

opportunity to Television One news to complete an objective and balanced report.

The Tribunal has come to the conclusion that, particularly in light of the action taken to ensure that the subsequent interview with the Minister would be published, there was no deliberate attempt to depart from objectivity by Television One news. However, the incident does suggest that the considered editorial decision to delay the seeking of official reaction to serious charges was not in accordance with recognised professional standards. Such a practice can at worst be misinterpreted as showing bias (as indeed was alleged on this occasion). At best it can only lead to the deplorable practice of presenting only one part of the story because that way it makes better "news", with more impact and perhaps even, it might be said, more entertainment value than would be inherent in a balanced item giving the complete picture.

On this occasion, it appears to the Tribunal that a piece of investigative reporting was presented in an unnecessarily incomplete form, so tending to bring this essential form of journalism into undeserved disrepute not only with authority but with thoughtful and objective viewers. Broadcast journalists have a duty to themselves not only to be fair but to be seen to be fair in their investigations if the integrity of their medium is not to be challenged or indeed whittled away by such authority.

To this end, the Tribunal would commend the Corporation's editors to consider the implications of an editorial attitude reflected before the Tribunal by the editor of Television One news. He was asked if he saw any distinction between a news item which records something which happened on the day and must necessarily go to air on that particular day and a news item that arises from research over a period of time and which is finally put to air on a given day. Were they to be distinguished in deciding whether to balance the item in the same programme or later? From his point of view, Mr Eckhoff saw no difference in the two categories.

In relation to the provisions of section 24 (1) (e) the general issue of the treatment of overstayers is certainly a controversial issue of public importance and the Corporation acknowledges that reasonable efforts are to be made to present significant points of view either in the same programme or in other programmes within the period of current interest. It did not accept that this needed to occur in the present instance in the same programme. The Tribunal has already found that this was necessary under section 24 (1) (d).

A fresh set of allegations had been made. The conflict was over factual matters rather than the putting of points of view on a public issue. We find that it was not sufficient, in those circumstances, to have set about presenting one side of the case as news on one day and then to have endeavoured to balance by presentation of a reply as news on the next day.

The failure to secure an interview with the Minister for broadcast together with the allegations appeared to reflect not bias but a lack of editorial co-ordination. The editorial choice of presenting conflicting statements within a period or within the same programme would more fairly have been exercised on this occasion by taking the initiative to complete the investigation before presenting part of its result.

The complaint is upheld on the grounds that the news item should not have been broadcast without a reasonable opportunity given for the Minister or his department to answer the allegations in the same programme.

#### *Co-opted Members—*

In accordance with the Act, the Tribunal co-opted Mr G. C. Ell and Mr G. R. Wear, two persons whose qualifications and experience were likely, in the opinion of the Tribunal, to be of assistance to the Tribunal in dealing with this complaint. They took part in the hearing and the deliberations of the Tribunal. The decision however, in accordance with the Act, is that of the permanent members.

Dated the 23rd day of November 1978.

For the Tribunal:

B. H. SLANE, Chairman.

#### *Appointment of the Air Cadet League of New Zealand (Inc.) to Control and Manage a Reserve*

PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Director of National Parks hereby appoints the Air Cadet League of New Zealand (Inc.), to control and manage the reserve, described in the Schedule hereto, subject to the provisions of the said Act, as a reserve for local purpose (air training).

#### SCHEDULE

##### TARANAKI LAND DISTRICT—BOROUGH OF STRATFORD

1312 square metres, more or less, being Section 1061 (formerly Part Sections 164, 165, 166, and 1014), Town of Stratford, situated in Block I, Ngaere Survey District. All *New Zealand Gazette*, 1978, p. 1461. S.O. Plan 11155.

Dated at Wellington this 31st day of January 1979.

J. B. HAYES,  
Assistant Director of National Parks,  
Department of Lands and Survey.

(L. and S. H.O. 6/1/1418; D.O. 8/169/2)

#### *Change of Name of Westbrook Scenic Reserve*

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 declares that the reserve for scenic purposes, described in the Schedule hereto, and known as the Westbrook Scenic Reserve, shall hereafter be known as the Paynes Gully Scenic Reserve.

#### SCHEDULE

##### WESTLAND LAND DISTRICT—GREY COUNTY— PAYNES GULLY SCENIC RESERVE

35,8854 hectares, more or less, being Reserve 1756, situated in Block XII, Waimea Survey District. All *New Zealand Gazette*, 1939, p. 311. S.O. Plan 3440.

Dated at Wellington this 5th day of February 1979.

J. B. HAYES,  
Assistant Director of National Parks and Reserves,  
Department of Lands and Survey.

(L. and S. H.O. Res. 10/3/31; D.O. 13/22)

#### *Vesting a Reserve in the Manukau City Council*

PURSUANT to the Reserves Act 1977, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Director of National Parks of the Department of Lands and Survey hereby vests the reserve, described in the Schedule hereto, in the Manukau City Council in trust for local purpose (esplanade).

#### SCHEDULE

##### NORTH AUCKLAND LAND DISTRICT—MANUKAU CITY

5387 square metres, more or less, being Allotment 381, Pakuranga Parish, situated in Block III, Otahuhu Survey District. S.O. Plan 48811.

Dated at Wellington this 19th day of January 1979.

J. B. HAYES,  
Assistant Director of National Parks,  
Department of Lands and Survey.

(L. and S. H.O. Res. 2/2/97; D.O. 8/1/565)

#### *Reservation of Land*

PURSUANT to the Land Act 1948, and to a delegation from the Minister of Lands, the Assistant Director of Land Administration of the Department of Lands and Survey hereby sets apart the land, described in the Schedule hereto, as a reserve for local purpose (air training).

#### SCHEDULE

##### TARANAKI LAND DISTRICT—BOROUGH OF STRATFORD

1312 square metres, more or less, being Section 1061 (formerly Part Sections 164, 165, 166, and 1014), Town of Stratford, situated in Block I, Ngaere Survey District. All *New Zealand Gazette*, 1978, p. 1461. S.O. Plan 11155.

Dated at Wellington this 31st day of January 1979.

K. W. CAYLESS,  
Assistant Director of Lands Administration,  
Department of Lands and Survey.

(L. and S. H.O. 6/1/1418; D.O. 8/169/2)