



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	212/01
2. Advertiser	Bendigo Airport Bus Services
3. Product	Travel
4. Type of advertisement	Radio
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 11 September 2001
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The radio commercial submitted to the Board starts with a female voice saying “Welcome to Bendigo Airport Service. We are scheduled to arrive at Melbourne Airport in two hours. Sit back, relax and enjoy the air-conditioned comfort.” A male voice continues: “Next time you fly out of Melbourne, leave the car at home and catch the Bendigo Airport Service. You’ll be dropped right at the terminal, so you won’t have to worry about crazy Melbourne drivers, parking hassles or lugging heavy suitcases. With three return trips daily, Bendigo Airport Service is the only way to travel.” The female voice resumes with contact details for the service.

THE COMPLAINT

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

“(I) heard the statement ‘crazy women drivers’ ... half an hour later an ad using the same voice came on, this time referring to ‘crazy Melbourne drivers’ ... there is no doubt with me that there are two separate commercials along similar lines. While the latter may be put down to a parochial and provincial disposition, the former reinforces stereotypes of sexual discrimination.”

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 correspondence from the complainant suggesting that there were several variations of the advertisement, and that “to my knowledge the ‘crazy women drivers’ has only been played once.” It also noted a response from the advertiser that the words ‘crazy women drivers’ were never used, and that the advertisement using the words ‘crazy Melbourne drivers’ was withdrawn within an hour of a complaint being notified to one of the company’s principals.

The Board determined that the content of the submitted advertising material did not constitute discrimination/vilification under the Code. It further found that the material did not contravene any other provisions of the Code and, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.