

amount in New Zealand currency, the amount to be so taken into account shall be the equivalent in New Zealand currency of that amount ascertained in accordance with the rate of exchange set out in the Schedule to this notice.

3. Revocation—The Customs Exchange Rates Notice (No. 6) 1987, published in the Supplement to the *New Zealand Gazette*, No. 30, dated 10 March 1987 on page 1069 is hereby revoked.

SCHEDULE

Value of One NZ Dollar

Australia	.82 Dollar
Austria	7.19 Schilling
Bangladesh	17.41 Taka
Belgium	21.57 B Franc
Brazil	11.76 Cruzado
Burma	3.80 Kyat
Canada	.74 Dollar
Chile	117.48 Peso
China	2.08 Renminbi or Yuan
Denmark	3.86 Krone
Egypt	.78 E Pound
Fiji	.62 F Dollar
Finland	2.52 Markka
France	3.41 Franc
French Polynesia	62.02 FP Franc
Greece	75.39 Drachma
Hong Kong	4.36 HK Dollar
India	7.27 Rupee
Indonesia	922.88 Rupiah
Ireland	.38 I Pound
Israel	.92 Shekel
Italy	728.37 Lira
Jamaica	3.05 J Dollar
Japan	84.68 Yen
Korea	474.69 Won
Malaysia	1.41 M Dollar (Ringgit)
Mexico	617.89 Peso
Netherlands	1.16 Florin (Guilder)
Norway	3.88 Krone
Pakistan	9.65 Rupee
Papua New Guinea	.52 Kina
Philippines	11.19 Peso
Portugal	79.85 Escudo
Singapore	1.20 S Dollar
South Africa	1.19 Rand
Spain	72.65 Peseta
Sri Lanka	15.77 Rupee
Sweden	3.59 Krona
Switzerland	.86 Franc
Taiwan	19.29 Twn Dollar
Thailand	14.44 Baht
Tonga	.82 Pa'anga
United Kingdom	.35 Pound
U.S.A.	.56 Dollar
West Germany	1.02 Mark
Western Samoa	1.22 Tala

Dated at Wellington this 17th day of March 1987.

M. J. BELGRAVE, Comptroller of Customs.

2

Election of Members to Southland Licensing Committee

PURSUANT to section 36 (11) of the Sale of Liquor Act 1962, notice is given that an election was held at 2 p.m. on Monday, 2 March 1987, and the following members were elected to serve on the committee:

William Ronald Cunningham, 10 Kerwood Place, Gore.

Bruce William Pagan, 76 Theodore Street, Bluff.

John David Richmond, 5 Henry Street, Te Anau.

Alistair John Soper, P.O. Box 18, Athol.

Dated at Invercargill this 3rd day of March 1987.

N. T. FARRELL, County Clerk.

1

Decision No. 2/87

COM 2/86

Before the Broadcasting Tribunal

IN the matter of the Broadcasting Act 1976, and in the matter of a complaint by GEORGE IAN ANDREWS:

WARRANT HOLDER—BROADCASTING CORPORATION OF NEW ZEALAND (TELEVISION NEW ZEALAND):

Chairman: B. H. Slane.

Member: Ann E. Wilson.

Co-opted Members: S. H. Gardiner and Wayne K. Sellwood.

DECISION

On 30 April 1986 Mr George Andrews filed a two-part complaint with the tribunal. It related first to an advertisement for a Jeremy Coney cricket coaching video which was played on Television One at 6.15 p.m. on 18 January 1986. The second part of the complaint was about a Mazda commercial promoting a programme to be shown of a women's softball tournament, played on Television One at 9 p.m. on 17 January 1986. The complaint is that both commercials were in breach of the Broadcasting Rules Committee's advertisement rule 1.1 which reads:

"Advertisements shall be clearly distinguishable from other programme material."

This two-part complaint was first made to the Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand ("BCNZ") whose board considered it at their meeting on 26 March 1986. The BCNZ Board did not uphold the complaint in either respect. Mr Andrews then referred it to the tribunal.

Jeremy Coney Advertisement

This advertisement occupied the whole of a short commercial break during Saturday coverage of the World Series cricket from Perth in January. The advertisement included in its opening sequence shots from other cricket matches which, Mr Andrews wrote in his letter to the BCNZ, were "not dissimilar from the programme shown immediately before. Only after some 10 or 15 seconds does the real purpose of the advertisement become clear . . ."

This part of Mr Andrews' complaint to the tribunal specifically was: "That the Jeremy Coney advertisement began with a cricketing sequence which sufficiently resembled the programme material on either side of it to make it not 'clearly distinguishable' as advertising rule 1.1 requires."

In his supporting statement, Mr Andrews wrote that there was no break of any kind between the live coverage and the cricketing scenes at the beginning of the commercial and that, although these scenes may have been of a different character than the live coverage, they were still scenes of international cricket and therefore not clearly distinguishable. Mr Andrews stated that for nearly 10 seconds, the distinction was merely between types of the one sport, not between one type of television material and another.

He also asserted that: "When 30-second commercials are placed singly between overs there is an even stronger obligation on the broadcaster to ensure such distinctions are plain." He felt that "... no effort of any kind was made to ensure the rule was being observed."

The BCNZ Board's initial response to Mr Andrews was that "... the three opening segments depicting cricket incidents contrasted so sharply with the preceding live coverage it was considered it would become abundantly clear almost immediately that something quite different was being screened."

The BCNZ considered that because there were three quick action cuts of highlights, the commentary was sharper and the cricketers in the advertisement were of different races wearing brilliant whites and different coloured 1-day clothing, "... the question of distinguishability should not have been a problem for anyone."

The BCNZ pointed out that there had been a 100 percent increase in cricket coverage since 1984 and that therefore there was a considerably increased viewer awareness of the game. The BCNZ stated that the commercial had been played dozens of times previously in other programmes and that 30-second commercials were now played singly between overs and not in blocks to minimise disruption of coverage.

This was the substance of the BCNZ's response to Mr Andrews' letter to them.

In commenting further, on Mr Andrews' complaint to the tribunal, the BCNZ observed that viewer interpretations are an important consideration and maintained its view that there could be no viewer confusion. The BCNZ reiterated that the scheduling of the Coney commercial began in December and continued into January. There were 64 placements with only 9 being scheduled during the World Series cricket.