

## LEGAL EDUCATION IN SINGAPORE\*

The institution concerned with basic legal education in Singapore is the Faculty of Law, University of Singapore. It was established in 1957. The other institution which is also concerned with legal education is the Board of Legal Education set up in 1967. The concerns of the Board of Legal Education are with the preparing and examining of persons for law practice in Singapore.

### *FACULTY OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE*

The three degrees in law offered by the Faculty of Law, University of Singapore, are the undergraduate degree of Bachelor of Laws, the postgraduate degrees of Master of Laws and Doctor of Philosophy.

#### *Bachelor of Laws*

The Bachelor of Laws is an Honours degree of four years duration, taken full-time. Part-timers however take two years longer. In the initial years of the Faculty there was a good response to the part-time course. However in the course of the years the part-time course has become virtually non-existent. The reasons for this could be several. The length of the course, the gruelling nature of law studies and the fact that no special classes are run in the evening for part-timers so that they are obliged to attend classes during normal working hours may be some of the reasons for the disappearance of this species of law students.

#### *Curriculum*

The LL.B. Singapore is a first degree in law. It is at the same time an academic as well as a professional qualification;<sup>1</sup> "... it must provide, first and foremost, a university education in law and secondly, if that is consistent with the first objective, it must so frame its bachelor's degree that it will be acceptable as a professional qualification without further formal instruction in substantive or abjective law. . . ."<sup>2</sup> It is this twin function that has determined the curriculum content and it is this duality of function of the degree that has prompted the revision of the curriculum from time to time.

The present curriculum came into operation ten years ago. The objectives of this curriculum are firstly to teach the basic "bread and butter" subjects. These are Introduction to Law, Criminal Law, Torts

\* Paper delivered at the *Conference on Legal Development in ASEAN Countries*, held in Jakarta, Indonesia, 6-10 February 1979.

<sup>1</sup> The LL.B. holder is a 'qualified' person within the Legal Profession Act (Cap. 217, Singapore Statutes, Rev. Ed. 1970).

<sup>2</sup> Calvert, Coomaraswamy and Sheridan, "Legal Education in Malaya" (1960) J.S.P.T.L. 155.

and Contract Law in Year I, and Family Law, Company Law, Public Law and Land Law in Year II. In the Third and Fourth years the students are required to read four compulsory subjects, Trusts and Evidence in Year III, Administration of Criminal Justice and Civil Procedure in Year IV, and three optional subjects in each of these years. The compulsory courses are again the basic courses and those subjects which a practitioner would need to know.

Secondly, the curriculum is so designed as to enable a student a choice of subjects to suit his inclination and ability and yet ensure that he would have exposure to "perspective" courses as well as the more technical specialised subjects. By "perspective" courses are meant those subjects which compel students to appreciate and understand the individual subjects which they had studied in relation to the whole legal system, courses which show the interrelation of law and society, which focus on the purpose and function of law. Jurisprudence, Law and Society, Comparative Legal History are some examples of "perspective" courses. The curriculum also permits a student to take at the maximum two non-law courses offered by the other Faculties. The availability of these courses is made not only on the assumption that some knowledge of non-law subjects is good in itself but also that these courses would enhance the students appreciation of the law subjects.<sup>3</sup> Hence they are offered to the students in the later years rather than in the initial years of their law studies. The students are not given a complete free hand in the choice of non-law subjects; their choice is within the selection of subjects made for them by the Dean. The criterion which the Dean uses in making this choice is the supportive or contextual element of the non-law courses to the law courses taught. For example, the non-law subject of Sociology of the Family offered by the Department of Sociology is available to the law student for it should place him in a better position to evaluate the laws relating to marriage, divorce, legitimacy. Likewise a student of Public International Law's appreciation of the subtleties of the subject would be enhanced if he were to study a subject in Political Science.

For the students who desire only to know more specialised law subjects there is a list which includes such subjects as Revenue Law, Banking, Insurance and Shipping Law to name just a few.

The problem which the Law Faculty faces in respect of its curriculum is the desire on the one hand to minimise the practical incompetence of the law graduate with the other function of a law school which is not only to train "journeymen practitioners" but also "the men who must be leaders and set the standards and tone, and provide the imaginative insights for an important part of the community for many years after leaving law school."<sup>4</sup>

As Professor T.T.B. Koh asked<sup>5</sup> "[i]s it the purpose of the Law School to prepare its students for the practice of law or to give them a liberal education through the medium of law?" In an earlier article

<sup>3</sup> See T.T.B. Koh, "Legal Education in Singapore" (1968) 9 *Me Justice* 21 at p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> *Per* Dean Griswold, "The Future of Legal Education" (1953) 5 *Journal of Legal Education* 438 at pp. 443-4.

