for consultation referred to above. The writer of this note can contrast favourably the ability to consult widely on both a formal and informal basis conferred on the Commission by the Securities Act, with the situation of a public servant, bound by the Official Secrets Act, and once the drafting of statutory provisions had commenced, by the constraints of Parliamentary privilege.

In preparing the Proposals for Securities Regulations recently released, the Commission consulted widely both formally and informally. A background paper on Financial Advertising Control was issued in September 1970 and invitations to interested parties attracted 27 submissions of which 17 were heard in person by the Commission at meetings held during November.

The prospectus proposals were developed internally, with the assistance of a chartered accountant seconded to us by a major accounting firm for a period of 3 months and of a parliamentary counsel. Informal assistance was given by a number of accountants and stockbrokers. Successive drafts were debated at meetings of the Commission. The “proposals” were issued at the end of March containing the text of the regulations proposed to be recommended and supported by an extensive essay discussing the principles and giving reasons. The Commission has invited submissions on this document by the end of May.

While it is too much to hope that complete agreement will be attained, this procedure does have the advantage of exposing, in the formative stages, proposed laws on very complex matters to the views of those who will be affected by the legislation. This can only lead to better law.

T. J. Doyle, B.A. (Cantab)

Director of Research, Securities Commission

LAW REFORM IN NEW ZEALAND—THE STATE OF PLAY*

The main purpose of this article is modest — it is to provide up to date information about the machinery of law reform in New Zealand to mark the beginning of a regular feature in this review on law reform activities in New Zealand. What we understand today as law reform i.e. accelerated legislative intervention\(^1\) is a relatively modern concept only dating back as far as Bentham and the Utilitarian movement.\(^2\) New Zealand in that sense, though a new country, has had a long history of law

---

* The author is indebted to Mr B. J. Cameron, Deputy Secretary for Justice, for supplying the information in the Schedules and details of the current membership of committees. He is also grateful to Mr M. U. Kidd for research into the Department of Justice.


The Judicature Acts were anticipated in terms of assimilation of the administration of Common Law and Equity in a single Supreme Court and simpler, more rational rules of procedure. The Stephen Criminal Code and the Torrens system of registered land were adopted and have survived the test of time. New Zealand also produced much progressive social legislation between 1875 and 1910. Thereafter in the debilitating aftermath of the First World War and world economic recession there was something of a quietus and a tendency to follow English or Australian legislative precedents for a long period. There were exceptions of course, notable amongst them being the introduction of an ombudsman, a review of the criminal code and criminal procedure and indigenous family law and social welfare reforms. The basic pattern, however, from 1910 until the nineteen sixties in many areas was cautious and essentially imitative. The pattern since the 1960’s and particularly since 1973 when the United Kingdom joined the Common Market has changed. Accident Compensation in the 1970’s has represented a major reform of considerable originality as well as profound social significance. In the area of contract New Zealand has opted for piecemeal codification and, unlike the English Law Commission, it has got on with it. Minors’ contracts, illegality, mistake and remedies have all been codified with broad discretions conferred on the judiciary in a manner to which the common law has grown unaccustomed. In the area of commercial law New Zealand has given a local twist to earlier Australian restrictive practice and monopolies legislation and the Commerce Act 1975 reads in places more like a ministerial brief than an Act of Parliament. In the Securities Act 1978 it has developed a local solution to securities regulation suited to the local capital market and combining an administrative agency with self regulation in an interesting way. The New Zealand Securities Commission is also charged with a law reform function which it is actively pursuing in an outward going style reminiscent of Mr Justice Kirby’s Law Reform Commission in Australia.

The New Zealand system differs from some other systems in the precise form of its Department of Justice and the structure of its law reform agencies. The differences are sources of both strength and weakness. Since there is a recurrent debate in the United Kingdom about the need for a

---

3 See B. J. Cameron “Law Reform in New Zealand” (1956) N.Z.L.J. 72, 88 and 106; R. Hanan, Law in a Changing Society. Mr Cameron who is Deputy Secretary for Justice has long been active in law reform. The Hon. Ralph Hanan was a dynamic law reformer as Minister who worked closely with Dr J. L. Robson, then Secretary for Justice.

