



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 242/07 |
| 2. Advertiser | Reckitt Benckiser Aust Pty Ltd (Pine-O-Cleen) |
| 3. Product | Housegoods/services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 14 August 2007 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on a woman (Jane) cleaning her kitchen benches as her next door neighbour rushes in to ask if she can borrow some grocery items as her family is sick. The neighbour says that her daughter picked up a bug at kindy and now the twins have caught it - her house was in chaos as she had not had time to get to the shop and the doctor was due to arrive. Jane continues cleaning then suddenly has an idea, handing her neighbour a bottle of Pine-O-Cleen disinfectant. As the neighbour thanks her and leaves she tells Jane "You take care of yourself now, won't you?"

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

I find this ad offensive because it suggests that the children of the second woman are sick BECAUSE she does not use Pine O Cleen. I get the impression as a viewer that the second woman's home is not clean and is in need of a good scrub and this is the reason her kids are ill, when it is plainly stated that the kids brought the sickness home from school. I think it is an insult to mothers loaded up with kids who are struggling to keep a clean home, suggesting that their lack of ability to keep their house clean results in sickness for their children, which can be seen as a form of negligence.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

We treat any complaint about our advertising seriously. We have no intention of conveying a message that either explicitly or implicitly insults mothers in any respect or for any reason.

We are advised by our regulatory department that bacteria which can cause illness can be left behind on surfaces such as benches, tables, doors and handles by a source of the bacteria, including someone whose hands are contaminated with the bacteria and has touched the surface. The bacteria can then be picked up by another person touching the surface, and this person can infect themselves or others.

It is our view that a reasonable person viewing the Pine O Cleen Commercial is more than likely to understand the key message to be that Pine O Cleen kills 99.9% of germs such as staphylococcus, E coli or salmonella that can make people sick (as is specifically set out in the Pine O Cleen Commercial) and not as an implied or express insult to mothers (or fathers) who are trying to keep their homes clean but who may not use Pine O Cleen.

In addition, we have reviewed Section 2 of the AANA Advertiser Code of Ethics (Code) in light of

the Complaint and are of the view that the Complaint does not, even if what the Complaint alleges is true (which we deny), represent or disclose a breach of Section 2 of the Code.

If the Advertising Standards Bureau is of the view that the Pine O Cleen Commercial does contravene Section 2 of the Code and is able to provide us with more specific information regarding any such alleged breach, we are more than happy, and would appreciate the opportunity, to address any such further allegation if it arises.

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board considered whether the advertisement discriminated against or vilified women by suggesting that women who did not use the advertised product were poor parents or housekeepers. The Board agreed that the advertisement suggested that it is good housekeeping practice to use a disinfectant such as the advertised product around the house. However the Board considered that this suggestion did not amount to vilification of women who did not use the product, but rather was usual advertising which suggests that use of a particular product is beneficial to the purchaser.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.1 of the Code. Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.