March 1962)			X												
8. G.W. Bartholomew (20 May 1960 - 28 July 1963)				X											
9. G.E. Glos (4 June 1960 - 5 November 1963)				X											
10. L.W. Athulathudali (July 1960 - June 1964)				X											
11. Harry E. Groves (July 1960 - July 1964)				X											
12. Theodore B. Lee (1 August 1960 - 31 January 1961)		X													
13. L.C. Green (10 December 1960 - 1 September 1965)					X										
14. E.P. Ellinger (April 1961 - May 1965)					X										
15. THIO SU MIEN (May 1961 - February 1971)					X					X					
16. V. Kumar (August 1961 - May 1965)					X										
17. S.P. Khetarpal (August 1961 - May 1966)					X										
18. J. Minaitur (April 1962 - February 1965)			X												
19. *TOMMY T.B. KOH (May 1962 -)															
20. B. McKillop (April 1963 - May 1967)					X										X
21. *KOH KHENG LIAN (May 1963 -)					X										X
22. D.C. Jackson (May 1963 - May 1964)	X														

* = still on staff as at 1st May 1977

Names in Caps = local staff

Names in lower case = expatriate staff

Names in Italics = visiting staff

Dates in brackets are dates of joining and leaving Faculty

*To supplement this List, it should be noted that at the time of going to press, July 1977, four new full time staff (R.C. Beckman, J.K. Canagarayar, P.K. Jones Jr., R. Rawlings) and one visiting professor (M.P. Jain) joined the Faculty.

	Number of Years on Staff														
	1 Year or less	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5-6 years	6-7 years	7-8 years	8-9 years	9-10 years	10-11 years	11-12 years	12-13 years	13-14 years	14-15 years
23. Hla Aung (May 1963 - October 1965)			X												
24. David M. Donaldson (July 1963 - May 1965)		X													
25. D.C. Buxbaum (August 1963 - July 1964)	X														
26. F.A. Trindade (August 1963 - August 1966)		X													
27. V.G. Venturini (13 October 1963 - 21 May 1966)		X													
28. *TAN SOOK YEE (May 1964 -)												X			
29. <i>Michael Contant</i> (June 1964 - June 1965)	X												X		
30. *S. JAYAKUMAR (August 1964 -)														X	
31. F.K. SELLAR (May 1965 - May 1966)	X														
32. M.J.L. Rajanayagam (May 1965 - May 1972)	X						X								
33. J.L. Montrose (May 1965 - February 1966)	X														
34. M.B. Hooker (January 1966 - July 1969)				X											
35. G.W. Bartholomew (January 1966 - November 1976)										X					
36. D.J.M. Brown (March 1966 - May 1967)															
37. *MOLLY CHEANG (April 1966 -)														X	
38. DAVID WONG SIONG YONG (May 1966 - July 1976)										X					
39. J.S. Brown (May 1966 - January 1967)	X														
40. TAN NG CHEE (October 1966 - May 1973)											X				
41. F.R. Beasley (November 1966 - March 1968)															
42. *TAN PHENG THENG (April 1967 -)															
43. G. Cowper-Hill (May 1967 - February 1974)															X
44. Leonard Pegg (September 1967 - September 1970)															X
45. C.G. Watkins (October 1967 - September 1969)															X
46. Timothy A. Manning (December 1967 - March 1970)															X
47. A.B. Afterman (January 1968 - February 1969)															X
48. G. PANNIRSELVAM (April 1968 - May 1969)															X
49. H.W. MORAIS (August 1968 - January 1970)															X
50. M.A. Clarke (August 1968 - February 1970)															X
51. John J. Bentley III (January 1969 - February 1971)															X
52. CHEONG YUEN HEE (May 1969 - February 1971)															X

* = still on staff as at 1st May 1977

Names in Caps = local staff

Names in lower case = expatriate staff

Names in Italics = visiting staff

Dates in brackets are dates of joining and leaving Faculty

Number of Years on Staff	Number of Years on Staff	
	1 year or less	14-15 years
1 year or less	X	
1-2 years	X	
2-3 years	X	
3-4 years	X	
4-5 years	X	
5-6 years	X	X
6-7 years	X	X
7-8 years		
8-9 years		
9-10 years		
10-11 years		
11-12 years		
12-13 years		
13-14 years		
14-15 years		