4 See G. Palmer, Compensation for Incapacity—A Study of Law and Social Change in New Zealand and Australia.


8 See Mr Justice Kirby’s valuable paper, “Reforming Law Reform—New Methods of Law Reform in Australia” for the U.K. National Committee on Comparative Law Colloquium on “Methods of Law Reform” held at the University of Warwick, 11-12 September 1979. Modern law reformers owe much to the learning, industry and imagination of Mr Justice Kirby. He has assumed the intellectual leadership of Commonwealth Law Reform formerly exercised by Lord Scarman.
Ministry of Justice to take over the responsibilities of the law officers, Lord Chancellor’s Department and penal side of the Home Office it may help if one states that Ministries of Justice do differ and if we first spell out the particular responsibilities of the New Zealand Department of Justice.9

The New Zealand Department of Justice:

The Department of Justice is currently divided into the following “programmes”

I General Administration
   (a) Head Office
   (b) Law Reform Division
   (c) Planning and Development
II Courts
III Patents Office
IV Births, Deaths, Marriages, Registration, and Electoral
V Probation Service
VI Registration of Land
VII Penal
VIII Commercial Affairs
IX Public Buildings Construction
X Tribunals Division
XI Psychological Services

The detailed job definition of the Law Reform Division is as follows:10

“(b) Law Reform Division

Role:

(i) To provide the departmental services required by the Minister to implement his legislative programme.
(ii) To participate in the work of the five law reform committees and provide them with administrative services.
(iii) To give legal advice to the other divisions of the department.

Objectives:

(i) To advise on the constitutional implications of legislative proposals.
(ii) To initiate and carry through proposals for legislative change.
(iii) To formulate draft legislative proposals to implement Government policy.
(iv) To monitor the effectiveness of legislation administered in the department where appropriate, to advise the Secretary of Justice on necessary amendments.
(v) To provide prompt, competent advice on legal aspects of departmental activities.
(vi) To achieve an annual legislative programme formed in relation to priorities established by the Government.”

Thus it can be seen that the Department has general superintendence of law reform as well as taking on a range of matters which go beyond such

---

9 On this question see Farrar, Law Reform and the Law Commission 18 et seq 123
10 See Statutory Functions and Responsibilities of New Zealand Government Departments 1977, 132
Ministries in many other systems. Patents, registration of births, deaths and marriages, electoral lists, land registration and commercial affairs including the registrars of companies all fall within its purview. The Department’s Commercial Affairs section in the past has handled Company Law reform although to a certain extent this function has been taken over by the Securities Commission which in practice works closely with Commercial Affairs. Some of the Department’s functions go back to early colonial times when they were vested in the Colonial Secretary. The Department was formally established in 1873 but is not the creature of statute and no one statute prescribes its functions and responsibilities. Notwithstanding its big workload the staff employed by the Department is small. The current staffing figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Strength</th>
<th>As at 31st March 1980 (Numbers)</th>
<th>As at 31st March 1979 (Numbers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General administration</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents Office</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births, deaths, marriages, registration and electoral</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation service</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration of land</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penal</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial affairs</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribunals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>3,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff ceiling</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>3,828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff ceiling 1980-81 3,841

One of the gaps in the past has been lack of adequate research facilities although recently there has been a modest but significant increase in qualified staff allocated to this work.

As we have seen law reform falls under the programme of general administration and there is no separate budget for it. The ministry’s current budget of $98,005,000 is allocated as follows: 11

Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>1980-81 $(000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I General administration</td>
<td>4,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Courts</td>
<td>23,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Patents office</td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Births, deaths, marriages, registrations and electoral</td>
<td>1,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Probation service</td>
<td>9,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Registration of land</td>
<td>5,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Machinery of Law Reform:12

There is currently a part time law reform council consisting of:—the Minister as chairman; the chairmen of the standing law reform committees; the Solicitor General; the Chief Parliamentary Counsel and the Secretary for Justice. The standing committees are not satellites of the Council but are directly appointed by and answerable to the Minister. There are currently five standing law reform committees which are all part time. In addition to these the Securities Commission is now a standing company and Securities law reform agency.13 The membership of the committees is as follows:—

