

SCHEDULE

SOUTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—THAMES-COROMANDEL DISTRICT

1.6187 hectares, more or less, being Section 5, situated in Block VIII, Tairua Survey District. All *New Zealand Gazette*, 1955, p. 1884. M.L. Plan 7306.

Dated at Hamilton this 5th day of March 1979.

G. L. VENDT,

Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.

(L. and S. H.O. 6/6/543; D.O. 8/5/278)

Cancellation of the Vesting in the Hauraki Plains County Council

PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands hereby cancels the vesting in the Hauraki Plains County Council of the reserve for local purpose (quarry) described in the Schedule hereto.

SCHEDULE

SOUTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—WAIKATO COUNTY

16.4300 hectares, more or less, being Section 29, situated in Block II, Piako Survey District. Part *New Zealand Gazette*, 1935, p. 1030, and 1979, p. 129. S.O. Plan 49475.

Dated at Hamilton this 9th day of March 1979.

G. L. VENDT,

Assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands.

(L. and S. H.O. 6/1/1382; D.O. 8/5/288)

Substitution Notice

PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Director of National Parks and Reserves of the Department of Lands and Survey hereby substitutes the Schedule hereto for the Schedule appearing in the Classification, *Gazette Notice*, No. 100, 16 November 1978, p. 3138.

SCHEDULE

SOUTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—RAGLAN COUNTY—BRYANT MEMORIAL SCENIC RESERVE

16.7436 hectares, more or less, being Lot 1 and part Lot 2, D.P. S. 14566, being part Whaanga 2A Block, situated in Blocks I, IV, and V, Karioi Survey District. Part certificate of title, No. 13A/451. Part *New Zealand Gazette*, 1971, p. 2846.

Dated at Wellington this 28th day of March 1979.

N. D. R. MCKERCHAR,

Assistant Director of National Parks and Reserves of the Department of Lands and Survey.

(L. and S. Res. 3/3/10; D.O. 13/249)

Notice Declaring a Quarantine Ground at Trentham
(No. 2125, Ag. 6/4/72)

NOTICE is hereby given that, pursuant to section 11 of the Animals Act 1967, the land and premises of Wrightson N.M.A. Ltd., sale grounds, situated at the northern end of Racecourse Road, Trentham, comprising approximately 1 hectare and known as "J and K Block" is hereby declared to be a quarantine ground for the detention of imported horses from 29 March 1979 to 29 September 1979.

Dated at Wellington this 28th day of March 1979.

G. H. ADLAM, for Director-General.

Decision of the Films Censorship Board of Review

In the matter of the Cinematograph Films Act 1976, and in the matter of an application by Amalgamated Theatres Ltd., for a review of the film "Scandalo".

THE FILMS CENSORSHIP BOARD OF REVIEW

Messrs A. B. Beatson, S.M. (chairman), W. Colgan, R. Tanner, Dr R. A. Sharp, Mrs M. T. Cole, Mrs V. Forbes (Professor E. M. Dalziel, O.B.E., was absent).

Review: 8 December 1978.

DECISION

THE Chief Censor of Films declined to approve the film and Amalgamated Theatres Ltd. had appealed to the board, in line with its powers under the Cinematograph Films Act 1976, to consider *de novo* any film according to the criteria laid

down in section 26. The board (in the absence of Professor Dalziel and with Mrs Cole dissenting) having viewed the film decided that it should be approved for exhibition with an R20 certificate.

In reaching its decision the board gave particular attention to the matters it was required to consider under section 26 (2) (c) and (d). Three episodes in the film were especially considered in the light of subsection (2) (c): one in which an act of fellatio was depicted; one in which a maid-shopgirl was made to witness the sexual and moral humiliation of her mistress; and one in which the mistress, also the mother of a young girl, procured (on a harsh reading) her daughter for the man-servant with whom she was herself obsessed. The board agreed that the fellatio scene was realised very modestly, would be unlikely to be recognised by the innocent as depicting fellatio in any case, and was far less specific in its depiction of the act than scenes in some films already passed for public exhibition. The "humiliation" episode seemed to the board, at first sight, to perhaps contain elements of excessive cruelty, sex, and anti-social behaviour. Further consideration however, led the board to the conclusion that the episode was an integral part of the film, was played for its dramatic rather than prurient and sadistic qualities, and relied for its disturbing impact not on the particular way it depicted the acts in question (which was very restrained) but on the fact that any audience likely to view the film would react most disapprovingly to the morally, rather than physically, cruel actions of the man-servant. As to the episode in which the mother provided her daughter to the man-servant the board felt the same: that the "manner, extent, and degree" of the depiction of this episode were not the important considerations that might lead to a decision that the film was likely to be injurious to the public good. Rather it was simply that the episode had been presented at all. It was the morality of the act and not the way it was presented that might raise objection. The board decided that the depiction of morally wrong acts in a film could not, *ipso facto*, constitute grounds for banning it. It was clear in the context of the film that there was no question of presenting the action as praise-worthy, glamorous, or worth imitating. And for this reason the board could not envisage any deleterious effects on likely audiences stemming from this episode.

The "humiliation" scene and the episode in which the mother procured her daughter were also considered in the light of section 26 (2) (d) as to whether they denigrated women. It was felt, though, that there was small substance to this concern. Villainy, weakness, lust, and desire seemed spread over all characters regardless of gender.

Finally, the board considered, under section 26 (2) (a), the "dominant effect of the film as a whole". Some of the board thought the film depressing, tasteless, and vapid. Others considered it well produced and acted overall, showing some artistic merit. Depicting as it did relationships between the French bourgeoisie and the servant class on the eve of European war, it would seem to provide little for imitation. Its likely effect on any audience would not be one of eliciting anti-social behaviour.

The Board accordingly granted an R20 certificate.

Dated this 20th day of January 1978.

A. B. BEATSON, Chairman.

DISSENTING DECISION OF MRS M. T. COLE

IN dissenting from the majority decision of the board ("Scandalo", 8 December 1978), I did so on the grounds that certain scenes in the film "Scandalo" were "likely to be injurious to the public good" (section 26 (2)) bearing in mind those standards of morality and behaviour which have traditionally been accepted by the community at large.

The general theme of the film depicting a woman's sexual obsession for a man, leading to her eventual debasement has been shown on the screen before, in "Madame Bovary" and "Lady Chatterley's Lover". Scenes showing, whether explicitly or implicitly, sexual behaviour between consenting adults in private, may perhaps be more accepted now. However what are the disturbing aspects of the film are the scenes showing the seduction of a young and innocent schoolgirl by a debauched servant actively aided and abetted by his mistress who is also the mother of the girl.

The whole issue of child seduction raised in this and other films is one which offends against standards of morality, of taste, and of generally acceptable behaviour.

I am therefore of the opinion that the "manner, extent, and degree" of the depictions of those episodes (section 26 (2) (c)) are important considerations in leading to a decision that the film is likely to be injurious to the public good and consequently should be banned.

Dated this 11th day of January 1979.

M. T. COLE.

(I.A./Cul. 2/17/5)