<sup>5</sup> T.T.B. Koh, "Legal Education in Singapore" (1968) *Me Justice* 21 at p. 25.

on "Legal Education in Malaya"<sup>6</sup> the authors indicated that these two seemingly opposed objectives are not so. "They are consistent because... the antithesis between academic and professional training is largely illusory."<sup>7</sup> T.T.B. Koh endorses this view and explains the non-conflict. He states "[T]he purpose of the Law School is two-fold. It is first, to develop the law students ability to think logically, to differentiate between the relevant and the irrelevant, to communicate thought effectively and to discriminate among values. All these qualities are necessary for the successful practice of law. The second purpose is to give law students a deep understanding of the nature of the legal process and of the basic principles of law. This knowledge is also necessary for the practice of law."<sup>8</sup>

However, the recurrence of curriculum changes in the Law School indicates that while in theory and in logic the conflict between the two aims of the law school is more apparent than real, in practice it may be different. Practitioners demand that the law graduate should be able to handle problems of law practice deftly almost from the first day of life as a practitioner. So it has often been suggested to the Law Faculty that Conveyancing, the life-blood of a Singapore practising lawyer, should be made a compulsory subject. The current availability of this subject as an option is to this group of practising advocates and solicitors insufficient. On the other hand there are those who feel that the Law Faculty should not pander too much to the demands of practitioners and at the expense of its role as an academic institution where minds and intellects are developed.

It has been said that it is not the subject but how it is taught that is important, so that very practical subjects like Conveyancing or Civil Procedure can be taught in such a way that much more than the mere imbibing of rules is involved. It is then said that there need not be such conflict between what is practical and what is academic. The truth of this is not disputed. However in practice this is difficult to achieve as it demands a teacher who is familiar with the rules and who can teach them in an intellectual way. Moreover in the rather limited time of one academic year there is a tendency where a choice has to be made, to sacrifice the teaching of the "wherefores" and "oughts" for what "is."

The many changes, in the early years, of the Law Faculty's curriculum reflect the swing between the different schools of thought. The existing curriculum is a compromise. The technical and relevant (in terms of practice) subjects are available as options, likewise the seemingly less relevant but intellectually demanding subjects. The scheme of options is devised to ensure that the students are exposed to some subjects from each category.

There is a close interrelation between phases of a country's growth in its social political and economic aspects, and law.<sup>9</sup> Thus lawyers

<sup>6</sup> Calvert, Coomaraswamy and Sheridan, "Legal Education in Malaya" (1960) J.S.P.T.L. 155.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> T.T.B. Koh, *op.cit.* at pp. 25-26.

<sup>9</sup> See S.M. Thio, "The Role of the Law Schools in the Developing Nations" (1969) 11 Mal. L.R.; M. Cheang, "Legal Education and its role in the Future of Singapore" 4 LAW ASIA 53.

should be suitably and adequately equipped not only to react to changes when they come but to take a lead in effecting them. This is another demand on the Law Faculty which affects curriculum content as well as how the subjects should be taught.

Thus the current curriculum content reflects an attempt by the law school to satisfy all three objectives as stated. The long list of compulsory subjects seeks to satisfy the demands of the profession that a graduate should emerge from the law school equipped with some basic knowledge of the subjects with which he would most likely be confronted as a practising lawyer. The list of "perspective" optional subjects and the availability of certain non-law subjects to the senior students reflect the other demand on the law school to produce a graduate with a liberal education in law. Finally, the list of specialised optional subjects seeks to satisfy the student who desires to specialise at this stage of his career. By this list of optional subjects the law school hopes to offer subjects that reflect the particular needs of the country.

### *Teaching Methods*

The most common method of instruction is the bi-weekly lectures followed by a tutorial. This method is used where the number of students taking the course is large. The other method of instruction is through seminars. This is used where the number of students taking the course is smaller.

Within these two main methods of instruction there is much diversity. The tutorials can be grouped into two kinds, those which are closely structured with problems set in advance for discussion and those which are totally unplanned and free flowing. The latter style makes greater demand of a tutor and different groups would have different tutorial content. For this reason where there is more than one teacher for the course and when there are younger teachers the closely structured tutorial is to be preferred.