(a) Contracts and Commercial Law Reform Committee:
C. I. Patterson — Chairman. Also full-time chairman of the Securities Commission
D. F. Dugdale
J. H. Wallace Q.C.
J. S. Henry Q.C.
W. H. Isles (parliamentary counsel)
Prof. B. Coote (Auckland University)
Prof. J. F. Burrows (Canterbury University)
J. R. Fox
B. J. Cameron (Dept. of Justice)
P. J. Carroll, Secretary

(b) Criminal Law Reform Committee
P. G. S. Penlington Q.C. — Chairman
D. A. S. Ward (former law Draftsman)
A. A. T. Ellis
R. . McLennan (N.Z. Police)

12 For a useful survey of the modern system see David B. Collins op. cit. and Prof. Gordon Orr’s paper for the AULSA conference “Law Reform and the Legislative Process” to be published in the Victoria University Law Review. See also B. J. Cameron in Law Reform in the Commonwealth published by the Commonwealth Secretariat, 28.

13 The personnel of the Securities Commission is as follows: Mr C. I. Patterson (full-time Chairman), of Wellington, barrister and solicitor; Dr C. J. Fernyhough (vice chairman), of Auckland, barrister; Mr P. S. Stannard, of Wellington, accountant; Mr A. W. Mann, of Christchurch, accountant; and Mr K. E. F. Grenny, of Auckland, retired businessman. The alternative members are: L. M. Papps, of Wellington, barrister and solicitor (for C. I. Patterson); J. E. Aburn, of Paraparaumu, sharebroker (for K. E. F. Grenny); G. C. Edgar, of Auckland, chartered accountant (for P. S. Stannard); and J. A. Valentine, of Dunedin, chartered accountant (for A. W. Mann).
(Capital Letter, 1979, Vol 2 No. 16 (48), page 4 and No. 17 (49), page 4).
W. A. Moore
A. Satyanand
Mrs J. E. Lowe (Dept. of Justice)
Dr G. F. Orchard (Canterbury University)
D. A. R. Williams
Dr W. Young (Director of the Criminology Institute, Victoria)

(c) Property Law and Equity Reform Committee
V. R. W. Gray — Chairman
P. F. Robinson
Miss J. M. Potter
Mr A. J. Forbes
Mr R. G. F. Barker
Mr S. F. Drummond
Prof. R. J. Sutton (Otago University)
Registrar-General of Land — appointment pending
Ms J. Finnigan, Secretary

(d) Public and Administrative Law Reform Committee
Prof. J. F. Northey — Chairman (Auckland University)
Judge D. F. G. Sheppard
E. W. Thomas
Prof. K. J. Keith (Victoria University)
Prof. D. L. Mathieson (Victoria University)
E. A. Missen
R. G. Montagu (Dept. of Justice)
G. R. Laking
Parliamentary Counsel — appointment pending
Mrs C. J. Cosgriff, Secretary

(e) Torts and General Law Reform Committee
I. L. McKay — Chairman
S. C. Ennor
B. McClelland Q.C.
Prof. D. L. Mathieson (Victoria University)
G. E. Crowder, Secretary

Schedules 1 and 2 at the end of this article give details of reports of these committees and certain ad hoc committees, together with the resulting legislation, and matters under consideration as at 1 August 1980.

The Current Debate —

The Alleged Need for a Full Time Commission.

It may seem surprising to overseas readers that in 1980, fifteen years after the setting up of the English and Scottish Law Commissions, New Zealand is still debating whether or not to set up a full time law commission or at least a full time law commissioner. It is not that Kiwis necessarily sleep with their heads in the sand but that New Zealand has a long tradition of public service by part time committees which has made an impoverished system work surprisingly well. Nevertheless there is a movement for change. The Royal Commission on the Courts recommended the creation of a permanent law reform commission in a form
suitable for New Zealand in 1978. The current controversy is being actively carried on by Prof. Don Mathieson of Victoria University, Wellington, supported by Prof. Douglas Whalan, a New Zealander who is now based in Canberra. On the other side is Prof. Gordon Orr, former Secretary for Justice and now also of Victoria University.

The main arguments for change can be summarised as follows:—

1. The present part time committees work too slowly and their present system of one day meetings raises practical difficulties.
2. The terms of reference of the committees are too wide.
3. There is a need for the involvement of laymen.
4. There is a limit to what busy practitioners can be expected to do.
5. The Law Reform Council has few and ill-defined functions and is unable to keep the entire law under review.
6. The system lacks independence from the Government of the day.

