

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	18/193
<b>COMPLAINANT</b>	K Sutcliffe
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Greenpeace NZ
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Greenpeace NZ, Television
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	21 June 2018
<b>OUTCOME</b>	No Grounds to Proceed

**Advertisement:** The television advertisement for Greenpeace showed landscapes and fauna in the Mackenzie Country and said it was “about to be invaded by more industrial dairy farming”. The advertisement said industrial dairy farming could contaminate drinking water and pollute waterways. The advertisement stated, in part: “Enough is enough, text your name to 4662 to donate \$3 to help save the Mackenzie”.

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

**Complainant, K. Sutcliffe, said:** “With the current affairs of New Zealand Dairy and Beef farmers having to destory there entire herds. I find it in really bad taste greenpeace can advertise dairy herds are hurting the enviroment while farmers are hurting themselves The ad in question has been seen on Prime a number of times since I made this Complaint Greenpeace have a right to advertise but not while farmers are seeing herds going to the meatworks.”

**The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4, Rule 4 and Rule 11;**

**The Chair** noted the Complainant’s concern it was in bad taste to promote dairy farming as polluting the environment while the famers in New Zealand are affected by the Mycoplasma bovis infection being found in their cattle.

The Chair confirmed the advertisement, by Greenpeace, was intended to raise awareness about Greenpeace’s view on the contamination of rivers. She said both the identity and the position of the Advertiser were clear, in compliance with Rule 11, and therefore the advertisement should be reviewed in the context of advocacy advertising. As such, and in the interests of freedom of expression under section 14 of the Bill of Rights Act 1990, a more liberal interpretation of the Code was appropriate.

The Chair considered the timing of the Greenpeace advertisement when farmers were experiencing other stresses relating to their industry and said the Complainant was conflating the two matters. While she sympathised with the current position farmers were in and noted the Complainant’s point, the advertisement’s primary message was about protecting the Mackenzie Country from the pollution associated with dairy intensification.

Taking into account generally prevailing community standards and the advocacy message, the Chair said the advertisement was unlikely to cause serious or widespread offence to most people and was not in breach of Rule 4 or Rule 11 of the Code of Ethics.

The Chair said the advertisement had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and society and was not in breach of Basic Principle 4 of the Code of Ethics.

Accordingly, the Chair ruled the complaint had no grounds to proceed.

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

**APPEAL INFORMATION**

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website [www.asa.co.nz](http://www.asa.co.nz). Appeals must be made in writing via email or letter within 14 days of receipt of this decision.