



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	346/05
2. Advertiser	Bluescope Steel Ltd
3. Product	Housegoods/services
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 13 December 2005
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement forms part of a larger campaign that previously featured advertisements titled: “*Undies*” and; “*Kiss*”. This current advertisement depicts an old-style “outhouse” in the garden of a suburban home. The homeowner is shown to be sitting on the toilet. He opens the door to gaze proudly at his Colorbond roof. As he opens the door even wider, a woman and her young daughter come into the garden with the homeowner’s wife and all are shocked to see him in view. The man reluctantly closes the door as the woman places her hands over her daughter’s eyes.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“... pathetic, low moral standards...”

“Why is it that it is a man sitting on the toilet? Don’t women sit on toilets?”

“... I’ve had enough of witnessing people’s bodily functions and what it has to do with the product advertised is beyond me.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

“The advertising strategy... was executed by showing people forgetting themselves and the situation they were in, once they caught sight of their new roof...”

“So engaged were they by the look of their new roof, they forgot all else!”

“In the case of “Outhouse”, we believe there is a strong Australian history and connection with the backyard loo, indeed many people still have them.”

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 that the advertiser had used humour to portray people ‘forgetting themselves’ when appreciating their new roof. The Board was of the view that the majority of people would understand and appreciate this humour and not find the advertisement offensive. It also considered that the images in the advertisement were not overly graphic nor explicit. The Board was of the view that the advertisement did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex/sexuality or nudity.

The Board also noted a complainant’s view that it is a man rather than a woman shown to be on the

toilet. The Board determined that the scenes in the advertisement did not portray people or depict material that discriminated against people on account of their sex.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.