The main arguments against change are:—

1. The present system works well and has been productive and successful.
2. This is due in large measure to successive Ministers of Justice who have taken an interest in law reform.
3. It is also due to the character of the New Zealand Department of Justice and its personnel.
4. The part time system achieves the right balance of practising lawyers, academic lawyers and public servants and liaison between these groups.
5. It is unlikely that the full time alternatives would result in more or better legislation. There are dangers of a legislative bottleneck; difficulties of getting suitable personnel; the danger of impractical proposals; and the loss of the part time services of private legal practitioners.
6. We cannot afford it anyway at the moment.

The present writer’s own view is that there is some truth in all these points but that Prof. Mathieson’s proposal of a commissioner, deputy commissioner, five or six research officers and secretarial staff does not seem quite right. If change is to be considered the precedent of the New Zealand Securities Commission would seem more appropriate to New Zealand than most overseas commissions given the limited resources, the strong part time tradition, and the healthy, although excessive, scepticism about things academic which prevail. Only the Chairman of the Securities Commission and the handful of members of his staff are full time appointments. The rest of the commission is part time and it calls in consultants from private practice. Like the Australian Law Reform Commission it

14 Para. 996.
17 See Orr op. cit.
18 For interesting comparative data about membership of commonwealth law commissions see Law Reform in the Commonwealth, 22 et seq.
conducts public hearings on its proposals. My suggestion is, therefore:—
a law reform commission consisting of:

a full time chairman of at least High Court calibre, four part time
commissioners chosen from private practice and the universities and
a nucleus of research officers and secretarial staff.

This should then decide whether to keep in being all the existing part time
committees, restructure them or assume some of their functions. However,
as always the last word rests with the current Minister of Justice. The Hon.
J. K. McLay, an energetic but pragmatic reformers, said last year: 19

My mind is certainly not closed on the question of a full time Commission or
Commissioners. I certainly believe that our system of law reform must be allowed
to develop and adapt to changing circumstances and for that reason I have
arranged for the matter to be one of regular discussion at future Law Reform
Council meetings. However like my predecessors, both Labour and National, I
remain at this stage unconvinced of the need for a fundamental change in our
law reform structure.

SCHEDULE 1

Matters Reported on by Contracts and Commercial Law Reform Committee

1. Sea Carriage of goods  Reported August 1967  Proposals enacted: Sea Carriage of Goods Amend-
ment Act 1968.

2. Misrepresentation and Reported March 1968, Pub.  Proposals enacted: Con-


4. Minors’ contracts  Reported May 1969  Most proposals enacted: Minors’ Contracts Amend-
ment Act 1971.


after death


8. “Package” insurance Reported October 1969, Pub.  No change in existing law
policies


Purchase Bill

10. Textual review Door to Reported November 1970  No change in existing law
Door Sales Act 1967

   of Savings bank accounts

12. Promissory notes Reported July 1972 No change in existing law
   (Statute of Limitations)

   1972) 1975.

14. Hire Purchase Act (use Reported August 1973 Some proposals enacted:

15. Secured transactions Reported September 1973, Some proposals enacted:

16. Unsolicited goods and Reported February 1974, Proposals enacted:


18. Insurance law (first Reported April 1975, Proposals enacted:

19. Contractual mistake Reported May 1976, Pub. Proposals enacted: Con-

   Pub.

Criminal Law Reform Committee

1. Forgery: De La Rue v. Proposed April 1972 Proposals enacted: Crimes

2. Thefts of documents Proposed April 1972 Proposals enacted: Crimes
   rights

3. Use of stolen property Proposed April 1972 Proposals enacted: Crimes

   whether arrested accused
   should be required to attend

5. Suppression of name of Proposed September 1972, Minority report enacted
   until charge heard Majority report partially included in 1975 legislation
   retained.

6. Preliminary hearing of Proposed September 1972, Proposals enacted:

   by impossibility
Law Reform


10. Differential penalties depending on occupation of victim in violent offences Reported October 1975 No change recommended.