Seminars too differ in that in some students are required to deliver papers on given topics. These are then subjected to criticisms from their colleagues. In others the teacher leads the seminar discussion. Where students tend to be quiet and unresponsive to the teacher's questions, the type of seminars where students are required to prepare papers and to discuss them are more successful.

Lectures also differ in style. Some lectures are conducted in the case class and problem method, others seek to lay down the broad framework of the subject, yet others concentrate on individual problem areas in a given subject. Of these it would be fairly true to say that the case class and problem method has not taken firm root as yet. The reasons are many, but perhaps the main reason would be the relative inexperience of the teachers who themselves may never have been exposed to such a method of instruction. Moreover the problem is compounded by the general reticence of Singapore students. Successful case classes have been conducted where the classes are smaller and where there are casebooks on the subject. The other different styles of lectures are determined by the availability of text books on a subject. Where these exist then lecturers may with ease of mind

concentrate on the problem areas leaving the students to cover the syllabus on their own. However, where there are no adequate text books the lecturers are compelled to cover the syllabus.

### *Examinations*

Whatever the disadvantages of sit-down examinations they are a necessary evil of educational institutions. It is the acknowledged task of educationists to minimise the limitations of the system; these are mainly that the three hour paper tends to tax the memory rather than intelligence, that there is too much concentrated pressure on the student at the end of the year, and that there is hardly any approximation to the conditions a lawyer is likely to work under in real life.

In the Law Faculty we are mindful of the defects of the traditional three hour sit-down examination although they form the main method of assessment. To answer the criticism that such examinations tend to tax the memory powers of students rather than their intelligence, students are permitted access to relevant legislation in the examination hall. We also have the 'open book' examination. The drawback of this is that some students feel that as the cases and other materials will be available in the examination hall they need not be so familiar with them before the examination. This is of course a false assumption.

In addition to the three hour sit-down examination, in most courses the final assessment is also dependent on classroom performance and performance at a term paper. The weightage attached to these various methods of assessment is generally 10% for class performance, 20-25% for term papers and the balance on the end of year examination.

Most of the assessment is based on a student's written work. Apart from class performance, in the Final Year's examinations students may be called for a *viva voce* to determine the precise grade that a student should have where some doubts on this are raised on his written work.

In keeping with the thinking that a student's final grade or class should not be based merely on the final year's work, but that his other years' performance should also be reflected in his final ranking, the results of the students performance in the second, third and fourth years are weighted in the following manner *viz.* 20% for the second year, 40% for the third year and 40% for the fourth year.

### *Master of Laws*

The degree of Master of Laws is open to any person who is either a LL.B. degree holder from the University of Singapore or to graduates in law from any other University that the Senate may approve.

The degree is currently obtainable only by way of submission of a thesis of about forty thousand words. This has to be written under the supervision of one of the members of staff of the Law Faculty. The minimum period of candidature is 1 year and the maximum period is three years. Currently there are six persons registered for the degree.

They are lawyers doing it on a part-time basis. Because of this there have been many casualties. Another constraint on the LL.M. programme is the availability of suitable persons on the staff for supervision. The Faculty is a small one and much if not all of its resources are spent on undergraduate teaching.<sup>10</sup> It has been said that in view of the rigour of an LL.M. by thesis bearing in mind that the bulk of our LL.M. candidates are doing it part-time, the LL.M. by coursework and mini-thesis should be resuscitated.<sup>11</sup>

Such a LL.M. programme could be the answer to two discernible problems of the Law Faculty and of the legal profession. As indicated earlier the Law Faculty's list of optional subjects try to take into account the desires of a student to develop a certain amount of specialisation. Some of these subjects are really too demanding for an undergraduate course. Further there seems to be a growing demand by young lawyers for acquiring knowledge in those subjects which they never did whilst in law school. There is no way at the moment whereby they could get such training except through exposure and osmosis in practice. Thus if there be such an LL.M. programme then those graduates who wish to specialise in a given area of law may do so at postgraduate level. This would also provide a kind of continuing legal education for the younger lawyers. The availability of such a programme would then necessitate a review of the undergraduate optional subjects, so that instead of adding more subjects to the list to meet with the changing needs of society, it should be the LL.M. courses that should be determined on this criterion.