No.	Name	Period
53.	LOKE KIT CHOY	(May 1969 - June 1974)
54.	F.A. Kiencke	(May 1969 - March 1970)
55.	K. Polack	(June 1969 - January 1970)
56.	WILLIAM HUI CHONG ONG	(August 1969 - September 1973)
57.	Narendra N. Singh	(April 1970 - April 1976)
58.	HARBAJAN SINGH	(May 1970 - October 1976)
59.	*JAMES WONG KONG KEE	(June 1970 -)
60.	Robert Fabrikant	(August 1970 - September 1972)
61.	Rowena Daw	(October 1970 - October 1973)
62.	*PHILIP N. PILLAI	(May 1971 -)
63.	ANDREW ANG	(May 1971 - April 1974)
64.	KENNETH WEE KIM SENG	(June 1971 - November 1976)
65.	L.C. Green	(June 1971 - April 1972)
66.	*U. MYINT SOE	(July 1971 -)
67.	Richard C. Maxwell	(July 1971 - October 1971)
68.	John R. Hatland	(December 1971 - March 1972)
69.	*TAN LEE MENG	(June 1972 -)
70.	*V.S. WINSLOW	(June 1972 -)
71.	*POH CHU CHAI	(June 1973 -)
72.	Collin A. Ying	(December 1973 - February 1977)
73.	J.W.D. Ambrose	(April 1974 - July 1975)
74.	*TAN KENG FENG	(June 1974 -)
75.	R.H. Hickling	(August 1974 - August 1976)
76.	L.J.M. Cooray	(November 1974 - May 1976)
77.	*LYE LIN HENG	(April 1975 -)
78.	S.H.D. Elias	(April 1975 - April 1976)
79.	*CHIN TET YUNG	(October 1975 -)
80.	*WANG WAI KUM	(June 1976 -)
81.	*T.A.G. Beazley	(November 1976 -)
82.	*Peter Fox	(3 September 1976 -)

* = still on staff as at 1st May 1977

Names in Caps = local staff

Names in lower case = expatriate staff

Names in Italics = visiting staff

Dates in brackets are dates of joining and leaving Faculty

ANALYSIS OF STAFF TURNOVER & RETENTION
(1956 - 1977 (May 77))

APPENDIX VI

	First Decade 1956 - 1966	Second Decade 1967 - 1977	Total 1956 - May 1977
1. Total No. of staff joining the Faculty (excluding visiting staff)	38	33	71
2. No. & % of local staff (excluding visiting staff)	12 31.6%	19 57.6%	31 43.7%
3. No. & % of expatriate staff (excluding visiting staff)	26 68.4%	14 42.4%	40 56.3%
4. No. & % of visiting staff	3 7.9%	8 24.2%	11 15.5%
5. No. of staff who resigned:			
(a) local	7	8	15 (21.1% of total staff: 48.4% of local staff)
(b) expatriate	26	13	39 (54.9% of total staff: 97.5% of expatriate staff)
(c) total	33	21	54 (76.1% of total staff)
6. No. of staff who resigned within 3 years:			
(a) local	3	3	6 (40% of local staff who resigned)
(b) expatriate	15	10	25 (64.1% of expatriate staff who resigned)
(c) total	18	13	31 (57.4% of all staff who resigned)
7. No. of those staff resigning who stayed on staff for more than 3 years but not more than 6 years:			
(a) local	0	4	4 (26.7% of local staff who resigned)
(b) expatriate	8	2	10 (25.6% of expatriate staff who resigned)
(c) total	8	6	14 (24.1% of all staff who resigned)
8. No. of those resigned after serving for more than 6 years:			
(a) local	4	1	5 (33.3% of local staff who resigned)
(b) expatriate	3	1	4 (10.2% of expatriate staff who resigned)
(c) total	7	2	9 (16.6% of all staff who resigned)
9. No. of those who stayed on staff more than 6 years and still on staff:			
(a) local	5	2	7 (9.9% of total staff: 22.6% of local staff)
(b) expatriate	0	0	0 (0% of total staff: 0% of expatriate staff)
(c) total	5	2	7 (9.9% of total staff)

