

Law (192 /) Department.
(Education)

Ordinary SERIES.

G.O. No.

1693

DATED

25-11-21

[Despatch Abstract.]

L.C. Resolution---November 1921

Law College, Madras---~~regarding~~ ^{*the*} adjustment of

the hours of teaching-disallowed-Notes recorded.

2032

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

L.C. Rem 164

Rem 164

50. 538/1900 S.C. S.C.
 447/1901 " S.C.
 529/1904 " S.C.
 1099/12 " S.C.
 224/13 " S.C.
 1424/15 " S.C.
 360/16 " S.C.
 1351/16 " S.C.
 1355/16 " S.C.

*The Resolution passed the
resolution on the ground of
not being in the public interest - 164 3*

NOTES ON RESOLUTION ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC
INTEREST.

[For the meeting of the 12th October 1921.]

[SUBJECT—Law College—hours of teaching.]

COUNCIL OFFICE.

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—

164. That this Council recommends to the Government that to facilitate the study of law, the hours of teaching in the Law College may be so adjusted as to make it possible for law students to earn their livelihood during the law course.

LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

When the Law College was first established in 1888, the hours of instruction were fixed between 7 and 10 a.m. and 5 and 8 p.m. so as not to interfere with the office duties of any of the students. In 1900 when the Director of Public Instruction came up with the proposal to convert the College into a full-time day College, the question of fixing the hours of working was fully gone into and it was finally decided in paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 538, Education, dated the 26th October 1900, to approve of the Director of Public Instruction's proposal to convert the institution into a day college. The working hours were fixed between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. The question of the working hours cropped up again in 1912 in connexion with the reorganization of the College and both the Principal of the College and the College Council were in favour of continuing the working hours then in vogue—vide portion side-lined at pages 2 and 3 of G.O. No. 1099, dated 10th December 1912. Owing chiefly to the views expressed by the late Mr. Krishnaswami Ayyar and Sir P. S. Sivaswami Ayyar, the Government decided that the hours of work should fall between 10 and 11 in the morning and 5 and 7 in the evening in order to secure to the College the services of men of distinction in the legal profession who would not ordinarily be available during court hours—vide G.O. No. 224, dated 15th March 1913. But the Principal and the College Council were not in favour of the proposal as will be seen from the portion side-lined at pages 4, 5 and 11 of G.O. No. 1424, dated the 14th October 1915. Some of the arguments urged by the Principal in favour of the existing hours were:—

- (i) that work from 5 to 7 p.m. is bad for the students as they are hours when the brain is least active and most easily fatigued;
- (ii) that the only time that healthy exercise and recreation can be taken will be robbed from the students and the athletic life of the College will cease entirely;
- (iii) that students will be tempted to seek some other employment during the day to fill their spare hours and their pockets and return at 5 to give tired hours to their legitimate work; and
- (iv) that work from 5 to 7 p.m. by practitioners who have been busy all day in court is certain to be inferior however willing and able they may be.

In view of the arguments above set forth, the Government decided to reconsider the orders passed in 1913 and fixed the working hours of the College between 10 a.m. and 5 p.m.

2. The member's intention in bringing forward the resolution is to enable law students to earn their livelihood during their Law course. It is not to the interests of the students themselves that they should be allowed to resort to bread-winning occupation to the detriment of their studies. Besides, prior to 1900 when the College was only a part-time institution, the number of students otherwise employed who attended the College was only 6.4 per cent of the total strength. The working

G.O. 1099-12
10.11.12

pp 576 y ude
G.O. 538
20.7.11
+ pp 576 y ude
G.O. 1099-12
10.12.12

vide pp 4-5 of G.O. 1424
14.10.15

para 2(ii) G.O. 310
22.3.16

para 12 of G.O. 538
26.10.00

vide para 5 of
Office note at p
2 of the note to
G.O. 538
26.10.00

W
B

2
hours of the College have been fixed in the interests of the majority of the students and the suggestion to alter the hours to suit the convenience of the minority cannot be accepted.

3. For orders whether any additional information will be collected, whether the subject will be discussed in the Cabinet and as to who should take charge of the resolution.

4. It is for consideration whether the remarks of the Director of Public Instruction should be invited u.o.

(No similar resolution was moved during the past 12 months).

C.S.D.—26-8-21. N.K.—29-8-21.

C. RAMANUJA ACHARIYAR—29-8-21.

P. C. DUTT—29-8-21.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

The wording of this resolution is unfortunate. The mover apparently means not 'to facilitate the study of law' but 'to offer larger facilities for the study of law'. To facilitate the study of law means to make the study of law easy and all the evidence before us is that the study of law is not made easy by adjusting the hours of teaching so as to make it possible for law students to earn their livelihood during the Law course. On the contrary the study of law is made all the more difficult. If then the resolution is accepted as it stands and the mover is not allowed to alter the wording there will be little trouble in pointing out the arguments which are stated in the above Secretariat note. They should be found sufficient to induce a rational body to reject the resolution.

I do not put forward the argument that the study of law should not be made any more easy than it is, since we have too many lawyers at present practising or waiting for practice and that it would therefore be desirable to curtail the facilities offered for the study of law. No doubt some non-official member of the Council will raise this point.

I consider that the resolution ought to be opposed on the grounds stated in the Secretariat note, in particular we have—vide page 10 of G.O. No. 1424, Educational, dated 14th December 1915—the opinions of the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tyabji, the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sadasiva Ayyar and Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.

If, however, in the course of debate it is evident that the Legislative Council appears likely to be in favour of the resolution I suggest that it be put forward that this is a matter which Government will refer to the Law College Council for opinion.

R. LITTLEHAILES—31-8-21.

LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

May be submitted to M-3.

Orders are requested whether the resolution should be discussed at a meeting of the Cabinet and as to who will be in charge of it.

N.K.—11-9-21. C.R.—1-9-21.

P.C.D.—1-9-21.

I take it.

A. P. P[ATRO]—8-9-21.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Law (Edn) DEPARTMENT.

350-23-9-21.

The following resolution was—

carried.
carried as amended.
lost.
not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.
in the absence of the mover, deemed to have been withdrawn.

Resolution No.

Re-adjustment of the hours of teaching in the Law College.

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—

164 [183] That this Council recommends to the Government that, to facilitate the study of law, the hours of teaching in the Law College may be so adjusted as to make it possible for law students to earn their livelihood during the law course.

The Honourable Member was prepared to move the resolution but the Honourable the President did not permit him to do so as the subject of the resolution was not a matter of general public interest so as to satisfy the terms of Standing Order 54.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OFFICE.

17-11-1921.

Secretary to the Legislative Council.

L. S. Swamikannu

Law (Eng) Dep.

Order no 1693, d. the 25.11.21

Abst.

L.C. Res. - No. 2

Law Coll. Madras -

Re-adjustment of the hours of teaching - dis allowed - note received.

Records

21.11.21

23/11/21

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

192 .

READ AGAIN G.O. No. _____, DATED
 192 .

OUT
 CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DISTO.

PAPERS NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.