#### *The Doctor of Philosophy*

The Doctor of Philosophy in Law is open to a person holding a Master's degree in law either from the University of Singapore or from any other University approved by the Senate. It is obtained by the submission of a thesis of about eighty thousand words on an approved topic written under the supervision of a member of staff.

The minimum period of candidature is twenty four months and the maximum period is sixty months. To date there are only three persons who hold the Ph.D. in law from the University of Singapore.

#### *THE BOARD OF LEGAL EDUCATION*

The Board of Legal Education was established by the Legal Profession Act<sup>12</sup> with the task of providing training, education and examination of persons intending to practise law in Singapore. In addition to the provision and the supervision of the postgraduate professional aspects of legal education, the Board of Legal Education is also entrusted with the task of supervising the articled clerks during their articles of clerkship. The Board is made up of the Attorney-General, a judge of the Supreme Court, four representatives of the legal profession two of whom are nominated by the Minister for Law and two by the Law Society, the Dean of the Faculty of Law University of Singapore and two other representatives from the Faculty of Law.

<sup>10</sup> See S. Jayakumar, "Twenty one years of the Faculty of Law, University of Singapore: Reflections of the Dean" (1977) 19 Mal. L.R. 1 at pp. 18-19.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Cap. 217, Singapore Statutes, Rev. Ed. 1970.

### *Postgraduate Professional Training*

In order to gain admission to the practice of law a person must be firstly a “qualified person” who is defined in the Legal Profession as (a) a holder of a LL.B. from the University of Singapore; (b) a barrister-at-law of England or of N. Ireland or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland; or (c) a solicitor in England or N. Ireland.<sup>13</sup> Secondly he must successfully undergo the three-month postgraduate practical course run by the Board of Legal Education and then he must fulfil a six-month period of pupillage with an advocate and solicitor who has been in active practice in Singapore for a period of five out of seven years.<sup>14</sup>

### *Postgraduate Practical Course*

The Postgraduate Practical course which prepares a “qualified person” for practice is organised and run by the Board of Legal Education with the aid of a part-time honorary Director.<sup>15</sup> The courses are taught by practising lawyers and members of the legal service on a part-time basis. Accordingly most of the classes are conducted in the evenings after office hours. In addition to attending these classes, the students are also required to do such written work as may be assigned by the teachers of the course and to pass such examinations as may be held.

It would readily be conceded that the best training for practice is practice itself. This I would imagine is the rationale of reading in chambers for budding barristers and articleship for aspiring solicitors. However the ideal has to be trimmed to accommodate the constraints of the number of law firms able to respond to the need and the number of persons seeking chambers.<sup>16</sup> In any event it was also thought that even some aspects of practice can be effectively “taught” to groups and even made examinable. Thus in 1961 the first Postgraduate Practical Course of three months was instituted. The subjects now taught in this course include Advocacy and Trial Practice, Bankruptcy and Winding Up, Incorporation and Registration of Companies, Practical Conveyancing, Solicitors & Trusts Accounts, Taxation of Costs, Professional Ethics, Legal Drafting, Admiralty Practice, Criminal Procedure and Probate and Administration. On the whole this course may be considered as successful. But some complaints nevertheless exist. Although much improved the course still lacks consistency in standards expected of the student in the different courses. Further whilst there is more written work now, it is still insufficient. The cause of these complaints rest mainly on the fact that it is very difficult to get persons who have the right credentials to teach two hours a week for three months of a year. Practitioners with the experience are busy people. It is a tremendous sacrifice on their part to engage in part-time teaching in the Postgraduate Practical Course. Additionally there is a problem

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, s. 2.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, s. 11.

<sup>15</sup> When it was first instituted in 1961 the course was organised by the Dean of the Law Faculty and taught by practising lawyers on a part-time basis. However this state of affairs was corrected in 1975 when the organisation of the course was transferred to the Board of Legal Education.

