



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	107/00
2. Advertiser	Sancell Pty Ltd (Libra Invisible)
3. Product	Toiletries
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 11 April 2000
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The television advertisement portrays two young men, one looking at a photograph through the viewfinder of a video camera. He says, 'There's the happy couple, now honeymooning in Hawaii.' A 'bride and groom' figurine falls to the floor and is picked up by a cat which the men follow to a bedroom. They come upon a third man wearing a wedding dress and stiletto heeled shoes who steps onto the bed to be photographed. The bed is punctured by the heel of the shoe and spurts water. The action moves forward to the newlyweds making love in the waterbed, which has been repaired with Libra Invisible. The voiceover says: 'Libra Invisible won't leak – so you'll never get caught out.'

## **THE COMPLAINT**

Comments which the complainants made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*'I think it is very poor taste to show a Libra pad as a means of patching up a hole in a waterbed.'*

*'I find this add (sic) highly offensive, derogatory to women and disparaging to women's menstrual cycles. Further, it implies that marriage is a joke and women are only useful as sex objects.'*

*'Firstly, I feel this advertisement belittles the wedding/marriage by making fun of the occasion ..... Secondly, do we really need to see people in the throes of lovemaking during an advertisement?'*

*'As a parent, I found this advertisement to be offensive. My children who were watching television at the time were disgusted by the image on the screen. Children do not have to be privy to adult themes which are the equivalent of pornography.'*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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

The Board noted that the advertisement had received a PG rating, restricting its broadcast to the relevant time classification zones. The Board was of the view that the material contained within the advertisement did not contravene community standards in its treatment of sex/sexuality/nudity; neither did it constitute discrimination or vilification. The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach the Code on these or any other grounds and, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.