

COMPLAINT NUMBER	17/385
COMPLAINANT	L. West
ADVERTISER	World Animal Protection
ADVERTISEMENT	World Animal Protection, Television
DATE OF MEETING	24 October 2017
OUTCOME	No Grounds to Proceed

Advertisement: The World Animal Protection television advertisement shows images of animals chained up and being trained to perform tricks. The voiceover states that these animals do not have a voice to resist this and need those who love animals to be their voice and “make some noise” by becoming an Animal Protector for \$10 a month.

The Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

Complainant, L. West, said: Complaining about the images shown when children are watching TV. My daughter who is 6 years old was watching TV And playing and was subjected to horrific images of animal abuse.

We support the cause but DO NOT believe children should be subjected to the images of animals being abused. It is disgusting and my daughter was in tears and distraught at the topic and the images of bears with rings through their noses being whipped and made to dance etc

The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4, Rule 11, Rule 4, Rule 5.

The Chair noted the Complainant’s concern about the images of animals being abused was distressful and unsuitable for children.

In considering the complaint, the Chair referred to precedent Decisions 17/087 and 15/154, which had dealt with similar advertising campaigns and said in part;

...”The Chair confirmed the advertisement for World Animal Protection was intended to raise awareness about the conditions some animals are kept in. While these images can be confronting, Advocacy advertising is provided for under Rule 11 of the Code of Ethics.

The Chair noted the advertisement had been afforded a GXC (General Except Children) rating by the Commercial Approvals Bureau, which meant it may be broadcast at any time except during programmes which are intended specifically for children under the age of 13. “

Turning to the complaint before her, the Chair confirmed the advertisement had aired during the AM Show, which was not targeting children and therefore had played within the constraints of its afforded rating.

While acknowledging the distress the advertisement had caused the Complaint's child, she said that advocacy advertisements were allowed to be robust and provocative. As such she ruled that as long as the advertisement had played in accordance with its rating, there was no apparent breach of the Advertising Codes.

Accordingly, the Chair ruled that there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

Chair's Ruling: Complaint **No Grounds to Proceed**