<sup>16</sup> In any event there are dissatisfaction with this type of professional training which is dependent on the conscientiousness and competence of the Master. See Report of the Committee on Legal Education 1971 Cmnd. 4595.

of co-ordinating the courses so that they would be conducted at a similar level and would complement one another. This is the task of the Director who has been and still is doing the work on a part-time basis. Fairly senior practitioners who have the inclination and who are prepared to find the time can only take on this demanding post for two to three years at a stretch. Thus there is need for a full-time Director who could co-ordinate the courses and also set down some guidelines on course requirements and syllabi so that even if different persons were to teach a course in different years the variation in course content and standard would be minimised. Such a post calls for a practitioner with considerable experience and such a person would only be enticed from what is certain to be a lucrative practice by an attractive salary and conditions of work. Thus it was only when the Law Society finally agreed to support the cause that the Board of Legal Education could at last agree to advertise the post.<sup>17</sup>

The other criticism of the course attacks the very notion that practice knowhow can be taught by the traditional classroom methods. This criticism is in many respects valid. It is not disputed that the Postgraduate Practical course should not duplicate and telescope what has been taught in four years at undergraduate level in three months. It should train students by requiring them to perform the tasks that would be expected from them as practising lawyers. In short they should be made to do exercises under supervision and subject to correction. If this is the mode of instruction then the institutional method of in-training has the following advantages.<sup>18</sup> Firstly all students would be exposed to all of the more commonly met with tasks of practitioners. This would to a great extent answer some of the usual criticisms of in-training schemes (pupillage) that a set of chambers may not have the varied work, that a master may be too busy to be able to instruct his pupil. Secondly in view of the growing number of "qualified persons" there is increasing difficulty in finding a set of chambers for all persons who wish to be called to the Bar. Institutional in-training would to some extent alleviate this problem.

It is hoped that on the appointment of a suitable person as a full-time Director the Postgraduate Practical course could be improved so that even with part-time teaching by practitioners it would better serve its object of providing a link between the undergraduate University training and actual life as a practising lawyer.

### *Pupillage*

In addition to attending the three months Postgraduate Practical course as described above an aspiring advocate and solicitor has to "read in chambers" for a period of six months with a practising lawyer who has of not less five out of seven years experience as a practising advocate and solicitor.<sup>19</sup> This aspect of the professional training is part of our Common Law heritage. Prior to the institutionalising

<sup>17</sup> The advertisement will combine the position of Director of the Postgraduate Practical Course with that of Secretary to the Law Society.

<sup>18</sup> The practical training of law graduates for admission to the legal profession in Ontario Canada has such a scheme. See Report of the Committee on Legal Education 1971 Cmnd. 4595.

<sup>19</sup> S. 11(2), Legal Profession Act (Cap. 217, Singapore Statutes, Rev. Ed. 1970).

of a part of in-training by the three months Postgraduate course, the length of compulsory pupillage prior to being called to the Bar, was nine months. The reason for retaining the system of pupillage albeit for a shorter period of time is probably attributable to some skepticism as to the efficacy of the postgraduate practical course. Moreover three months is too short a time within which to fully prepare the graduate for actual practice. In any event however good the institutional in-training programme, a period of pupillage or articleship is probably still necessary, for there is no better place to learn the practice of law than in a law office.<sup>20</sup> Ideally if the standard of the legal profession is to be maintained, young lawyers should not be allowed to practise on their own immediately upon their being called to the Bar.

### *Articled Clerkship*

In addition to "qualified persons" a person who has successfully completed the programme for articled clerkship may be admitted as an advocate and solicitor of the Supreme Court.<sup>21</sup>

"Articled clerks" are persons who are attached or "articled" to practising advocates and solicitors. Usually they are persons who are employed in the firms of their "principal" in executive positions. The period of articles is generally not less than five years. However for graduates of a university (not necessarily in law) the minimum length of articled clerkship is three years. During this period he is required to sit for and pass such examinations as are stipulated by the Board of Legal Education.<sup>22</sup>

This route to the legal profession has hitherto not been too popular for the chances of success are fraught with difficulties. For persons who could not for various reasons, study law in the University of Singapore but who desired nevertheless to practise law the easier alternative to articled clerkship was to get called to the English Bar.<sup>23</sup> It was easier in the sense that they could study for these examinations *via* correspondence courses. However with the change in entry requirements of the Council for Legal Education in England, it may be that the route by articled clerkship to the profession would be resorted to more often.<sup>24</sup>

### *SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS*

The problems in the field of legal education may be posed in the following contexts: (1) the LL.B. degree offered by the Faculty of Law (2) the postgraduate professional training (3) the continuing legal education of members of the profession.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. T.T.B. Koh, *op. cit.* at p. 34.

<sup>21</sup> S. 9(1), Legal Profession Act (Cap. 217, Singapore Statutes, Rev. Ed. 1970).

<sup>22</sup> Currently there are four examinations: the Intermediate Part I covering Contract, Tort and Criminal Law & Procedure, Intermediate Part II covering Public Law, Land Law and Evidence, the Final Part I covering Estates & Trusts, Conflict of Laws, and Commercial Transactions and Final Part II covering Conveyancing, Revenue Law, Associations and Civil Procedure.

