

Law (Education) (1925) Department.

Ord. SERIES.

G.O. No. 507

DATED

7. 4. 1925

[Despatch Abstract.]

Legislative Council Question

Law College - Reorganization

Scheme - Notes Recorded

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.


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

Law Dept. III-8-4,000-1-12-24.
Law Edu. no. 426C
7.2.25

QUESTION.—No. 578 * for the meeting of the Legislative
 Council to be held ⁱⁿ on the *February* 1925. *V*

SUBMITTED that two copies of this Question may be forwarded to the
Law (Education) Department.

The Question has been admitted.



To

The *Law (Education)* Department.

7-2-25

V. 17

Legislative Council Order
Law College - Birmingham
Shree - R. R. Thakur

Starred question

MR. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB:-
THE LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT

578.* Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state ^{with reference to} the recommendations of the committee regarding the appointment of special lecturers in the reorganisation scheme of the Madras Law College;

(a) whether ~~any test has been laid down to show as to who are specialists and who are not;~~

(b) whether the Advisory Committee for Education was consulted as regards the adoption of the recommendations and as regards the formation of the Committee dated 11th September 1923;

(c) in view of the recommendations of the Committee as regards the permission of students of exceptional ability and industry to attend to other avocations in their spare hours whether the committee have considered the desirability of allowing unpassed F.L. students to attend F.L. classes and put in their term of attendance; if so, what the recommendations are; if not, why not?

(d) whether the committee considered suggestion of abolishing the apprenticeship course and substitute in its

Paragraph 10 of P. 27

20. 17. 28

(E) 5. 11. 24

Marked for

definitive

one more year of study in the Law College during which time the professors should put the students in practical touch with processual law; if so, what its recommendations are;

(e) whether the appointment of Assistant Lecturers is to be made only from the Madras Bar or from both the Madras and the mufassal Bar;

(f) why the committee has fixed the experience of the junior practitioners to be appointed as Assistant Lecturers to be below six years' standing at the Bar;

(g) supposing a practitioner of more than six years' standing is willing to be appointed as an Assistant Lecturer, whether his case is not to be considered at all;

(h) whether the rule 6 years' standing applies also to members of the mufassal Bar; and

(i) whether the rule of 6 years' standing ^{applies to} includes only High Court Vakils or even 1st Grade Pleaders?

S.R.

A.S.

Clause (a);- Paragraph 7 of the Law College reorganisation committee's report clearly states the class of men from whom the special lecturers have to be ~~XXXX~~ appointed and the Government ~~have~~ accepted the suggestion. No particular test has been laid down either by the committee or by the Government as to who are specialists. Men who are eminent in the profession will be invited by the College Council to deliver courses of lectures on topics in which they have acquired special proficiency. The answer to this clause may be

(a) "The attention of the Hon'ble Member is invited to paragraph 7 of the report of the Law College Re-organisation Committee and to paragraph 4 of G.O. No. 1702 Law (Edn) dated the 5th November, 1924, placed on the Editors' table.

Clauses (b), (c), (d) & (e). The following answers are suggested,

(b). No.

(c) & (d). The points were not included in the terms of reference to the committee.

(e). From both.

Clause (f). The Committee suggested the appointment of assistant professors on the recommendation of the College Council from among competent juniors. The six years' limit was put in by Government. The following answer is approval:-

(f). No such suggestion was made by the Committee.

Clause (g). The answer may be

(g) The question does not arise.

392

pp 2 & 3 of (E) (Lecture file)

q. also p. 6 of 45.
166881
(A) 31.10.24

Paragraph 5 of 1924
(E)
p. 79 ibid.

Clause (h). The answer may be

(h). Yes.

Clause (i). The original idea was that assistant professors should possess an ^{European} degree in law, or a degree of Master of Laws, or distinction in the first or second class in the B.L. examination. In the final orders issued the qualification described above was not specified. It does not however ^{appear} to be the intention to recruit assistant lecturers from the ranks of first grade pleaders. The following answer is for approval:-

(i). It is not the intention of the Government to recruit assistant lecturers from the ranks of first grade pleaders. The six years' limit applies to all applicants otherwise eligible.

12.2.25

12.2.25

13.2

M2

'A' / f - in answer to
g - is hypothetical case suits
to point out information -
The answer suggested is hence accepted.



'A' above.

The trouble: The Minister
presumably refers to clause (d)

14/2/25

9th
14/11/25
C-1. B

Please despatch in
answer to L.C. office Sharma
in red pencil.

San Edu no 4269/25.

17.2.25

pp 2 & 7 of
the pp at 217 (B)

p. 65 of No. 1202

5.11.24

S. Satyaguram at the last meeting of
the Council. The clause (f) of the
question now under consideration is a
little different from Mr. Satyaguram's
question. The former speaks as though
presumes that the six years' limit
was put in by the Committee. As a
matter of fact, the Committee did not
suggest any such limit, the limitation
being one put in by the Govt. of
their own accord. In this view the
answer to clause (f) may stand. There
is no difference in the substance of the question also there is difference.
For others who have answered
as drafted may view.

15.2.25

16.2.25

Issue
16.2

* 392 Q.—Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state with reference to the recommendations of the committee regarding the appointment of special lecturers in the reorganization scheme of the Madras Law College—

(a) whether any test has been laid down to show as to who are specialists and who are not;

(b) whether the Advisory Committee for Education was consulted as regards the adoption of the recommendations and as regards the formation of the committee, dated 11th September 1923;

(c) in view of the recommendations of the committee as regards the permission of students of exceptional ability and industry to attend to other avocations in their spare hours whether the committee have considered the desirability of allowing unpassed F.L. students to attend B.L. classes and put in their term of attendance; if so, what the recommendations are; if not, why not;

(d) whether the committee considered any suggestion of abolishing the apprenticeship course and substitute in its place one more year of study in the Law College during which time the professors should put the students in practical touch with processual law; if so, what its recommendations are;

(e) whether the appointment of Assistant Lecturers is to be made only from the Madras Bar or from both the Madras and the Mufassal Bar;

(f) why the committee has fixed the experience of the junior practitioners to be appointed as Assistant Lecturers to below six years' standing at the Bar;

(g) supposing a practitioner of more than six years' standing is willing to be appointed as an Assistant Lecturer, whether his case is not to be considered at all;

(h) whether the rule six years' standing applies also to members of the Mufassal Bar; and

(i) whether the rule of six years' standing applies only to High Court vakils or even first-grade pleaders?

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to paragraph 7 of the report of the Law College Reorganization Committee and to paragraph 4 of G.O. No. 1702, Law (Education), dated the 5th November 1924, placed on the Editors' Table.

(b) No.

(c) & (d) The points were not included in the terms of reference to the Committee.

(e) From both.

(f) No such suggestion was made by the committee.

(g) Such cases will not be considered.

(h) Yes.

(i) The six years' limit applies to all applicants otherwise eligible.

[5th March 1925]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“With reference to the answer to clause (d), may I ask why the Advisory Committee was not consulted and if it is not consulted, why the committee exists?”

The hon. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO :—“Being a matter which was considered by a special committee it was thought unnecessary to place it before the Advisory Committee.”

Law (Hon) Sept

Legislative L. - March 1925

Order 507 Recorded.

Q. 7 - Law College
Reorganization Scheme

- Notes recorded -

mis 7-4-25

6-4-25

6-4-25

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____ } 192
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

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

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES to C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT. _____

STATEMENT WITH DITTO. _____

PAPEERS NOT FILED OF, 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.