

*Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1954—Proposed  
Cancellation of Registration of Industrial Union*

PURSUANT to section 85 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1954, it is hereby notified that the registration of the Eastbourne Passenger Transport Drivers' Industrial Union of Workers, Registered No. 2068, situated at Flat 1, Bus Garage, Muritai Road, Eastbourne, will, unless cause to the contrary is shown, be cancelled on the expiration of 6 weeks from the date of the publication of this notice in the *Gazette*.

The notice of Cancellation of Registration published in the *New Zealand Gazette*, of 13 January 1972, No. 1, p. 31, is hereby revoked.

Dated at Wellington this 3rd day of February 1972.

A. C. RUFFELL, Registrar of Industrial Unions,  
Department of Labour.

*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 \$
Matamata County Council: Tokoroa Community Housing Loan 1971 .....	150,000
Mount Roskill Borough Council: Melrose Road Flats Loan No. 2, 1971 .....	130,000
Rotorua Fire Board: Training Building Loan 1971 .....	32,500
South Canterbury Hospital Board: Hospital Works Loan 1971 .....	1,200,000
Southland Hospital Board: Redemption Loan No. 2, 1971 .....	137,000
Waikato Hospital Board: Hospital Works Loan 1971 .....	3,000,000
Waimairi County Council: Joint Vehicle Testing Station Extension Loan 1971 .....	28,980

Dated at Wellington this 4th day of February 1972.

S. A. McLEOD, Assistant Secretary to the Treasury.  
(T. 40/416/6)

*Revision of District Valuation Rolls*

PURSUANT to the Valuation of Land Act 1951, the Valuer-General has revised, as at 1 February 1972, the district valuation rolls for the districts named in the following Schedule.

SCHEDULE

Boroughs and Cities—Hamilton, Northcote, Rotorua, Wanganui, Hokitika.  
Counties—Taieri.

Dated at Wellington this 3rd day of February 1972.

V. P. McGLONE, Valuer-General.

No. 396

*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 booklet *Love in Plain Language* by Robert Chartham, PH.D., published by Wilson and Horton Ltd., New Zealand.

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

*Love in Plain Language* by Robert Chartham, is a reprint in booklet form of a series of articles which were published in *Thursday*, a fortnightly magazine, earlier in 1971. The booklet was submitted to the Tribunal by the Secretary for Justice, and it became clear at the hearing that he did so in response to a complaint from Miss P. M. Bartlett.

At the hearing Mr G. W. Alderdice appeared on instructions from Miss Bartlett, who sought under section 14 (6) of the Act to appear as a party to the proceedings. Under this subsection a person who can satisfy the Tribunal that he is a person likely to be affected may be joined as a party to the proceedings in any particular hearing and has the right to call evidence and make representations.

The application was refused by the Tribunal but Mr Moody, who appeared for the Justice Department, agreed to put Miss Bartlett's written submissions in evidence. The grounds for the refusal were two. First, the simple concern of any member of the public (even if substantiated by membership of a particular society) is a general one and far less than that implied by the expression "likely to be affected", which in the context means likely to be affected by the hearing of and decision on an application about a particular book. Miss Bartlett was not, for example, the author or distributor of the book in question, nor was her counsel able to establish that she was likely to be affected by this particular hearing in a way in which the public in general would not be affected. Second, Miss Bartlett, having engendered the application by the Secretary for Justice, must be deemed to have come to a decision to allow him to proceed rather than to seek leave to proceed herself in accordance with section 14 (2) of the Act. The existence of section 14 (6) is to make sure that no one with a genuine and particular interest in the hearing or its outcome will lose his right to be heard. It is not to permit multiplication of parallel submissions; if it were, the number of persons who could be joined as parties would be without limit.

Miss Bartlett's submissions and a letter in support from Dr F. B. Desmond, were put in evidence by Mr Moody for the Department of Justice. They have been taken into account by the Tribunal in reaching its decision. We would, however, make some comment about the handling of cases submitted by the Department of Justice on a complaint by a member of the public. When the Comptroller of Customs or the Secretary for Justice submits a book to the Tribunal for classification, as either is entitled to do under the Act, it is understandable and indeed perfectly acceptable, that he will not normally wish to make submissions. Where, however, the origin of the submission is a public complaint which, so to speak, the Department has accepted, the Tribunal would be greatly assisted if the Department made a statement explaining why it is submitting the complaint. If it is not, in fact, supporting the complainant, it should be left to the complainant to bring the matter before the Tribunal under section 14 (2) of the Act. At the least, we consider, the Department should call the complainant in evidence.

Mr R. A. Heron appeared for Wilson and Horton Ltd., the publishers of the booklet and also of *Thursday*. In his submission he drew attention to the previous history of the magazine series and to the association of Wilson and Horton with *Family Doctor* magazine, sponsored by the British Medical Association, which had included a variety of articles on sexual matters. He also made it plain that the decision to reprint in booklet form was taken because of the unsatisfied demand after the appearance of the series in *Thursday*.

The Tribunal considers the booklet to contain a plain, even prosaic, presentation of sexual information in an easily understood and objective manner. The Tribunal accepts that there is a place for information of this kind to be widely available and it cannot be said that *Love in Plain Language* deals with sex in a manner injurious to the public good. After careful consideration it was decided not to impose any age restriction; the Tribunal noted that the cover states that the publication is not recommended for sale to persons 15 years or under without their parents' or guardians' consent. If the booklet should happen to fall into the hands of younger persons it is unlikely that they would be harmed by it; it is better to have sex information imparted in a factual manner rather than in the haphazard fashion which, to judge by some of the correspondence appearing in *Thursday* at the time of the original publication, is still all too prevalent.

The Tribunal classifies this book as not indecent.

R. S. V. SIMPSON, Chairman.

31 January 1972.

Nos. 397-405

*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 decisions in respect of the following books: *American Lesbians*, anonymous, *Big Boobs*, anonymous, *Over 42*, No. 3, anonymous, *King Size Tops*, anonymous, *Pictorial Pornography*, Vol. 3, anonymous, *Knickers*, No. 3, by Gilbert Oakley, D.P.S.Y., and *Unusual Sex in Pictures* by James D. Williams with Dr