will have a value (and possibly an impact) beyond this part of the world. The Secretary of Justice of Sri Lanka, Mr. N. Jayawickrama, informed the Conference that his country was in the midst of implementing legislation to adopt certain of the recommendations of the Canada L.R.C. on evidence law reform and of the A.L.R.C. on criminal investigation (A.L.R.C.2). There is a little irony in the fact that A.L.R.C.2 (which has been well received in legal journals) is to be implemented overseas before it finds its way into the Australian law.

Law Reform up North : The P.N.G.L.R.C.

This is an exciting time for law and lawyers in Papua New Guinea. The vital and energetic approach of the P.N.G.L.R.C. is evidenced in the first Annual Report of that Commission 1975. It was witnessed at first hand by Mr. Justice Kirby (A.L.R.C. Chairman) when he visited Papua New Guinea 29 May - 2 June 1976. The visit was at the invitation of the Minister for Justice, the Hon. N. Ebia Olewale, M.P. During his visit the A.L.R.C. Chairman met the Governor-General of Papua New Guinea (Sir John Guise), the Chief Justice (Sir Sydney Frost), other Members of the National Court, Ministers, Secretaries of Justice and Labour and other law officers. He participated in meetings of the P.N.G.L.R.C. to discuss the common work of the A.L.R.C. and P.N.G.L.R.C. concerning their respective criminal investigation references, and joint co-operation.

The P.N.G. Commission was established in May 1975 and, following Independence, re-established under the Constitution in September 1975. It has a distinct constitutional role to review the "underlying law". This is the customary law of Papua New Guinea and the introduced common law and equity of England. The power to review the "underlying law" and to recommend changes to it does not require reference by the Minister, the normal method of initiating commission work.

P.N.G.L.R.C. Chairman, Bernard Narakobi, graduated in Law at the University of Sydney and, in the discussions leading up to the Independence Constitution he was a Consultant to the Constitutional Planning Committee. The Deputy Chairman is Mr. Francis Iramu, a member for many years of the highest rank of magistrates. He has also recently been appointed to head the country's first Arbitration Tribunal. Other Commissioners include Bishop Riley Samson, Chief Commissioner John Nilkare, of the Liquor Licensing Commission, Mrs. Nahau Rooney, a District Officer in the Manus Province and Ms. Mek Taylor, who has the LL.B. degree from Melbourne University. The Chairman, Mr. Nilkare, Ms. Taylor and the Secretary, Mr. N. O'Neill, all attended the Third Law Reform Conference in Canberra. The strong view held in Papua New Guinea concerning the need for law reform agencies to closely consult the community in law reform proposals, is brought home in the Annual Report. It was explained to the A.L.R.C. Chairman on his visit. The problems of communicating law reform proposals in a developing country with people at different levels of development and sophistication expand the difficulties faced in Australia in the same enterprise. A first attempt was made in the P.N.G.L.R.C.'s working paper on Adultery: a matter which naturally occupies a much more important part of social control in Papua New Guinea than it does in Australia. The working paper was issued in English, Pidgin and Hiri Motu. Commissioners travelled widely throughout the country. The media were used and the Commission's proposals hit the headlines.

During Mr. Justice Kirby's visit, there was much interest expressed in the possible reference to the A.L.R.C. of the question of integrating Aboriginal customary law into the legal system in Australia. This question had been raised following a Royal Commission report in Western Australia, the decision of the Federal Government to proceed with land rights legislation for Aboriginals and a decision of Wells J. in South Australia attaching certain conditions to a bond granted to an Aboriginal prisoner. (R v. Williams, No. 8 of 1976. Delivered 25 May 1976).

Papua New Guinea has a well developed system of village courts, modelled on earlier like tribunals established in Africa to utilise and give recognition to local customary law. A paper on the subject was delivered by Frost C.J. to a Seminar held in Canberra in 1975. Mr. Justice Kirby said that if a reference were given to the A.L.R.C. on this subject, it would study what was being done in P.N.G. to see if some of the ideas could be applied in Australia. "The one-way exchange of ideas between two countries has finished and the process of two-way exchange of legal concepts has begun".

What the Academics are Saying

This little section proved quite popular last time. Sir Leslie Scarman, the doyen, wrote to us saying that it was very useful for those who have to keep their heads in (and above!!) the heady academic waters "in which we have to swim if law reform is to be a success". Obviously, nothing more than a broad brush is possible. The literature produced by lawyers in the last quarter would fill a room. The A.L.R.C. prepares a supplement for the Interim Digest. This contains in much more detail an epitome of academic writings concerning especially law reform. It runs into many pages. It is organised under the following headings:

* History of law reform
* Fundamental values in law reform
* Definition and rationale of law reform
* Techniques and methods
* Simplification and codification
* Legislation and legislative drafting
* Uniform law reform
* International law reform

About one hundred supplements to the Interim Digest go off each quarter to the organisations and people on the receiving end. These include law reform agencies at home and overseas. Perhaps when the final Digest is produced, the quarterly supplement can be more widely distributed.

Turning to the academic lists, the last quarter has seen the Human Rights debate rage unabated. The views of Mr. Ellicott (Cwth Attorney-General) have already been referred to. Lord Lloyd of Hampstead answers the question "Do we need a Bill of Rights?" (1976) 39 M.L.R. 121 with a resounding negative. He looks to Parliament as the guardian of citizens' liberties. Mr. T. Harper (1976) 126 New L.J. 327, however, sees Parliament as an "unpredictable watchdog". The same theme is touched upon in the speech of the English Home Secretary reported (1976) 73 Law Soc. Gazette 134 and by D.J. Williams in (1975) 1 U.N.S.W.L.J. at p.118. The Canadians are only now at a point where they can evaluate their Bill of Rights. In a part devoted to an evaluation of the Supreme Court of Canada after its first hundred years, the Alberta Law Review scrutinises the record of the Supreme Court and Civil Liberties (1976) 14 Alberta L.R. 58. See also 92 L.Q.R. 127. Despite the difficulties of the courts in interpreting the Canadian Bill of Rights, Professor Taurapolsky agrees with the commentary by the Hon. J. Turner, a former Minister of Justice of Canada, that"a mere statement of what people's rights are, contained in an authoritative text, has a very useful effect".

Of course, the existence of the European Convention on Human Rights makes the whole subject more pressing, perhaps, for the English lawyer. A. Drzemczewski writing in [1975] Cam.L.J. 9, asserts that "it may not be self-evident to many British practitioners but since 1966 the supreme review tribunal in many matters of civil liberties and administration is not the House of Lords but the Strasbourg Court or Commission". The recent Golder case is cited as a poignant illustration of this. Somewhat cynically perhaps, D.G.T. Williams in his note on the Crossman Diaries case [1976] Cam.L.J. 1 at p.2 wonders aloud whether "in several English