



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	288/03
2. Advertiser	Clorox Australia Pty Ltd (Chux)
3. Product	Housegoods/services
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Violence Other – section 2.2
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 9 September 2003
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement opens on dramatic fire-fighting scene, with a fire truck screeching to a halt outside a small suburban home, and firemen smashing down a door to gain entry. A woman is shown waiting in the kitchen, holding a very dirty pot scourer to which the firemen direct their high-pressure hoses, pushing the woman off her feet in the process. A voiceover states: “You’d have to go to extremes to get your pot scourer as clean as ours, and even then it won’t be completely clean.” A close up of the scourer shows it is still dirty, although the woman is soaking wet. The next scene show the woman happily washing plates and pans with a Chux Clean Rinse Sponge, the voiceover continuing: “The brush-like fibres of our Chux Clean Rinse Scrub Sponge rinse clean in seconds, every time.” The advertisement ends with the sponge being squeezed clean under a tap ahead of a product pack view and caption reading: ‘Cleaner-Faster-Smarter.’

THE COMPLAINT

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

“It shows a mature-aged lady being subjugated to football scrum treatment by a group of uniformed persons armed with a powerful water hose, while carrying out her domestic duties in the kitchen of her home...This is not suitable treatment for any person...”

“...my young son saw this advertisement and it really upset him I think this ad should not be shown in prime time as it is actually quite violent and, being a fire engine, it is something that appeals to young children and something they will naturally look at.”

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 the advertiser’s submission that: ‘...a dramatic scene was chosen to achieve cut through. While dramatic, there certainly is no intended aggressive or malicious violence within the creative.’

In the opinion of the Board, the majority of people viewing the depiction would recognise it as an unreal situation rather than regarding it as a portrayal of reality.

The Board determined that the depiction did not constitute violence as represented in the Code, and that it did not otherwise breach any other provisions of the Code.

Accordingly, the complaint was dismissed.