



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	168/01
2. Advertiser	RACQ/RACQ Insurance
3. Product	Insurance
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 10 July 2001
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENTS

This series of 10 advertisements [3 for RACQ and 7 for RACQ Insurance] depicts different domestic scenes: a father imitating his son's car driving; a husband relating the story of his wife's car breaking down while he was 'off havin' a beer at Dave's'; a wife taking over her husband's attempt to list discounts available to RACQ members; a husband's relating of a fishing boat accident being interrupted by his wife's interjections; a wife's story about paying insurance by the month being accompanied by her husband's over-zealous pruning of a topiary tree; a son leaving his father to face his mother after installing a doorbell which sounds like a car horn; a car-driving mother's dealing with the backseat misbehaviour of her two young sons; an elderly couple's relating the insurance benefits for the 'more mature' concluding with the husband acting childishly; and a man nursing a Chihuahua fitted with a veterinary cone over its head talking about pet insurance while pretending the dog is a megaphone. Each of the advertisements ends with a graphic providing contact information.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant made regarding these advertisements included the following:

'I believe that they are discriminatory, sexist and politically incorrect as the (sic) all depict the males as a fool (sic) and of low intelligence. If the ads had been a combination of both male and female made to look the fool, though inappropriate, would have been more acceptable (sic).'

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether these advertisements breach Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The determination of the Board was that none of the advertisements breached the Code's provisions relating to discrimination/vilification. Finding also that the advertisements did not contravene any other provisions of the Code, the Board dismissed the complaint.