

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612 Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833

CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number 310/01

2. Advertiser AXA Aust Health Insurance Pty Ltd (HBA 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, 13 November 2001

7. DETERMINATION Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The television version of this advertisement shows a man with buck teeth having difficulty making himself understood when asking representative of HBA Insurance for the advertised 'three for free' special offer of three months Free Extras Cover. Eventually understanding the request, the female representative is asked: "Does that include optical?" to which she responds: "Yes, and dental."

The advertisement ends with a graphic incorporating an HBA Health Insurance logo and the Internet website address 'freeextras.com.au.' The print version of the advertisement features a photograph of the man with buck teeth overprinted with large-type text reading: "Get fwee months Extras fwee." The advertisement also incorporates the HBA Health Insurance logo and Internet address.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainants made regarding this advertisement included

the following:

'I am personally disgusted with a company who makes money from offering health insurance to people (who) may need cosmetic surgery, for being so insensitive and showing such a lack of morals...'

'I think we should be more sensitive to people who suffer physical deformities and ask ourselves how we would cope if we were in their situations.'

'I thought it was very degrading and must be embarrassing to anyone who has this problem.'

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board ('the Board') considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics ('the Code').

The Board determined that the advertising material did not constitute discrimination and/or vilification and did not breach the Code on any other grounds.

Accordingly, the complaint was dismissed.