

# Authorities and Other Agencies of State

## Broadcasting Standards Authority

### Broadcasting Act 1989

#### Broadcasting Standards Authority—Decision No. 6/92, 7/92, 8/92, 9/92, 10/92, 11/92, 12/92, 13/92, 14/92, 15/92 and 16/92

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 6/92, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by the Society for Promotion of Community Standards that the broadcast by TV3 Network Services Limited of the documentary *Inside New Zealand* on 29 August 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters to be truthful and accurate on points of fact, to show balance, impartiality and fairness in dealing with questions of a controversial nature and to avoid the use of any deceptive programme practice.

(ii) In Decision 7/92, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by the Gisborne Boys' High School Board of Trustees that the broadcast by Radio 89FM of Gisborne, on 10 June 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters to maintain standards consistent with the privacy of the individual.

(iii) In Decision 8/92, the Authority upheld a complaint by Cook Islands Pearls Limited that the broadcast by TV3 Network Services Limited of an item on *60 Minutes* on 7 July 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters to deal justly and fairly with any person referred to, to show balance, impartiality and fairness in dealing with questions of a controversial nature, to take care in editing to ensure that overall views are not distorted and not to encourage the denigration of, or discrimination against, various groups. The Authority ordered TV3 Network Services Limited to publish a brief summary of the decision in the public notices column of the major Cook Islands newspaper by 1 April 1992.

(iv) In Decision 9/92, the Authority upheld a complaint by the Solicitor-General about action taken by Capital FM Limited after the broadcaster declined to consider a formal complaint in accordance with the requirements in the Broadcasting Act 1989.

(v) In Decision 10/92, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Mr R. Odnot of Eastbourne that the broadcast by Radio New Zealand Limited of an item on *Morning Report* on 10 October 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters to maintain standards requiring good taste and decency, to deal justly and fairly with any person taking part in a programme and to show balance, impartiality and fairness in dealing with political matters.

(vi) In Decision 11/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint from Ms Rosalie Sugrue of Dunedin that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of an item on *Frontline* on 18 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, to deal justly and fairly with any person taking part in a programme, to show balance, impartiality and fairness in dealing with questions of a controversial nature, to take care in editing to ensure that views are not distorted and to present all

significant sides of a controversial public issue as fairly as possible.

(vii) In Decision 12/92, the Authority upheld a complaint from the Treasury that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of an item on *Frontline* on 16 June 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters to deal fairly and justly with any person taking part in a programme.

(viii) In Decision 13/92, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint by Mr H. E. Jensen of Wellington that the broadcast by Radio New Zealand Limited of an item on *Morning Report* on 27 January 1992 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters to maintain standards requiring good taste and decency.

(ix) In Decision 14/92, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint from Mr Robert Wardlaw of Auckland that the broadcast by Television New Zealand Limited of the programme *Birds of a Feather* on 12 November 1991 breached the responsibilities placed on broadcasters about taste and decency, about the protection of children and not to encourage the denigration of, or discrimination against, various groups.

(x) In Decision 15/92, the Authority upheld a complaint from the New Zealand Police that the broadcast by TV3 Network Services Limited of an item on *60 Minutes* on 5 May 1991 breached the responsibility 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. The Authority ordered TV3 Network Services Limited to broadcast a brief summary of the decision on a *60 Minutes* programme before 15 May 1992.

(xi) In Decision 16/91, the Authority declined to uphold a complaint from Dr Nick Cooper of Auckland that the broadcast by TV3 Network Services Limited of an item on *60 Minutes* on 13 October 1991 breached the responsibility placed on broadcasters to show balance, impartiality and fairness in dealing with a controversial matter.

Copies of Decisions may be purchased from the Broadcasting Standards Authority, P.O. Box 9213, Wellington at the price of \$5.00 each or by annual subscription of \$100.00.

Dated at Wellington this 30th day of April 1992.

G. POWELL, Executive Officer.

au4082

## New Zealand Fish and Game Council

### Conservation Act 1987

#### Eastern Fish and Game Region District Anglers Notice 1990, Amendment No. 1

Pursuant to section 26R (3) of the Conservation Act 1987 (as amended by section 17 of the Conservation Law Reform Act 1990), The Eastern Fish and Game Council amends the Eastern Fish and Game Region District Anglers Notice 1990, supplement to the *New Zealand Gazette*, 1990, No. 151, page 3205–3206.

**1. Title and commencement—**(1) This amending notice may be cited as the Eastern Fish and Game Region District Anglers Notice 1990, Amendment No. 1 and shall be read together with and deemed part of the Eastern Fish and Game Region District Anglers Notice 1990 (hereinafter referred to as the "principal notice").