



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 281/99 |
| 2. Advertiser | Bell's Dry Cleaners Pty Ltd |
| 3. Product | Retail |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 14 September 1999 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The television advertisement commences with voiceover saying ‘Tom’s feeling very romantic and he’s brought flowers home’ as a man holding a bunch of flowers is shown coming through a doorway. A woman is shown ironing as voiceover continues ‘But Mary’s too busy ironing shirts’. The woman is then shown throwing a pillow at the man, saying ‘You can sleep on the sofa’. Voiceover says ‘Poor Tom ... The next day, Tom has a new plan, but Mary’s still ironing shirts’ as the man is shown with a bunch of flowers and a box of chocolates. The man says ‘But the sofa’s so uncomfortable’ to which the woman replies ‘Get a new sofa’ and slams the bedroom door. Voiceover says ‘The next day, Tom has a new plan’ and the man is shown coming home with a number of ironed shirts on coat hangers. The woman says ‘You’ve been to Bell’s’ as she reaches up to let down her hair. In the final scene, the man and woman are shown together in bed. The woman says ‘Darling, turn out the lights’ as the shirts are shown hanging in a cupboard and appearing to radiate a fluorescent glow. Voiceover says ‘Bell’s new ‘fluoroglow’ process gives shirts that special bloom. They even have a button guarantee.’

THE COMPLAINT

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

“... inappropriate viewing for young people in that the content portrays both males and females and male/female roles appallingly. As an adult I just find them crude and vulgar.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board determined that the depiction of the man and woman within the advertisement did not breach the Code on the grounds of its treatment of sex, sexuality or nudity, nor on any other ground. The Board, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.