



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 222/01 |
| 2. Advertiser | Medical Benefits Fund of Aust Ltd |
| 3. Product | Insurance |
| 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 September 2001 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

One of a series of television advertisements based on theme of “every life is a different story,” in the advertisement subject to complaint “Mike and Alice” are shown getting married over a commentary that “They’ll spend 60,000 hours together, with the kids. And they’ll spend many more without them.” Over images of food and dancing in a park, where attention is drawn to the man putting his hand on the woman’s bottom, the commentary continues: “They’ll enjoy 4,200 meals and 3,000 hours of romance.” Over a scene of bouncing bed springs, the voiceover says: “Their hearts will beat 3 billion times.” Over vision of a woman with extraordinary long hair and a balding man, the voice continues: “Alice will grow 9 metres of hair, and Mike won’t.” The advertisement cuts to a scene of a couple in bed, the man having blocked his ears in defence against the woman’s snoring, before concluding with details of MBF insurance for couples.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“It is my opinion that this commercial is tacky, indecent and

offensive and is not appropriate for television regardless of the timeslot. I was mildly disgusted with the tacky imagery of the ‘bouncing bed’ scene. With regard to the ‘groping the bottom’ scenes, it was both tacky and disrespectful to women.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board determined that the content of this television advertisement did not constitute a contravention of the Code in relation to the portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity or discrimination/vilification. Finding that the content of the advertisement did not breach the Code on any grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint accordingly.