



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	330/99
2. Advertiser	Big Colour Pages Pty Ltd
3. Product	Telecommunications
4. Type of advertisement	Radio
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 12 October 1999
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

There are two radio advertisements the subject of complaint.

In the first advertisement, a man is heard saying “Look, this is difficult for me to tell you but, as you know, things are pretty tight around here. And there’s really no easy way to say it so, to get right to the point, there’s no room for you here any more, we’ve got to let you go”. A young girl then says “But Daddy, I live here”.

In the second advertisement, a woman is heard saying “Gran, you’ll love it here. The facilities are great, very modern, there’s people your own age, you won’t be short a bridge partner and don’t forget weekly bingo”. An elderly woman then asks “Can’t I come home?” to which the first woman replies “Well, to be honest, Gran, we kind of need the space”.

Both advertisements conclude with voiceover saying “With comprehensive internet and business phone listings in one compact book, it’s worth making room for the Big Colour Pages”.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

Comments that the complainant/s made regarding these advertisements included the following:

*“I find this particularly offensive as, not only is this the Year for the Aged, but I work in a unit where facilitation of placement into residential care is often necessary. There is already a stigma placed on these institutions and this particular advertisement does not make the job any easier.”*

*“I find it very disturbing that a business is implying that their product is more important than the welfare of children and the aged. This is not funny in the least.”*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether the advertisements breached Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (‘the Code’).

The Board determined that neither advertisement constituted discrimination or vilification, given the clearly fictitious nature of the exchanges and their humorous context. The Board therefore determined that the advertisements did not breach the Code on this or any other ground and, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.