



CASE REPORT

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 216/05 |
| 2. Advertiser | Always Synergy (deferred from August 2005) |
| 3. Product | Professional Services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Print |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Race – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 13 September 2005 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This is a radio advertisement promoting the security services supplied by Always Synergy. A voiceover states: *“Security is a serious business. If you’re not happy with your current security provider, switch to Always Synergy Security guard specialists and customer service award winners. If you’ve experienced unprofessional, unreliable, inflexible or poor English speaking guards, call Always Synergy for an obligation free security appraisal...”*

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

“The advertisement asks listeners not to risk the security of their employees or business assets with ‘poor English speaking guards’. Not only does this promote discrimination on the basis of race, but it plays on the racist hysteria that both Chris Smith and Philip Clarke actively promote on their shows.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

No comments were received from the advertiser in response to the complaint.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board was of the view that the comment relating to the use of poor English speaking guards was not material that discriminates against or vilifies a person or a section of the community on account of their race. The Board considered that in the security industry there may be a need for well-spoken guards. The Board was of the view that in the context of prevailing community standards, the majority of people would not find this advertisement offensive.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of people (race).

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.