<sup>23</sup> Under s. 2, Legal Profession Act 1970 a person who has been called to the English Bar is included as a "qualified" person.

<sup>24</sup> There are currently 15 persons registered as articled clerks. There are altogether 3 persons who have gained entry to the legal profession via this route.

*LL.B. Degree*

The basic problem here is one of curriculum content as a result of the LL.B. degree being also a professional qualification. The Report of the Committee on Legal Education sums up neatly and comprehensively the requisites of a professional lawyer.<sup>25</sup>

“The professional lawyer requires general and broadbased education to enable him to adapt himself successfully to new and different situations as his career develops; an adequate knowledge of the more important branches of law and its principles; the ability to handle fact both analytically and synthetically, and to apply the law to situations of fact; and the capacity to work, not only with clients but also with experts in different but also with experts in different disciplines. He must also acquire the professional skills and techniques which are essential to practice, and a grasp of the ethos of the profession, he must also cultivate a critical approach to existing law, an appreciation of its social consequences, and an interest in, and positive attitude to appropriate development and change. To achieve these aims, a combination of education at university level and apprenticeship in its widest sense is necessary.”

The University cannot be expected to turn out graduates in law fulfilling all these. Therefore it is for the University to concentrate on the inculcation of law and its principles, the instruction of handling of facts and the application of the law to facts, the cultivation of a critical attitude to existing law, and an appreciation of law in the context of the society. If all these can be achieved in the four years of undergraduate study the University would have more than discharged its burden. It is futile to attempt to include in the undergraduate curriculum more and more so called “practical” subjects in the hope that this would result in an instant able practitioner. Such an attempt to be comprehensive would result in the mere teaching of rules without understanding, and superficiality. The emphasis in the University curriculum should be on the acquisition of basic knowledge and understanding of the law and where to find it.

*The Postgraduate Professional Training*

It is heartening to note that the legal profession in Singapore has since 1975 accepted that it owes some responsibility for the training of its new recruits. However the postgraduate practical course can be further improved. The obstacles to improvement hitherto have been finance and personnel. To the extent that the Law Society is willing now to contribute some funds to the Board of Legal Education one of the obstacles to having a fulltime Director is removed. It now remains for the right person to be found. Ideally the course should be taught during office hours and by fulltime professional staff. Once this is possible, the course could then be lengthened and the unsatisfactory system of pupillage be replaced entirely. Such an ideal obviously requires money and even if this is available there remains the problem of recruiting suitable personnel. So this remains a dream. Therefore for the immediate future the task is to find a suitable full-time Director who would coordinate and supervise the teaching of the courses. So long as the system of pupillage remains necessary masters should be again reminded of their responsibilities and pupils in turn should be made more aware of their need still to learn.

<sup>25</sup> Report of the Committee on Legal Education 1971 Cmnd. 4595 at p. 42.

*Continuing Legal Education*

With the increasing specialisation within each field of law there has been felt among some lawyers a corresponding need to learn about these new branches and developments. Besides, there are those lawyers who after some years in practice feel that they would like to acquire knowledge in a law subject which they did not have the opportunity of reading whilst at University.<sup>26</sup> To cater for this the University LL.M. programme should be revised so that graduates in law could acquire the LL.M. degree through course work and examination. This however would require a more satisfactory and stable staffing position in the Faculty.

Apart from the revising of the LL.M. programme which would take some time to implement the Law Society has in recent years conducted one day or one afternoon seminars on certain aspects of law. These I believe have been quite successful and should be continued.

It has also been suggested that the Law Faculty run week-end courses on new developments of the various branches of the law. Something in this line was conducted by the Law Faculty in September last year on certain aspects of transnational enterprise investment in Singapore. The problems of holding such seminars relate to the costs involved for the funding of suitable speakers and participants and the hiring of premises.

On the whole continuing legal education has been ignored as the emphasis has been on the undergraduate and professional training. However it would appear that the time has come when the profession is being forced to take cognisance of this aspect of legal education. In this we can learn much from the American experience.

S.Y. TAN\*

<sup>26</sup> In recent years there has been an increasing number of young graduates who after some years in practice take leave to read for the LL.M. in London.

\* B.A., LL.B., Associate Professor & Vice-Dean, Faculty of Law, University of Singapore.