



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 256/00 |
| 2. Advertiser | Johnson & Johnson Pacific Pty Ltd (Carefree Tampons - Light Days) |
| 3. Product | Toiletries |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 5 September 2000 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The television advertisement depicts two young women, twins, talking alternately to camera. ‘People are always mixing us up.’ ‘Just because we look the same, doesn’t mean we are.’ ‘I’m this much taller.’ ‘And I’m that much shorter. But I’m older.’ ‘By 25 minutes.’ ‘We don’t even use the same size tampon. (Graph appears briefly on-screen.) Since 70% of a woman’s period happens in the first couple of days, we use a combination.’ ‘So I use Carefree Regular tampons at first, and then new Carefree Regular Light Days.’ (Product appears briefly on-screen.) ‘And I use Carefree Super tampons and new Carefree Super Light Days.’ (Product appears briefly on-screen.) ‘Because I want what’s best for my body.’ ‘Not someone else’s.’ The advertisement concludes with a shot of the products on a bathroom shelf and a voiceover and text: ‘Carefree. Tampons tailor-made.’

THE COMPLAINT

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

‘I do not believe that two perfect strangers should be able to come into my lounge room, uninvited and just start talking about this subject in such detail!’

‘Whilst I usually tolerate feminine hygiene products being advertised, I am deeply offended by a specific comment made in this commercial. I don’t appreciate being made to feel uncomfortable every time I see this advertisement.’

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board determined that the material within the advertisement did not contravene prevailing community standards in its depiction of sex/sexuality/nudity and that the advertisement did not breach the Code on this or any other ground. The Board, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.