APPENDIX VII

HIGHER DEGREE GRADUATES: LAW FACULTY
1956-1977 (May 1977)

	Degree	Year Awarded	Name of Graduate	Whether First Degree from Singapore Law Faculty	Title of Dissertation/Thesis
1.	Ph.D.	1971	Habibi, Syed Ahmad Moinuddin	No	Islamic divorce as a socio-legal institution.
2.	Ph.D.	1972	Koh Kheng Lian	Yes	Credit facilities and securities for development financing in Singapore.
3.	Ph.D.	1972	Tan Pheng Theng	Yes	The industrial relations machinery of Singapore.
1.	LL.M.	1962	Brown, Jean Margaret	No	Sociological factors associated with recidivism in Singapore - males, aged 6-21.
2.	LL.M.	1963	Bindsell, Reinhart	No	A comparative study of the legal structure of government in Germany and the Federation of Malaya.
3.	LL.M.	1963	Brown, Bernard John	No	Provocation as a defence to murder in English and Malayan Law: a comparative study.
4.	LL.M.	1964	Thio Su Mien (Hwang)	Yes	Equality before the law. Article 8: Constitution of the Federation of Malaya.
5.	LL.M.	1965	Mittal, Jitendra Kumar	No	Right to equality. Articles 14 to 18 & 29(2). The Constitution of India.
6.	LL.M.	1966	Koh Kheng Lian	Yes	Consent in criminal Law.
7.	LL.M.	1967	Banerji, Gouranga Deb.	No	Federalism in India.
8.	LL.M.	1968	Siddiqi, Shahid	No	The registration and deregistration of trade unions in Singapore.

	Degree	Year Awarded	Name of Graduate	Whether First Degree from Singapore Law Faculty	Title of Dissertation/Thesis
9.	LL.M.	1969	Ratnam, Isaac Paul	Yes	Effect of apostacy and conversion on marriage.
10.	LL.M.	1969	Wong, David Siong Yong	Yes	The relations of interests in land under the Malaysian Torrens System.
11.	LL.M.	1970	Joethy Ramalingam	Yes	Modern developments on the concept of cruelty.
12.	LL.M.	1970	Visuvanathan Sinnadurai	Yes	Singapore citizenship laws.
13.	LL.M.	1971	Giam Chin Toon	Yes	Maintenance under the Women's Charter.
14.	LL.M.	1971	Khoo, Michael Kah Lip	Yes	The Socio-legal aspects of pirate taxis in Singapore.
15.	LL.M.	1971	Lim Chin Joo	Yes	The law of advertising and consumer protection in Singapore.
16.	LL.M.	1971	Sat Pal Khattar	Yes	Some aspects of deductions under the Singapore income tax ordinance.
17.	LL.M.	1971	Woo Tchi Chu	Yes	Trade marks in Singapore.
18.	LL.M.	1972	Chandra Mohan Shunmugam	Yes	Bail in Singapore.
19.	LL.M.	1972	Huang Lui	Yes	Legal aspects — organ transplantation.
20.	LL.M.	1972	Tan Ching Tiong	Yes	The bill of exchange — the legal consequences.
21.	LL.M.	1973	Chan Chee Pew	Yes	Company directors.
22.	LL.M.	1975	Magnus, Richard Rokmat	Yes	Aspects on presumptions.
23.	LL.M.	1977	Chew Aiman	Yes	Secret Societies in Singapore: a legal and empirical study.

