

	Month Ended	Year To Date
	\$(000's)	\$(000's)
Cash flows from Crown and departmental activities:		
Borrowing from overseas	756,023	1,701,382
	<u>5,469,615</u>	<u>20,682,958</u>
Cash was disbursed to:		
Purchase of investments	1,427,591	2,044,665
Interest payments and costs	335,089	1,808,642
Major projects refinancing	-	4,991
Repayment of New Zealand loans	3,025,317	14,312,736
Repayment of overseas loans	1,251,290	2,837,769
	<u>6,039,287</u>	<u>21,008,803</u>

	Month Ended	Year To Date
	\$(000's)	\$(000's)
Cash flows from Crown and departmental activities:		
Cash flows from debt and cash management operations	(569,672)	(325,845)
Net increase (decrease) in cash held	(51,693)	(190,986)
Foreign exchange gain (loss)	(1,124)	(4,019)
Plus opening cash position	611,959	754,147
Closing cash position	<u>559,142</u>	<u>559,142</u>

go12472

Authorities and Other Agencies of State

Broadcasting Standards Authority

Broadcasting Act 1989

Broadcasting Standards Authority—Decisions No. 48/91, 49/91, 50/91, 51/91, 52/91, 53/91, 54/91, 55/91, 56/91, 57/91, 58/91, 59/91, 60/91, 61/91, 62/91, 63/91, 64/91, and 65/91

Pursuant to section 15 of the Broadcasting Act 1989, notice is hereby given that the Broadcasting Standards Authority has made the following decisions on complaints referred to it for investigation and review.

(i) In decision 48/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Mr Bill Rout of Hamilton that the broadcast by TV3 Network Services Limited of items on *3 National News* on 16 July 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters about the portrayal of violence.

(ii) In decision 49/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Mr C. Rosa of Wellington that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of an Orthodox advertisement in June 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters to maintain standards requiring good taste and decency and that advertisements should not use sexual appeal in an exploitive or degrading manner.

(iii) In decision 50/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Mr Robert Wardlaw of Auckland that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of a trailer for the programme *One Foot in the Grave* on 16 June 1991, and the broadcast of the programme itself on 18 June, breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters about taste and decency, about the classification codes, about the protection of children and not to encourage the denigration of, or discrimination against, various groups.

(iv) In decision 51/91, the Authority upheld a complaint by Mrs P. G. Greer of Nightcaps that the news broadcast by Radio 4ZA in Invercargill on the morning of 8 April 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters to show balance, impartiality and fairness.

(v) In decision 52/91, the Authority upheld a complaint by Mrs Gay Collins of Wellington that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of part of the programme *Catching Up* on 1 March 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters to deal justly and fairly with any person referred to.

(vi) In decision 53/91, the Authority upheld a complaint by the Group Opposed to Advertising of Liquor that the

broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of an advertisement on 15 June 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters which prohibits the advertising of competitions which require the purchase of liquor to participate.

(vii) In decision 54/91, the Authority upheld a complaint by Ms Lucille Young of Palmerston North that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of an item on the programme *Funny Business* on 16 May 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters about taste and decency.

(viii) In decision 55/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Dr Jane Ritchie of Hamilton that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of the programme *For the Love of Mike* on 20 June 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters about taste and decency and not to encourage the denigration of, or discrimination against, various groups.

(ix) In decision 56/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by the Group Opposed to Advertising of Liquor that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of an item on *One's World of Sport* on 3 June 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters that liquor advertisements shall not include references to brand names, other than to the name of the advertiser, or to the qualities of alcoholic liquor.

(x) In decision 57/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Dr Jane Ritchie of Hamilton that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of a So Good advertisement on 7 April 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters not to broadcast advertisements containing misleading claims or representations.

(xi) In decision 58/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Mr B. F. Shepherd of Whangarei that the action taken by Television New Zealand Limited when upholding Mr Shepherd's complaint about an item on the *Holmes* programme on 29 May 1991 about war veterans in Crete was inadequate.

(xii) In decision 59/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by the One New Zealand Foundation that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of an item on *Frontline* on 4 August 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters that, when controversial issues of public importance are discussed, reasonable efforts are made or reasonable opportunities are given to present significant points of view, and to show balance, impartiality and fairness in dealing with political matters, current affairs and all questions of a controversial nature.

(xiii) In decision 60/91, the Authority upheld a complaint by Mr Bill Rout of Hamilton that the broadcast by TV3 Network Services Limited on 29 July 1991 of a trailer for the