

Dated at Wellington this 10th day of February 1984.

A. K. EWING, Controller Marine Administration.
(M.O.T. 54/14/101)

10

Decision of the Films Censorship Board of Review

Chairman: J. M. Priestley.

Members: N. C. Anderson, Ms A. M. Dixon, Mrs J. B. Fish, M. B. Menzies, Mrs J. Walker.

Date of Review: 14 December 1983.

PURSUANT to section 82 of the Cinematograph Films Act 1976, an application for review was made by Proequity Entertainments Ltd., in respect of the film *Emmanuelle*.

Having conducted a review of the film the Board, pursuant to its powers under section 84 (5) of the Act refused to approve the film for exhibition.

The film was produced in France in 1974. The print which was submitted to the Chief Censor was much the worse for wear and had been dubbed in rather stilted English. Despite the poor quality of the print, it was clear that the film had been well produced and was technically of a high quality.

The plot involves Emmanuelle, the young wife of a French Embassy official in Bangkok. Emmanuelle leaves Paris to fly out to her husband who resides on the outskirts of Bangkok in a palatial bungalow. Emmanuelle and her husband operate an "open" marriage, their basic philosophy being that neither should place any restrictions on their partner giving sexual pleasure to others. Emmanuelle suffers initially from culture shock after her flight from Paris to Bangkok (which is uneventful other than her making love to 2 men on the jetliner). Her main social contacts seem to be with the Bangkok ex-patriate community. Emmanuelle is introduced to masturbation by the teenage Marie-Ange; to lesbianism by Ariane on the squash courts, and is captivated by a female archaeologist named Bee with whom she has an improbable affair in the Thai jungle.

Emmanuelle is finally taken in hand by an ageing Mario who, in the course of enlightening Emmanuelle with his somewhat incoherent theories of sex, arranges for her a series of bizarre sexual encounters which include rape and sodomy.

Having regard to the criteria set up in section 26 of the Act, the Board was unanimously of the view that the exhibition of this film was likely to be injurious to the public good. The dominant effect of the film as a whole was quite simply the provision of a vehicle for the explicit portrayal of sexual activity. Some of the behaviour depicted was offensive. The plot and Emmanuelle's encounters were highly improbable and the underpinning "philosophy" of the film was rambling and badly integrated. Despite its technical skill and undoubted eroticism in parts, the film was in effect little more than a series of improbable (and at times pornographic and bizarre) sexual encounters. In the Board's unanimous opinion the film was likely to be injurious to the public good and for that reason the Board refused to approve the film for exhibition.

J. M. PRIESTLEY, Chairman.

9

Decision of the Films Censorship Board of Review

Chairman: J. M. Priestley.

Members: N. C. Anderson, Ms A. M. Dixon, Mrs J. B. Fish, M. B. Menzies, Mrs J. Walker.

Date of Review: 14 December 1983.

PURSUANT to section 82 of the Cinematograph Films Act 1976, Amalgamated Fox Distribution applied for a review of the feature film *Chained Heat*.

Having conducted a review of the film, pursuant to section 84 (5) of the Act, the Board unanimously decided that the film should not be approved for public exhibition.

This film, which employs the matrix of an overcrowded women's prison for portraying a series of improbable episodes of sex and violence, was offensive in terms of all the criteria specified in section 26 (2) (c) of the Cinematograph Films Act 1976. Themes of racial tension, domination of prisoners by other prisoners as well as staff, and corruption at all levels of administration are used to link scenes of rape, murder, drug dealing, lesbianism, razor slashing, and sexual exploitation.

Although a theme of conflict and struggle in a prison is capable of being developed meritoriously, this film is devoid of artistic merit and of no social cultural or other value. This film's overall treatment

of anti-social behaviour, cruelty, violence, crime, horror, sex and indecent and offensive language and behaviour, without any measure of redeeming merit led the Board unanimously to the view that *Chained Heat* was likely to be injurious to the public good and ought not therefore be approved for public exhibition.

J. M. PRIESTLEY, Chairman.

9

Approval of Motorcycle Safety Helmets in Terms of the Traffic Regulations 1976

PURSUANT to subclause (1) of regulation 88 of the Traffic Regulations 1976*, and pursuant to a delegation from the Secretary for Transport, I, Robert Norman Abram, Chief Automotive Engineer, hereby approve for the purpose of regulation 31 of the said regulations, motorcycle safety helmets of the make and type described in the Schedule hereto.

SCHEDULE

SAFETY helmets manufactured by Bell Helmets, Inc. bearing the certification mark of the Snell Memorial Foundation Performance Standard 1980 or complying with Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 218 and marked accordingly and bearing the model designations:

M-2
Star-LTD,
Tourstar-S,
Roadstar,
Moto-4,
Moto-3,
Trailstar,
Magnum-LTD,
R-T.

Dated at Wellington this 13th day of February 1984.

R. N. ABRAM, Chief Automotive Engineer.

*S.R. 1976/227

Amendment No. 1: S.R. 1978/72
Amendment No. 2: S.R. 1978/301
Amendment No. 3: S.R. 1979/128
Amendment No. 4: S.R. 1980/31
Amendment No. 5: S.R. 1980/115
Amendment No. 6: S.R. 1981/158
Amendment No. 7: S.R. 1981/311
Amendment No. 8: S.R. 1982/93
Amendment No. 9: S.R. 1983/282

(M.O.T. 17/6/1)

40

Approved Woolmarking Preparations (Notice No. 3188; Ag. 6/15/5/8)

PURSUANT to sections 69 and 94 of the Animals Act 1967 and to a delegation from the Director-General of Agriculture and Fisheries, under section 10 of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries Act 1953, for the said sections 69 and 94, the Director, Animal Health Division of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, hereby gives notice that the wool marking preparations set out in the Schedule hereto (a product of Lumina Limited, Waipahi) are approved for sale and use in marking wool on sheep.

SCHEDULE

CLEARMARK aerosol stock marker, blue, green, black, lilac, orange, purple, red, and yellow.

Dated at Wellington this 9th day of February 1984.

G. H. ADLAM, Director, Animal Health Division.

9

Decision No. 78.

In the matter of the Commerce Act 1975 (the Act), and in the matter of a trade practice complaint relating to a tied meat purchasing arrangement between Soutar Super Meats Ltd. and F. Flipp Ltd.:

WHEREAS the Examiner of Commercial Practices (the Examiner) reported to the Commerce Commission on 6 August 1981, concerning a trade practice relating to a tied meat purchasing arrangement between Soutar Super Meats Ltd. (Soutar), a retailer, and F. Flipp Ltd. (Flipp), a wholesaler, which report concluded with the recommendation that the Commission make an order directing the discontinuance of the trade practice.