APPENDIX VIII

BOOKS ON SINGAPORE-MALAYSIAN LAW BY
(PRESENT AND FORMER)
FULL-TIME TEACHERS OF THE LAW FACULTY

<u>Year of Publication</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Title and Publisher</u>
1961	L.A. Sheridan (ed.)	<i>Malaya and Singapore, The Borneo Territories. The Development of their Laws and Constitutions No. 9, British Commonwealth Series.</i> (Stevens & Sons, London).
1964	H.E. Groves	<i>The Constitution of Malaysia.</i> (Malaysia Publications Ltd., Singapore).
1965	G.W. Bartholomew	<i>The Commercial Law of Malaysia: A Study in the Reception of English Law.</i> (Malayan Law Journal Pte. Ltd., Singapore).
1967	L.A. Sheridan & H.E. Groves	<i>The Constitution of Malaysia.</i> (Oceana Publications Inc., New York)
1970	M.B. Hooker	<i>Readings in Malay Adat Laws.</i> (Singapore University Press, Singapore).
1971	S. Jayakumar	<i>Constitutional Law Cases from Malaysia and Singapore.</i> (Malayan Law Journal Pte. Ltd., Singapore).
1973	Koh Kheng Lian	<i>Credit and Security in Singapore: The Legal Problems of Development Finance.</i> (University of Queensland Press, Australia).
1974	S. Jayakumar	<i>Public International Law Cases From Malaysia and Singapore.</i> (Singapore University Press, Singapore).
1974	Koh Kheng Lian & U Myint Soe	<i>Penal Codes of Singapore and the States of Malaya: Cases, Materials and Comments Vol. 1.</i> (Law Book Company of Singapore and Malaysia, Singapore).
1975	David S.Y. Wong	<i>Tenure and Land Dealings in the Malay States.</i> (Singapore University Press, Singapore).
1975	Philip N. Pillai	<i>Sourcebook of Singapore and Malaysian Company Law.</i> (Singapore University Press, Singapore).
1975	U Myint Soe	<i>The Banking Law of Singapore and Malaysia.</i> (Law Book Company of Singapore and Malaysia, Singapore).

<u>Year of Publication</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Title and Publisher</u>
1976	S. Jayakumar	<i>Constitutional Law Cases From Malaysia and Singapore</i> , 2d. Ed. (Malayan Law Journal Pte. Ltd., Singapore).
1976	Koh Kheng Lian & Molly Cheang	<i>Penal Codes of Singapore and Malaysia: Cases, Materials and Comments. Vol. 2.</i> (Quins Pte. Ltd., Singapore).
1976	S. Jayakumar	<i>Constitutional Law (with Documentary Materials)</i> , No. 1 in <i>Singapore Law Series</i> (Ed. Koh Kheng Lian). (Malaya Law Review, Singapore).
1976	Kenneth Wee	<i>Family Law</i> , No. 2 in <i>Singapore Law Series</i> (Ed. Koh Kheng Lian). (Malaya Law Review, Singapore).
1976	M.B. Hooker	<i>Personal Laws of Malaysia; An Introduction</i> (Oxford University Press, Kuala Lumpur 1976).
1977	Koh Kheng Lian	<i>Criminal Law</i> , No. 3 in <i>Singapore Law Series</i> (Ed. Koh Kheng Lian). (Malaya Law Review, Singapore).
1977	U Myint Soe	<i>The Insurance Law of Singapore and Malaysia: Cases, Materials and Comments.</i> 2d. ed. (Singapore Insurance Training Centre, Singapore).
1977	U Myint Soe	<i>Sourcebook of Banking Law in Singapore and Malaysia.</i> (Singapore Institute of Banking, Singapore).
1977	U Myint Soe	<i>The Law of Banking and Negotiable Instruments in Singapore and Malaysia.</i> (Quins Pte. Ltd., Singapore).

APPENDIX IX

THE MALAYA LAW REVIEW, 1959-1976, Volumes 1-18

Volume/Year	No. of articles	No. of articles on Singapore — Malaysian law	No. of articles on other South East Asian countries	No. of articles by staff members of Faculty (full-time & part time)
1 (1959)	16	5	0	5
2 (1960)	12	3	0	9
3 (1961)	14	1	0	4
4 (1962)	13	1	0	2
5 (1963)	15	2	2	2
6 (1964)	15	7	1	7
7 (1965)	12	3	2	6
8 (1966)	11	8	2	4
9 (1967)	12	5	0	7
10 (1968)	13	7	0	8
11 (1969)	8	6	0	5
12 (1970)	11	4	0	6
13 (1971)	8	4	1	6
14 (1972)	11	7	2	7
15 (1973)	11	6	3	3
16 (1974)	20	14	2	15
17 (1975)	14	6	1	8
18 (1976)	12	6	1	3
TOTAL Vols 1-18	228	95(42%)	17(7%)	107(47%)