

(b) This notice shall come into force on the 24th day of November 1971.
2. The Third Schedule of the principal notice is hereby amended by inserting the following name:

Lasallian Charities and Building Fund Organisation.

Dated at Wellington this 24th day of November 1971.

For the Reserve Bank of New Zealand:

R. W. R. WHITE, Deputy Governor.

*Published in the *New Zealand Gazette*, Thursday, 15 July 1971, No. 53, p. 1414.

Consenting to Raising of Loans by Certain Local Authorities

PURSUANT to section 3 of the Local Authorities Loans Act 1956 (as amended by section 3 (1) of the Local Authorities Loans Amendment Act 1967), the undersigned Assistant Secretary to the Treasury, acting under powers delegated to the Secretary to the Treasury by the Minister of Finance, hereby consents to the borrowing by the local authorities mentioned in the Schedule hereto of the whole or any part of the respective amounts specified in that Schedule.

SCHEDULE

Local Authority and Name of Loan	Amount Consented to \$
Hobson County Council: Workshop Loan 1971	50,000
Invercargill Fire Board: New Fire Appliance Loan 1971	20,000
Lytelton Harbour Board: Redemption Loan (No. 6) 1971	350,000
Manukau City Council: Roothing Supplementary Loan 1971	30,000
Roothing Loan 1971	200,000
Paeroa Borough Council: Fire Appliance Loan 1971	10,000
Queenstown Borough Council: Water and Sewerage Loan (Supplementary) 1971	16,100
Taumarunui Hospital Board: Works Loan 1971	400,000
Taranaki Harbour Board: Redemption Loan No. 2 1971	154,000
Redemption Loan No. 3 1971	225,000
Waipawa Hospital Board: Hospital Works Loan No. 2 1971	70,000

Dated at Wellington this 26th day of November 1971.

S. C. PARKER, Assistant Secretary to the Treasury.

(T. 40/416/6)

No. 374

Decision of the Indecent Publications Tribunal

IN the matter of the Indecent Publications Act 1963, and in the matter of an application by the Secretary for Justice for a decision in respect of the magazine *Pizzle-Rot* (Capping Magazine) produced by Lincoln College Students' Association.

There was no appearance of the applicant nor of the publisher's representative in New Zealand. Written submissions were made by the Society for Promotion of Community Standards and by Mr I. C. J. Polson, solicitor, on behalf of the Lincoln College Students' Association.

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

Pizzle-Rot, described as the Independent Lincoln College Journal of Agriculture, was submitted to the Tribunal by the Secretary for Justice on 30 July 1971.

The Lincoln College Students' Association was not represented at the hearing but written submissions dated 3 November 1971 were made by its solicitors. The Tribunal delayed its decision until the submissions of the Association had been received and considered. Mr H. T. Robinson, President of the Society for Promotion of Community Standards by letter dated 6 September 1971 made submissions. The Society's contention is that an indecent tone permeates the whole magazine, and that it should be banned.

In our classification No. 178 of *Masskerade*, 1969, we said that a responsible attitude was necessary on the part of

promoters of magazines of this kind and suggested that "a responsible attitude would be evident in a concern to ensure that any university publication, in the balance of its content, the nature of its wit, and the skill of its satire, came within the bounds of decency, as these may be inferred from earlier judgments of the Tribunal".

The promoters of *Pizzle-Rot* provide no evidence of any such responsible attitude: the journal is too unsophisticated to warrant consideration in such terms. It is flat, dull, and unoriginal, informed only by a desire to shock. Such a childish effusion as this does not, in our view, merit more serious attention than we would accord the graffiti on the walls of public lavatories. The promoters have done themselves no credit by putting out this journal. It represents a kind of self expression that most people leave behind before their undergraduate days begin. The paper is disgusting and unpleasant, but we do not consider it harmful. Most people's reaction to it, if it affected them at all, would be one of contempt.

Accordingly we do not ban this journal altogether. But even if it is not thought to be grossly offensive by most readers, its contents and presentation make it quite unsuitable for younger persons.

The Tribunal classifies this journal as indecent in the hands of persons under 16 years.

R. S. V. SIMPSON, Chairman.

26 November 1971.

No. 375

Decision of the Indecent Publications Tribunal

IN the matter of the Indecent Publications Act 1963, and in the matter of an application by the Secretary for Justice for a decision in respect of the book *Women* by John Philip Lundin, published by New English Library, London.

There was no appearance of the applicant nor of the publisher's representative in New Zealand. Accordingly no submissions were made.

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

THIS is a paperback book, one copy only of which was supplied to the Tribunal resulting in a delay in the reading by members and so in the giving of this decision.

The Tribunal recently considered a book called *Mistresses* by the same author (see Decision No. 335) which was said to be a sequel to *Women*. Both books place considerable emphasis on sexual experiences. They are of a similar pattern and the decision of the Tribunal in this present application is the same as given in the earlier one and for the same reasons.

The Tribunal classifies this book as not indecent.

R. S. V. SIMPSON, Chairman.

26 November 1971.

No. 376

Decision of the Indecent Publications Tribunal

IN the matter of the Indecent Publications Act 1963, and in the matter of an application by the Comptroller of Customs for a decision in respect of the book *The Chartham Letters* by Robert Chartham, PH.D., published by New English Library, London.

There was no appearance of the applicant nor of the publisher's representative in New Zealand. Accordingly no submissions were made.

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

THE subtitle of this book describes it as a collection of intimate questions that the author of *Sex Manners for Advanced Lovers* has been asked by his frankest readers. In our classification No. 205 dated 20 May 1970 and gazetted 4 June 1970 we found that book to be indecent, questioning its honesty of purpose. We said "The author may not be blameworthy, but if he is not his publishers are".

There may be some grounds, as in the cover-advertisement which the subtitle constitutes, for the same objection to be levelled against *The Chartham Letters*, but they are very slight. We do not, in this case, regard the popular and unscientific language of the answers, matching that of most of the questions, as a serious objection. Dr Chartham has acquired some