12. The law as to provocation in (a) murder (b) other offences Reported July 1976, *Pub.* No action as yet.


15. Aspects of the law and procedure relating to identification Reported September 1978 No action as yet.


Property Law and Equity Reform Committee


2. Contracts of sale subject to finance Reported August 1967 No change in existing law recommended.

3. Law relating to executors and administrators Reported October 1967 Most proposals enacted: Administration Act 1969. Referred back were:—
(a) The effect of murder/manslaughter on the rights of succession. Separate report now published (see No. 25 below);
(b) Section 52 Public Trust Office Act 1957 — no change recommended August 1971;
(c) Interest on arrears of annuities: no change in existing law since recommended June 1976.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Reported</th>
<th>Proposals/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Section 81(2) Property Law Act 1952</td>
<td>December 1968</td>
<td>No change in existing law recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Restraints on alienation and anticipation</td>
<td>March 1971</td>
<td>Legislation proposed. No action taken as yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sections 7, 8, 9 Statute of Frauds</td>
<td>March 1971</td>
<td>Legislation proposed. No action as yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Gift by way of release of debt—the formal requirements</td>
<td>June 1974</td>
<td>No legislative action recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Statutory condition of sale (and insurance of property subject to contract for sale and purchase)</td>
<td>August 1974</td>
<td>No legislative action recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Contracts for the sale of land</td>
<td>August 1974</td>
<td>No action taken as yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Investment in new debenture issues by trustees
Reported November 1974
No legislative action recommended.

22. Section 120 Property Law Act 1952
Reported May 1976
No action as yet.

23. Right of support by adjoining land
Reported August 1976
No change recommended.

24. Financial limits on a trustee power
Reported September 1976

25. Administration Act 1969: the effect of murder or manslaughter on rights of succession
Reported October 1976, Pub.
No action as yet.

26. The decision in Frazer v. Walker
Reported June 1977, Pub.
No action as yet (review of Land Transfer Act proceeding).

27. Mortgagee's power of sale through the Registrar
Reported June 1977
Legislation proposed. No action as yet.

28. Decision in Re Richards
Reported December 1978, Pub.
No action as yet.

29. Charitable Trusts
Reported February 1979
No action as yet.

Public and Administrative Law Reform Committee
1. Appeals from administrative tribunals
Reported January 1968, Pub.
Administrative Division of Supreme Court established —Judicature Amendment Act 1968.

2. Mining Bill 1969
Most proposals enacted: Mining Act 1971.

3a. Judicial control of administrative acts: procedure for proposed new remedy of judicial review
Reported April 1972, Pub.
Proposals enacted: Judicature Amendment Act 1972.

3b. Proposed amendments to the Judicature Amendment Act 1972
Reported September 1975, Pub.

4. Award of Costs where Crown privilege claimed, or where Crown intervenes
Reported April 1972, Pub.
Proposals enacted: Judicature Amendment Act 1972.

5. Regulation making powers and procedures of the Executive
Reported April 1974, Pub.
No legislative action recommended.

6. Code of procedure for administrative tribunals
Reported September 1975, Pub.
No legislative action recommended.
7. The publication of decisions of administrative tribunals

8. Compulsory acquisition of land

9. Suspension of school pupils

10. Marine Farming

11. Discipline within the legal profession

12. Standing for application for review

13. Codification of the grounds for judicial review of administration

The following tribunals have been considered and reported on.

(a) Land Valuation Court

(b) Town and Country Planning Appeal Board

(c) District Transport Licensing Authorities; Transport Licensing Appeal Authorities; Transport Charges Appeal Authority

(d) Trade Practices and Prices Commission; Trade Practices Appeal Authority; Prices Tribunal

(e) Motor Spirits Licensing Authority; Motor Spirits Licensing Appeal Authority

(f) Air Services Licensing Authority; Air Services Licensing Appeal Authority

(g) Licensing Control Commission Licensing Committees

Proposals followed. N.Z. Administrative Reports now published monthly.

Commission of Inquiry recommended. Proposals followed in part—Committee to examine Public Works Act 1928 set up and reported 1978.

Some proposals enacted: Education Amendment Act 1976.

No action taken as yet.

No action taken as yet.

No action as yet.

Included in 12th Report.


No action taken as yet.

No action as yet.

(h) Taxation Board of Review
Reported April 1974
Proposals enacted in part: s.43 Inland Revenue Department Act 1974.

(i) Cinematograph Films Licensing Authority; Registration Appeal Authority; Cinematograph Films Censorship Board of Appeal
Reported January 1969
Proposals enacted:
Cinematograph Films Amendment Act 1969.

