



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	397/08
2. Advertiser	Puratap Pty Ltd
3. Product	Housegoods/services
4. Type of advertisement	Radio
5. Nature of complaint	Health and safety – section 2.6
6. Date of determination	Wednesday, 8 October 2008
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This radio advertisement advises that if you do not have Puratap to filter all the chemical out of your water before you drink it, your own body has to act as the filter.

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

I believe that this advertisement is scaring people into purchasing their product.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

The advertisement is correct in that the person's body has to filter out the chemicals if they are left in the water. It is also appropriate to use the terms harsh. I will just sight just one example of a chemical that is harsh, there are many more that could be included.

Chlorine has to be added to the water to ensure the water is bacteriologically safe. Chlorine is a strong oxidising agent even when highly diluted. The by products of chlorine are class 3 carcinogens. (This is documented in the Australian Water Quality Guidelines for Drinking Water.) The cartridges we use in our systems have been tested to remove chlorine and it's by products to a class1 standard and NSF 61 which is considered the highest standard for chlorine reduction. We can provide documentation of laboratory tests to prove this if required.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board considered the application of Section 2.6, relating to health and safety. The Board noted the complainants’ concerns that the advertisement might alarm some people about consuming tap water. However, the Board agreed that to the extent a “scare” tactic was employed, it was mild in nature, grounded in fact and did not contravene prevailing community standards on health and safety.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.