



## CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	192/01
2. Advertiser	Canon Australia Pty Ltd (MV4301i digital video camera)
3. Product	Other
4. Type of advertisement	Print
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 Health and safety – section 2.6
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 August 2001
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement features a photograph of a man and a woman on a couch. The woman's head and shoulders are in the lap of the seated man, with her face turned towards him. In the forefront of the photograph, the man is shown to have something angular and bulky in one of his socks, with the obvious inference that it is what accompanying text describes as "The go anywhere Digital MV430i." Other text advises: "He wears the MV430i digital video camera. The Photo Mode records stills on a multimedia memory card for both PC and Mac. And with 200x digital/10x optical zoom and a 2.5" colour screen, it will never look out of place."

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*"This advertisement was particularly offensive because it depicted a woman who looked like she was about to perform fellatio, being filmed, apparently without her knowledge or consent....The advertisement legitimizes the notion that it is fine to do something without a woman's consent."*

*"...a woman draped across a man's lap in what I believe to be a sexually suggestive, submissive position with the added offensive element of a video camera being hidden in the man's socks—presumably for the purpose of surreptitiously filming their intimate moment."*

*"Their body positioning suggests that she is about to fellate him and he has the digital camera up his trouser leg, presumably to film the action, as the caption is 'the go anywhere' digital camera. I do believe I have fairly liberal views and am not easily offended, but feel that this ad has gone just a bit too far."*

.../2

## Complaint reference number 192/01 Page 2

*"Its overt sexual reference was insulting, demeaning and sexist. I am peeved that I have to now censor the newspapers to ensure that they are suitable to remain on public view over the weekend."*

*"I don't believe the ad displays any sort of message except to perhaps titillate the reader into thinking that an act of fellatio is being carried out and that it is possibly being filmed."*

*"In a world where paedophiles and other criminals are frequently reported as using such cameras to record their crimes for subsequent recreational viewing, I find it objectionable and incredibly offensive that you are advertising your product in this way. If the camera had not been hidden the*

*advertisement would merely have been tasteless. As it is, I believe that this advertisement is an affront to human decency.”*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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

The Board noted advice from the advertiser that it had already acted to modify future placements of the material and limit such placements to male lifestyle publications “to ensure that no further complaints are received.”

The determination of the Board was that the advertisement did not contravene the Code in relation to the portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity, discrimination/vilification or health & safety. Finding that the material did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.