(j) Indecent Publications Tribunal
Reported January 1969
No change in present procedure recommended.

(k) Earthquake and War Damage Commission
Reported March 1969
No change in present procedure recommended.

(l) Copyright Tribunal
Reported March 1969
No change in present procedure recommended.

(m) Military Service Postponement Committees; Conscientious Objection Committee
Reported March 1969
No change in present procedure recommended.

(n) Pharmacy Authority
Reported March 1969
Proposals enacted: Section 40, Pharmacy Act 1970.

(o) Shops and Offices Exemption Tribunal
No change in present procedure recommended.

(p) Animal Remedies Board

(q) Co-operative Dairy Companies Tribunal
No change in present procedure recommended.

(r) Land Settlement Board; Land Settlement Committees
No action taken as yet.

(s) Timber Preservation Authority
No change in present procedure recommended.

(t) War Pensions Board
No change in present procedure recommended.

(u) Harbour Ferry Service Licensing Authority

(v) Local Government Commission

(w) Local Authorities Loan Board
Reported March 1973, Pub. No change in present procedure recommended.

(x) Powers of the Audit Office
Reported March 1973, Pub. No change in present procedure recommended.

(y) Regional Water Board
Reported March 1973, Pub. No change in present procedure recommended.
(z) Air Accident investigations

(aa) Apprenticeship Committees
Reported April 1974, *Pub.* No change in present procedure recommended.

(ab) Coal Mines Council
Reported April 1974, *Pub.* No change in present procedure recommended.

(ac) Commissioner of Patents
Reported April 1974, *Pub.* No change in present procedure recommended.

(ad) Committee of the Board of Health

(ae) Compulsory acquisition of land

(af) Educational tribunals
Reported April 1974, *Pub.* No action as yet.

(ag) Hospital Review Committee

(ah) Noxious Weeds

(ai) Poisons

(aij) Rates postponement

(ak) Snow Loss Reserve Committee

(al) Tariff and Development Board
Reported April 1974, *Pub.* No change in present procedure recommended.

(am) Tobacco Quota Committee

(an) Milk Board
Reported September 1975, Recommendation accepted.

(ao) Public Service Tribunals: State Services Appeal Board Police Appeal Board Police Misconduct Tribunal Post Office Appeal Board Railways Appeal Board
Reported September 1975, *Pub.* No action as yet.

(ap) Invalid Benefit Appeal Board Minors Benefit Appeal Board
Reported September 1975, *Pub.* No change recommended.

14. Commissions of Inquiry
Reported April 1980, *Pub.* No action as yet. *Act* 1908

*Torts and General Law Reform Committee*


   (a) Breach of promise
   (b) Damages for adultery, and the action for enticement
   (c) The action for seduction
   (d) The action for enticement of a child
   (e) The employer's action for enticement and harbouring
   (f) Loss of services Reported April 1972 Action abolished by Accident Compensation Act 1972.
   (g) Loss of consortium Reported April 1972 Action abolished by Accident Compensation Act 1972.


10. Damage caused by animals Reported September 1975 No action taken as yet.


*Ad Hoc Committees*


**Other**


---

**SCHEDULE 2**

**Matters Under Consideration and Reported On by Law Reform and Other Committees as at 1 August 1980**

**A. Matters Under Consideration**

**Contracts and Commercial Law Reform Committee**


2. Secured transactions  First reported presented. Matter under consideration.


Law Reform

7. Frustration Under consideration.

Criminal Law Reform Committee

1. Desirability of separate summary and indictable offences of assault and wilful damage No consideration as yet.
3. Discovery in criminal cases Under consideration.

Property Law and Equity Reform Committee

2. Law relating to water courses and adjacent land Under consideration.
5. Share premium reserve dividends Under consideration.
6. Trustee companies: entitlement to benefit from transactions in the normal course of business Under consideration.

Public and Administrative Law Reform Committee

1. By-law making powers and procedures of local bodies Under consideration.
2. Study of discretionary powers conferred by statute on public authorities Working paper on powers of entry and search prepared and replies under consideration.
3. Appeals by way of case stated Working paper circulated and replies under consideration.

By John H. Farrar
Professor of Law in the University of Canterbury
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