

western side of Centre Road; thence generally northerly along the generally western side of Centre Road to a point in line with the north-western boundary of Section 35, Block XVII, aforesaid; thence north-easterly by a right line to and along that boundary to the north-western corner of part Section 28, Block XVII, aforesaid; thence north-easterly along the north-western boundary of part Section 28, aforesaid to a point in line with the south-western boundary of Section 66, Block XIX, Jacobs River Hundred; thence north-westerly by a right line to the south-western corner of Section 66, aforesaid; thence generally northerly, easterly and southerly along the generally western, northern and eastern boundaries of Section 66, aforesaid to the easternmost corner being a point on the south-western boundary of part Section 36, Block XIX, aforesaid; thence south-easterly along the south-western boundary of part Section 36, aforesaid to the south-eastern corner of part Section 36, aforesaid being a point on the southern boundary of Block XIX, Jacobs River Hundred; thence northerly and easterly along the western and southern boundaries of Block XIX, to the western boundary of Block III, Jacobs River Hundred being a point in the middle of the Pourakino River; thence generally northerly along the generally western boundary of Block III, aforesaid to the north-western corner of Block III, aforesaid; thence easterly along the northern boundary of Block III, aforesaid to the south-western corner of Block IV, Jacobs River Hundred; thence north-easterly along the north-western boundary of Block IV, aforesaid to the south-western corner of Section 7, Block IV, aforesaid; thence south-easterly along the north-eastern boundaries of Section 7, aforesaid and Section 16, Block IV, aforesaid to the south-eastern corner of Section 16, aforesaid; thence south-easterly by a right line, across the Riverton Otautau Road to the south-western corner of Section 28, Block IV, aforesaid; thence south-easterly along the south-western boundaries of Sections 28 and 42, Block IV, aforesaid and the production of the last-mentioned boundary, across Bath Road, to the north-western corner of Section 49, Block IV, aforesaid; thence south-easterly along the north-eastern boundary of Section 49, Block IV, aforesaid to the south-western boundary of Block IX, Jacobs River Hundred; thence south-westerly along the north-western corner of Block IX, aforesaid to the westernmost corner of Block IX, aforesaid being a point in the middle of the Aparima River; thence generally easterly along the generally southern boundary of Block IX, aforesaid to the north-eastern corner of Block VI, Jacobs River Hundred; thence south-easterly along the north-eastern boundary of Block VI, aforesaid to the sea coast; thence generally westerly along the sea coast crossing the mouths of all harbours and inlets to the point of commencement.

Dated at Wellington this 13th day of September 1979.

E. C. THORNE, Chairman.
W. J. HENDERSON, Fire Commissioner.
F. A. HARDY, Fire Commissioner,

(OPS 4/1/6B3)

Decision No. Com. 5/79

Decision of the Broadcasting Tribunal

IN the matter of the Broadcasting Act 1976, and in the matter of a complaint under section 67 (1) by Patrick Gerard Curran:

WARRANT holder—Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand in respect of Television One and Television Two:
BEFORE THE BROADCASTING TRIBUNAL

Members: B. H. Slane (Chairman), L. R. Sceats (member), J. C. Somerville (member), N. L. Macbeth (co-opted member), G. R. Wear (co-opted member).

Hearing: Monday, 30 July 1979.

DECISION

The complaint concerns the coverage on television of news and current affairs relating to Northern Ireland.

Mr Curran has for some years followed the broadcasting coverage of Northern Ireland. He described himself as born in Southern Ireland "of catholic stock". He came to New Zealand in 1956 and became a New Zealand citizen. He is concerned that his personal views should be made perfectly clear. He supports the present policy of Britain in Northern Ireland, that it will maintain its military presence for as long as the majority of the population should wish it. He condemns all the violence perpetrated by both the protestant and catholic sides of the sectarian struggle there.

I wish it to be understood at the outset that I do not condone or support any of the terrorism or acts of violence conducted by the Irish Republican Army or any group claiming to be of catholic background, he told the Tribunal.

I am not concerned that the I.R.A. is shown in a bad light by television programmes and news items. I am concerned that the Corporation has failed to maintain standards of objectivity and impartiality of news presentation in that it reports the activities of one faction and ignores almost completely the equally atrocious activities of the other.

The Complaint

Mr Curran made a statutory declaration, on 21 November 1978, running to some eight pages in the course of which he set out his criticism of news coverage by television in New Zealand for the past two years. He had compared presentation of news items in news broadcasts with copies of news supplied by Reuters to the New Zealand Press Association. He claimed the television news broadcasts were consistent in their almost total exclusion of any items relating to acts of violence allegedly perpetrated by proscribed protestant organisations such as the Ulster Volunteer Force, the Red Hand Commandoes or the Ulster Freedom Fighters. Pre-eminence, he claimed, was given to incidents of violence by members of the Irish Republican Army and other pro-catholic groups. The effect of this practice was he said to give an unbalanced view of the sources of violence and terrorism. He gave a number of instances where a news item which he considered unfavourable to the I.R.A. was reported on television and another item which was unfavourable to a protestant faction was not reported.

He specifically complained about the lack of balance in a World Watch programme broadcast by T.V. 2 on 10 September 1978.

Mr Curran subsequently added some later news items to his complaints.

The Corporation considered his complaint which had been anticipated by earlier criticisms of television handling of events in Northern Ireland in 1976 and 1977.

At its meeting, on 13 February 1979, the Corporation considered the declaration he had forwarded and the subsequent letter from his solicitors. The following findings were made by the Corporation:

1. Although Mr Curran's affidavit and complaint referred to coverage of events over a two year period, the evidence he brought forward covered only selected months in 1978, and in some cases the affidavit did not cover all news items broadcast in these particular months. The Corporation felt, therefore, that the complaint in its overall form could not be sustained.
2. Nevertheless it found that the World Watch programme, of 10 September 1978, was unbalanced in its treatment of the I.R.A.
3. The Corporation also acknowledges that Mr Curran brought forward sufficient evidence to suggest that great care should be taken to achieve a balanced presentation of events in Northern Ireland, by a closer study of the merits of wire service reports in relation to filmed reports. On this point the Director-General of T.V. 2 has made specific acknowledgment of T.V. 2's error in not recognising the significance of the international wire copy relating to the incident raised separately in your letter of 15 January.

Mr Curran was told that the Corporation's finds and amplifying observations had been drawn to the attention of the appropriate staff by their Directors-General.

The 15 January letter referred to a report carried by T.V. 1 news which accurately reported an incident concerning a priest's information on a bombing campaign in Britain, making it clear that the priest had given the Northern Ireland Office the information that he had. The South Pacific Television report on T.V. 2 news had left the impression, in the opinion of the complainant, that the priest had known of the planned attack but had done nothing to warn the authorities. Mr Curran complained to the Tribunal that he was dissatisfied with the Corporation's decision. He said that in its presentation of news items and current affairs programmes concerning Northern Ireland, in the period July 1978 to December 1978 (inclusive), the Corporation failed to have regard in the items and programmes to the accurate and impartial gathering and presentation of news according to the recognised standards of objective journalism in breach of section 24 (1) (b), and failed to have regard to the principle that when controversial issues of public importance